# SPECIAL MEETING OF WICKLOW COUNTY COUNCIL 

## HELD AT WICKLOW COUNTY BUILDINGS, WICKLOW TOWN

ON WEDNESDAY, 28TH MARCH 2018 AT 6:00 P.M.

Gwen Malone Stenography Services certify the following to be a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic notes in the above-named action.

THE HEARING COMMENCED ON WEDNESDAY, 28TH DAY OF MARCH, 2018 AS FOLLOWS:

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, you're all very welcome here today and welcome to those in the audience who are attending here as well. Can you hear me?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yeah.
CATHAOIRLEACH: You're all very welcome, Members, and welcome to the members of the audience as well. I'm just going to read out, for the record, the purpose behind this meeting and the reason it was called.
"To call a Special Meeting of wicklow County Council on Wednesday, 28th March 2018. The following Councillors, Members of Wicklow County Council, hereby request, in accordance with Standing Orders, that the Cathaoirleach of Wicklow County Council will call a Special Meeting of Wicklow County Council to be held at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 28th March in the Council Chamber, Wicklow County Council to discuss and decide on the following:

What measures the Council will take with regard to the conduct of the wicklow County Council meeting held on Monday, 12th March 2018, in particular" - and this seems to be the nub of it - "in particular discussions of Item 5 on the agenda and the controversial decision taken by the Cathaoirleach to disallow a formal proposal made by C11r. Brendan Thornhil1 and Mary Kavanagh from being allowed to be voted on by the

Elected Members of Wicklow County Council, despite this proposal being directly relevant to Item 5 of the agenda.

This refusal by the Cathaoirleach not to allow a vote to be taken in C11r. Thornhill and Kavanagh's resolution is, we believe, in breach of Standing Orders and outside the authority of the Cathaoirleach.

Given the issue was raised by C11r. Thornhill and Kavanagh the motion was mandated from a serious public concern with regard to the statutory process. It is important that these issues should now be dealt with by this authority in the interest of natural justice and due process.

Nothing to happen on this item until the outcome of this Special Meeting is concluded. Signed by 11 Members of Wicklow County Council."

So that's the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting for everyone here is to discuss whether I made a right decision or not to disallow a proposal made by C11r. Thornhil1. For everyone's information there was other proposals on the day as well and there was a proposal made which was voted on.

Now in relation to this, I was advised at the time, directed that it wasn't legal and proper to take that
vote. Subsequently I asked for advice from the Council, written advice as to what the situation was in relation to allowing that vote or not and advice has been received. I haven't actually seen it. It's just been -- I'm just aware that it has actually been printed and just handed to me now and I'm now requesting that that legal advice be circulated to all the Members of the Council here today and we could have time to read through it and people could then, you know, ask questions. Lorraine will read the legal opinion into the record.
MS. GALLAGHER: This is the legal opinion from the Council's Law Agent.
"I refer to this matter and to the requisition for a Special meeting which is scheduled for today, Wednesday, 28th March 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

I am instructed that when this matter came before the
Council meeting on 12 th March, there was a lengthy debate about the Part 8 proposal concerned. The proposal is as described at Item 5 on the agenda for that meeting.

I am further instructed that a proposal was put forward by two Councillors that the matter be adjourned and that legal advice be sought on the 'procurement and proposed demolishment planning process'. I am also
instructed that a proposal was put forward that the Part 8 function be delegated to the Municipal District concerned with the particular proposal. There was also a proposal put forward that the house forming part of the proposal would be retained and used for emergency accommodation or other use.

I am further instructed that ultimately there was a proposal to proceed with the matter and that ultimately a vote was taken on the Part 8 proposal before the Members and it was passed by 16 votes in favour; ten votes against, with six of the Council Members either absent or abstaining.

During the course of this discussion the Members were advised as to the options available to them, i.e., to vote against the proposal, to amend the proposal, or to accept the proposal which was before the meeting. I understand the Meeting's Administrator also adverted to the provisions of section 179 of the Planning and Development Act in that regard.

The Special Meeting is called to decide: 'What measures the Council will take with regard to the conduct of the wicklow County Council meeting held on Monday 12th March 2018' and to deal with the other matters set out in the requisition for the meeting.

You asked me for my views which are as follows:

1. With regard to the motion to adjourn and to seek legal advice in relation to the 'procurement and the proposed demolishment planning process', I am of the view that bearing in mind the terms of section 179(4)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, such a resolution is ultra vires, i.e., outside the powers of the Council. That subsection states that following consideration of the proposed development and the Manager's Report on the proposal in question, 'the proposed development may be carried out as recommended in the Manager's Report un1ess the Local Authority, by resolution, decides to vary or modify the development, otherwise than as recommended in the Manager's Report or decides not to proceed with the development'.

The resolution as submitted by C11r. Thornhill and cllr. Kavanagh, it seems to me is outside those terms. The motion proposed did not specify the length of the proposed adjournment. It also mentioned procurement which does not form part of the 'proper planning and sustainable development' of the area concerned and which is thus outside the terms of Section 179 of the Act. The motion also referred to the 'demolishment planning process'. The actual carrying out of the works proposed in the Part 8 follows from the Members' consideration of the proposal which was approved at the meeting. The Cathaoirleach declined to take that resolution and in view of the terms of section 179 of the Planning and Development Act, I consider that he
was correct in that decision, as to take the motion would very likely have prejudiced the entire process.
2. With regard to the proposal to delegate Part 8 functions to the Municipal District, as I understand it, the intention of that proposal was that this particular matter be of delegated to the Bray Municipal District.

Section 131 of the Act provides for delegation of reserved functions to Municipal Districts and Schedule 14a of the Act provides that functions under section 179 of the Planning and Development Act may be delegated to any particular Municipal District or Municipal Districts generally.

In this instance, however, the particular Part 8 was before Wicklow County Council in accordance with Section 179 and I am of the view that the process would have been invalidated if the Councillors had voted that this particular matter were to be delegated to the Municipal District midway through the process.

The Members may, if they wish, consider the matter of delegating functions to the Municipal Districts and if they pass the appropriate resolution then such functions can, in due course, be carried out by the Municipal District Members as and when they arise.

In this case the proposal arose at the meeting 12th March when the Part 8 proposal had been advertised, submissions had ben received, the Chief Executive's Report prepared and circulated and was under discussion by the Members of the full Council at the meeting. The 18:14 Council, therefore, had seisin or ownership of the matter and nowhere in Section 179 is there a provision equivalent to the delegation power contained at Section 131 of the Local Government Act. In those circumstances I consider that if the Members had decided to delegate this particular function to, in this case Bray Municipal District, such a delegation would be ultra vires being outside the terms of Section 179 of the Planning and Development Act.

In those circumstances $I$ consider that the Cathaoirleach acted correctly in not taking that motion.
3. A proposal was submitted that the house proposed to demolished be as part of the proposal be retained as a house and used as emergency accommodation or other use such as Jigsaw Project. The Members were advised that this proposal would amount to a new development and after some discussion this was accepted and no vote was 18:15 called for.

In overview, the Part 8 was considered by the Members on 12th March and a roll call vote was taken after
approximately two hours of discussion and I am instructed that any member, who wished to, made their contribution to the meeting before the vote. The proposal was approved by 16 votes in favour and ten
against the proposal, with two Members abstaining and four members absent from the meeting. Given the clear terms of Section 179 of the Planning and Development Act which sets out the process for a Part 8 it is hard to see how Standing Orders may have been breached at the meeting."

CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, we got two. we got a solicitor's letter.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, C11r. Thornhil1.
C11r. Thornhill.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, may I first of all say thanks to everyone for coming here to support this very important issue in Bray. This is an issue which has caused an awful lot of confusion and it's something that, as we saw at the last meeting, that it should be cleared up. I would like to see that due process is done in this because it's a very important issue.

I, first of all, would like to say that in fairness, the Administrator has just read out but, also, we have legal opinion from the an eminent Senior Counsel and I record. Once it is read in I will just (inaudible). CATHAOIRLEACH: I mean I haven't read it, we literally just got it this minute.

CLLR. LAWLESS: Yeah, but the same as the other one. CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: That's the point I was making we can adjourn for 20 minutes.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I hadn't finished. Sorry, I was halfway through what I was saying. I said I haven't read it. I've just had a quick peruse of it and it doesn't seem to be dealing with the issue of the meeting. The agenda item is to discuss whether I should have taken C11r. Thornhill and C11r. Kavanagh's proposal. This is something completely different. CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, can we adjourn the meeting for 20 minutes to read both these. This is the first time I've seen these documents. I just got two documents one from a solicitor and one from a Senior Counsel just there now and I'd like 20 minutes. MS. GALLAGHER: Can I say in accordance with Standing Orders. Can I just bring attention to Standing Order number 12:
"In the case of a meeting convened for a special purpose, the business specified in the notification for such meeting shall be transacted, and no other business."

CATHAOIRLEACH: I have no issue if Members want to take 18:18 time to read the opinion that we've just received. If you want to take five or ten minutes.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: There is a Senior Counsel's opinion and a solicitor's letter.

CLLR. VANCE: Chairman could I suggest 15 minutes? CATHAOIRLEACH: We'11 say 15 minutes. 6:35 then.

THE MEETING THEN ADJOURNED BRIEFLY AND CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS: its relevance to this meeting as well. C11r. O'Connor, did you want to come in?
CLLR. O'CONNOR: Yes, thanks, Cathaoirleach. what we have before us here is the legal opinion of the Law Agent of Wicklow County Council, Mr. Sweetman. Now the 18:35 Executive is probably correct in their assertion that the opinion provided by Mr. Whelan, Senior Counsel, is not relevant to this particular meeting considering the reasons why this particular meeting was called. I
accept that. It's unfortunate but that's what we're stuck with.

So we have to turn to Mr. Sweetman's opinion and that's exactly what the letter from Mr. Sweetman is, it's his legal opinion. He's a lawyer and he's presented his interpretation of the law. I'm also a lawyer and I may we11 have a different interpretation of the law. No doubt the Senior Counsel would have a different
interpretation of the law also. fact. In the interests of equality of arms, and simply as a matter of equality and as a matter of fair play, I'm now asking that independent legal advice be provided by a Senior Counsel and obvious7y I'm not talking about the Senior Counsel who's Mr. Whelan who would not necessarily be independent. I'm asking now that legal advice by a Senior Counse1 is presented, as soon as possible, on the issue of what occurred at the last meeting. I think without that our hands are completely and utterly tied. We have nothing to argue against Mr. Sweetman's letter and that's what we need to get do now. Until we get that $I$ don't think fair procedures can be seen to have taken place. This isn't just about what happens, it's about how people see what
happens, how it is presented and there's a notion out there, whether it's right or wrong, that wicklow County Council have not been doing things the right thing as far as that meeting went. Maybe to dispel that notion Senior Counsel's opinion, an independent Senior Counsel's opinion should be sought. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhil1.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, having just heard there Cllr. O'Connor, I would like to introduce to the Chamber here a resolution that I would like to propose and put to the Chamber.

That Wicklow County Council will seek an independent legal opinion from Senior Counsel with regard to the compliance of the Council with the statutory requirements of the planning process in connection with the Part 8 proposal, planning reference number 2017/171478, as discussed under Item 5 of the agenda at the Wicklow County Council meeting on Monday, 12th March 2018.

That this opinion will examine the issues of transparency, fair procedures, compliance with statutory provisions and obligations, and to include compliance with Standing Orders in relation to issues pertaining to the procedures adopted in the course of the discussion of Item 5 of the agenda at the said meeting, Monday, 12th March 2018.

CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, I would just like to add that I can't see for the life of me, in this case, why Councillors would refuse independent legal advice because at the end of the day there is advice now on both sides. So I would like to see independent legal advice because the question $I$ would like to ask is, Mr. Sweetman, who instructed Mr. Sweetman? But the point about it is, "independent", that's the keyword. Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could you pass us up the resolution so we can read it? I will just read this briefly. Do Members have a copy?
MS. GALLAGHER: C11r. Thornhi11 said that he had circulated it. We'11 get Gi11 to circulate it for you, C11r. Thornhil1.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, there's two parts to this resolution that Cl1r. Thornhill has submitted and I'm just going to ask -- I'm just trying to see whether it's proper to take it or not. I'm just going to bring in the County Manager on the first part of the resolution.

MR. CURRAN: Just a few issues there. The first part of the resolution doesn't relate to the business of the 18:44 meeting, it relates to the Part 8 process. Again, we went through this. That came in as part of the submissions and that was dealt with at the last meeting. At the last meeting we complied with

Section 179(4)(b) of the Planning and Development Act whereby the proposed development and the Manager's Report was put before the Members. The Members had a number of options there: not to proceed with it; to amend it; or, ultimately to proceed with it. There was 18:44 vote was taken 16:10 to proceed the development. That decision was taken. That decision stands and that's the place we're in at the moment.

Just to add, there is an urgency to this in that as people know, the construction of the Florentine Centre wil1 commence in July. So there is a certain urgency in terms of extra spaces that will be needed when the car park there closes.

The key point is that we've already voted on this, this Part 8 has been adopted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just on the second part of the resolution, I will just bring Lorraine in.
MS. GALLAGHER: Cathaoirleach, if you read the second
part: "That this opinion will examine the issues of transparency, fair procedures, compliance with statutory provisions and obligations, and to include compliance with Standing Orders in relation to issues pertaining to the procedures adopted in the course of the discussion of Item 5 of the agenda at the said meeting on Monday, 12th March 2018." And it just referred to the Section 132 of the Local Government Act 2001 which talks about the obtaining of a legal opinion
and it talks about, it speaks about "where in relation to the exercise or performance of a reserved function a legal opinion was obtained by a local authority or joint body, the Elected Council or joint body may, without prejudice to Section 153, by resolution direct that a second such opinion be obtained by the authority."

I think the keyword there is "in relation to the exercise or the performance of a reserved function". CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm not sure. what I'm going to do here is do everything proper so that the whole process is conducted properly here today, as I did, I believe, at the last meeting. I don't want to take -- I have no problem taking resolutions, votes any time, I've always done that but I don't want to take something that would compromise the process and may not be proper to take. cllr. o'Connor, you want to come back in?

CLLR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, again. I don't think that's the keyword at all in that particular
provision. I think the keyword in that particular provision is "may". It is entirely up to the Executive and up to this Council whether legal opinion is sought or not. As I said earlier, this is all about perception. And as was said earlier by, I believe, C11r. Thornhi11, I have no idea what anybody has to fear from a legal opinion. In terms of how people perceive this Council and how this Council does its business, I think it's in everybody's interest to put
any issues to bed by providing legal opinion of an independent Senior Counsel. So it is "may" seek the opinion of independent legal advice is what we should be looking at here.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. whitmore.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Thanks very much, Chair. I'm just taking on board all the legal advice and the
documentation that's been put to us this evening and obviously it's very complex and I don't think anybody here in the room would have the, I suppose, expertise to deal with it in full. But in the advice that came from David Sweetman it said in relation to Section 179 , it said:
"That subsection states that following consideration of proposed development and the Manager's Report on the proposal in question, the proposed development may be carried out as recommended in the Manager's Report unless the Local Authority, by resolution decides to vary or modify the development otherwise than as recommended in the Manager's Report or decides not to proceed."

So it seems that there's three options available. I think the question is when do those three options come into play and at what point can this Council no longer
do anything other than take those three options and decide upon them?

It says here in this document "that the subsection states that following consideration of proposed development." My understanding from reading the transcript that the proposal of C11r. Thornhill was actually put in during the consideration of the proposed development, not following the consideration of the proposed development and that in that case, because the 179 hadn't kicked in at that point that actually it was fully right that the Council can ask and seek legal advice and did not just have to go with, you know, Option A, B and C. I don't know if I'm being clear on what I'm saying but that seems to be the crux of it, is whether or not that proposal could be taken because it was 179, or not. There was no -- I go through the transcript. The proposal was put forward, it was seconded, it was supplied to yourselves and it was written down and it was taken at that point but then there was no further discussion about it. There was no rationale as to why it wasn't going to be heard. And, you know, I think maybe twice or three times C11r. Thornhill came in and asked was it going to be voted on? And then there seemed to be this rush and then all of a sudden there was a vote taken. So I think there's confusion about that. At what point -because if you go to the Local Government Act that Lorraine has just read out, section 132 says that "it
is the duty of every manager to carry into effect all lawful directions of the Elected Council of a Local Authority." So in that instance the fact that, you know, that this motion was not heard would imply that that particular section of the Local Government Act wasn't complied with. So it's which act has primacy I suppose is the issue?
MR. CURRAN: Just in relation to Cllr. Thornhill's proposal, the last day, the proposed resolution, that's covered in the legal opinion. I'11 just refer to it. The resolution referred "the procurement and the proposed demolishment planning process". The clear view from the Law Agent is that bearing in mind the terms of section 179(4)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, such a resolution ultra vires, it 18:50 is outside the powers of the Council. That subsection states that "following consideration of the proposed development and the Manager's Report", which is what we're doing at the last meeting, "and the proposal in question, the proposed development may be carried out as recommended in the Manager's Report unless the Local Authority, by resolution, decides to vary or modify the development otherwise than is recommended in the Manager's Report or decides not to proceed with the proposed development."

The resolution as submitted by C 11 r . Thornhill and cl1r. Kavanagh is outside those terms. The motion proposed does not specify the length of a proposed
adjournment. It also mentioned procurement, which does not form part of the planning and sustainable development of the area concerned and which is just outside the terms of Section 179 of the Act.

The motion and also refers to the "demolishment planning process", the actual carrying out of the works in the Part 5 follows on from Members' consideration of the proposal, which was approved at the meeting. The Cathaoirleach declined to take that resolution and in view of the terms of Section 179 of the Planning and Development Act, he was correct in that decision, as to take the motion would very likely have prejudiced the entire process.

So I think that's very clear and that was the advice at the meeting. As the Law Agent had time to consider that I think that's very clear advice in relation to that. The Cathaoirleach was correct in not taking that motion. And what happened then is at the meeting we were to consider the proposed development under Section 179. We knew what the proposed development was, which is the refurbishment of the car park and demolition of the house, et cetera. Then we had the options, as you outlined there yourself and the Members ${ }_{18: 52}$ took a vote. The vote was taken, it was 16:10 to proceed with the development. That's now done and dusted and it's something that, as I say, there's a certain amount of urgency to move on with that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Kavanagh.
CLLR. KAVANAGH: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. On the day of the meeting Mr. Sweetman wasn't present so, therefore, this decision that he has made subsequent to the meeting, it may very well -- it's his legal opinion, it 18:52 may very well not be somebody else's legal opinion, but the fact is that on the day, without any reference to Mr. Sweetman, the decision was made to ignore the motion by C11r. Brendan Thornhil1, seconded by myself. There was no discussion as to why it wasn't allowed to go forward to a vote. We were at no stage told it wouldn't be allowed. I know that C11r. Matthews was told that there were complications with his proposal and I know that C11r. Lawless was told that her proposal wasn't particularly anything to do with the Part 8, it was a completely different issue. we were given absolutely no reason, no excuse as to why our motion wasn't taken. Mr. Sweetman has said the Council was correct. Somebody else said that the Council is incorrect. We need independent legal advice because, you know, we just can't depend on somebody who is an employee of the Council who gives their legal opinion because it's bounds to be biased. Thank you.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just to reply to that, C11r. Kavanagh. You said it wasn't discussed and no reasons were given. That's not correct. It was discussed and reasons were
given by both the County Manager and Lorraine in relation to Section 179. Actually reasons were given at the meeting. It wasn't just ignored. I'm sure of that. Cllr. Thornhill.

CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. Cathaoirleach, I would just like to say to this Chamber here now, we are all around here and we are not legal experts and that, most of us here in different jobs or whichever but I mean this is very confusing to me. I have made a few notes on this matter that you got from Mr. Sweetman. One of the questions, and I asked it already about Mr. Sweetman, and this is not independent legal advice, I would just like to ask and I asked already, who instructed Mr. Sweetman? That's one question. Now I go to the second paragraph, and it says:
"I am further instructed that a proposal was put forward by two Councillors that the matter be adjourned and that legal advice be sought."

It should read independent legal advice.

Now, you were asking for views and this is down again on the first page there and you also let out seek legal advice, seek independent legal advice. Now, in one of the paragraphs, on the second page: "The Cathaoirleach declined to take that resolution." The Cathaoirleach, as C11r. Kavanagh mentioned, about our proposal the
last day did not make a ruling. He simply ignored it and just moved on to the main vote. I would just like to point out at this stage that you had one hour, one hour and you were reminded over and over again about precedents that had been set in this chamber about other matters and the Barracuda was mentioned a few times so the precedent was set. I can't see -- we're hiding behind a lot of legal jargon here but at the end of the day -- and we are not legal people but we are looking for fair play, due process and natural justice and it's something that should be -- this is a moment in this Chamber here, there's an awful lot being talked about, this Chamber here or whatever. I want to see that justice is seen to be done. Go raibh maith agat, Cathaoirleach.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: I have to come back there, Brendan. You've made the same accusation that I ignored your proposa1. I didn't ignore your proposal. There was comments made on the proposal in relation to Section 179 by both the County Manager and Lorraine. cllr. o'brien.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: I think, as I said, (inaudible) we're holding this meeting today, $I$ don't think it's correct in the first place. I don't think it would be discussed at the meeting. I think what the people are worried about here is the fact that it was rushed
through and there's a belief here that a maybe that a lot of the Councillors haven't thought through what they're doing by voting down to knock to down, to pay almost a million euro for a house and then to knock it to down. That they say: 'Has the Council got any priorities and what are your priorities?' Surely your priorities in the modern take-up should be families that are on waiting lists to 10 and 11 years, children that don't have changing facilities, toilets and stuff like that. Sure that's where the priority should be? My worry is that the Council has no set of priorities. I didn't know that they were giving a million euro away, that it would be available to knock down a good house. God, think what you could do with that. That's more my worry. I think that's the concern of the people here is that I mean I'd ask the question there. How much profit is actually going to be made to the new development? How much is that going to benefit from knocking down a house and putting in a car park. I'd love someone to put figures on that because I'd say you would come up with -- I'd also say if you asked any businessperson, you know what I mean, to invest, to buy a house for a million euro and knock it down and you were going to get profit out of 25 car parking spaces, I think he would laugh at you.

Now, my worry here is the lack of transparency. That when these discussions about buying St. Paul's Lodge was going on I'd say there was only a few people in the
room. I would think an important decision like that in relation to Bray, we should have a different process and that the ordinary people should be entitled to sit in for something when that is happening and whoever was negotiating on behalf of the Council and the developer, we need transparency. These decisions happen behind closed doors.

Now, at the end of the day I'd always feel that business should pay for itself. That the priority of the Council should be looking after the people. I actually thought, in 1916 I thought, 2016, that something major was going to happen and that all the funds and the priority of the Local Government were going to in to look after the people. Because at the moment there is a very, very sad feeling in Bray. we did a petition on Saturday and I think there was only one person that muttered something and wouldn't sign the petition. Everybody else was totally, totally in favour of not knocking it down. They said it was an idiotic decision. I think this is the kind of issue we're talking about here. It's not about first legal opinion, second legal opinion at all, it's what's going to happen Bray in the future if this kind of -- someone called it think tank, they call it think tank policy is in place where you buy houses and you knock them down. And what amazes me as well is that there was actually two houses going to be bought which means there's loads of money. I'm looking for a few bob up in Ballywaltrim
for children regards their changing room and they don't have water facilities. This is going on for four years. That's where the money should be going. If the business thing is going to succeed it will succeed. It shouldn't be getting a leg up from us taxpayers to do that. And I would (inaudible) when the negotiation was going on, that what actually happened was that whoever was negotiating on behalf of the Council said: 'okay, guys, do you know what I mean? If this is going to be successful you're going to have to put a million and a half into buying St. Paul's. The taxpayer is buying it.' I'm suggesting that there needs to be a big change here.

I was also very, very interested to know at the last peak, fair play to C11r. Irene winters there, and that she voted for it. It seems to me there seems to be some sort of a mix up in thinking here. As well as that it was 16:10. There's 32 Members in this Council, do you. So we're not sure, there's obviously some people that abstained for reasons of their own that they felt they weren't fully informed of it, and then there was four of them that didn't vote at all. You could say then, on such an important issue could it have gone 16:16? what I'm asking for the people, have a rethink about it. I always think the of old two poems, the old woman down the road that was mad looking for a house and she couldn't get it all her life and I also think funding in relation to the 1916 -- I think
as a Council we've to make up our mind who do we actually stand with and what we as fellow Councillors are here for. Do we have priorities? Is the priority worth (inaudible) or is it to deal with the immediate problems? That's my concern with this. Go raibh míle maith agat.

## [APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Connor.
CLLR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Now, we keep hearing this phrase that there's a certain urgency to matters. That doesn't mean that fair procedures can either be ignored or disregarded. The Cathaoirleach is presenting Mr. Sweetman's letter as if this was the revealed word of God. It's not. It's his legal opinion. And you really shouldn't be using a one-sided legal opinion to try and buttress your defence of particular allegations that are being made. Again, we need independent legal advice.

There's a longstanding legal principle that one cannot be a judge in one's own cause and what we see here is the Council Executives are relying upon the legal advice of one of its own employees. That is absolutely 19:01 not in compliance with fair procedures. And, again, for the fourth or fifth time, I'm demanding that independent legal advice be provided so that we can put this thing to bed. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CLLR. LAWLESS: Cathaoirleach, I want to formally accept that as a formal proposal from us for that independent legal advice.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you want to right a proposal. CLLR. LAWLESS: we have it written out and signed. CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Behan.
CLLR. BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, just a few points, if I could. First of all, I have absolutely no doubt about the integrity of the Law Agent of this Council and I think to suggest that he would in some way give biased advice is actually very unfair to him as a
professional. I think people should be very, very careful about statements they make along that line. Anybody who is involved as a legal professional knows that they have a duty to be objective in the advice that they give and I would not accept, at all, that there's anything tainted about advice he gives. However, he is the Law Agent. He's the solicitor, effectively, for the Council. But in the past we have resorted, on a number of occasions, to advice of Junior or Senior Counsel when we have a controversial decision. In fairness now, there's a new chief Executive here but there are plenty of staff here and plenty of Councillors here who can testify to the fact that Wicklow County Council has not covered itself in glory when it came to other legal battles involving this Council and the pub7ic and other agencies in the

County in the past. There has been a tendency, in my view, for the Executive of the Council at times to feel that they're invincible and that they always have the right answers when it comes to controversial issues.
The history of this Council will show that very often the Executive did not have the right answers. In fact they were very, very badly wrong in some of the answers that they gave. And this County and the Government will be paying for some of those decisions for a long time to come. So it's not the case that the Executive has a monopoly of wisdom. That's the first point.

The second point is that I'm on record and I'm going to put it on record again, because of the urgency of the situation where extra, not all of the spaces but extra spaces are going to be needed in the Town of Bray, sooner rather than later, I am still in favour of the proposal. But, I also think, because I'm in favour of the proposal I'm even more concerned to ensure that what has been done is legally correct and sound. And I 19:04 cannot understand why the Executive or the Cathaoirleach, yourself, Cathaoirleach, would feel in any way afraid of the fact that a Senior Counsel could be asked, an independent Senior Counsel could be asked for their advice on this because it's very likely this is going to end up in the courts one way or the other anyway. And if we accept, and I think we all accept there's an urgency about the situation in Bray when the Florentine Centre closes, it's important that we're not
delayed further by going through further, maybe unnecessary, court cases by getting advice now. So I can't honestly see why anybody would be against getting independent legal advice if people feel everything that was done was done in order what's the harm in getting that certified by an independent legal Counsel? Okay. That's the next point.

So I'11 be voting in favour of c11r. Thornhil1's motion for that reason. I want to see this matter resolved properly so that we can be sure that -- and if the decision was flawed or if the procedures weren't correct, well we're going to have go back and we're going to have do it again. But the next time we do it, if we are going to do it, the one point that hasn't been covered in the Law Agent's letter, which I'm disappointed with really, is that $I$ asked that the residents group be given the opportunity. I proposed at the last meeting that they get the opportunity for ten minutes to give their views to the full membership of the Council and that was ruled out of order, which I really just can't understand why that had to be done because it would have taken ten minutes and we would have maybe got a lot of those issues discussed and dealt with. However, I still feel, even at this late stage, it would be a good idea to hear from the residents, the representatives of the residents, even tonight when we are all here and present, to listen to their arguments. But I accept it's not part of the
proposa1. The proposal was formulated by c11r. Thornhill. I was not involved in the formulation of the proposal but I was happy to sign a requisition for a meeting. But I do accept a proposal to hear the residents is not on this agenda but I do think if we agreed to it we could still do it tonight. There is still time to do it, as far as I'd be concerned. And I do think, in fairness, they came to Bray but only eight Councillors from bray would have heard their points of view. All 32 should hear their points of view and I would ask you, Cathaoirleach, to consider that matter again. Thank you.
CLLR. THORNHILL: And I second that.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Sne11.
CLLR. SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. It's quite obvious that the resolution that's here before us, really we could sit here all night and we have 32

Councillors coming in speaking three and four times. This was well debated the last day. It didn't go the way that $I$ would have liked, in regards to the vote but it was a democratic vote. But it is hugely important in regards to due process and as other speakers have said in regards to transparency. I don't question the leadership role that you played as Cathaoirleach. As has been pointed out, we do need to be seen to get a legal opinion from somebody who is not directly
involved either for the keeping of St. Paul's or the legal opinion that was sought from the Law Agent of Wicklow County Council. I think it's quite simple that we take a vote on this resolution that's before us, otherwise we're going to be hear listening to the same stuff that we listened to before. I think it's hugely important that we get an independent legal opinion and I don't concur with the argument that it has to happen quite quickly and that if a decision is not made tonight that the sky is going to fall in on top of us at a11. In regards to, we have a meeting the second Monday in April and I'm sure the legal advice could be sought and had for that meeting. I would ask you, Cathaoirleach, rather than go round the room here for another two or three hours discussing the same stuff that was discussed before, we have Members speaking who weren't at the meeting here before and while I don't question their sincerity, you know, they were reading transcripts of what was said at that meeting. There was people who didn't vote on the meeting for their own reasons and others that just wasn't in the Chamber but I do believe that everyone that's here tonight should be given an opportunity to vote on this resolution and vote now quite quickly in regards to what's happening. Otherwise, Cathaoirleach, this meeting will go on and on and on and everyone will just keep coming in and look for a round of applause from the public gallery or otherwise. We need to vote on this resolution. We need to get an independent legal opinion and move
forward in regards to the process.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I mean I hear what you're saying, Councillor, and I agree with you, but it appears just from the advice you heard earlier that I can't take this resolution, the proposal by c11r. Thornhill.
Perhaps someone could come up with a resolution looking for a second legal opinion. I'm not sure as well, Nicola, that your one complies either. Something, you know, maybe more succinct that would just say in relation to the Law Agent's opinion, you know, that that area, because you could have it for legal opinion --
CLLR. LAWLESS: we can amend it.
CATHAOIRLEACH: -- St. Paul's is a different matter that's already been dealt with. We're just talking about my decision at the last meeting to not allow c11r. Thornhill's proposal. That's what the legal opinion that's been given and that's what we're discussing. That's the proposal to look for a second legal opinion. It would have to cover that and only
that. Cllr. Fitzgerald.
CLLR. FITZGERALD: I'm one of the ones that wasn't at the last meeting. I missed my first meeting in 20 years so for cllr. o'brien (inaudible) I'm glad to see you were worried that I wasn't here.

Can I just say this as a Councillor. When a Part 8 involves the Arklow Municipal District, if I'm concerned about it I make a submission or an objection.

I looked at this Part 8 and of the eight Councillors in Bray there was one submission beside me here, cllr. Steven Matthews. No one else made a submission from our elected representatives. That's not criticism but it would be my view that if you were against the project you make a submission. There was none made.

In the last few weeks the heat is on. There's all sorts of proposals, there's different things coming forward. I came here tonight: "what measures the
Council would take with regard to conduct of the Wicklow County Council meeting on 12th March." I stil1 don't know the problem with confidence. I have full confidence with the Cathaoirleach of wicklow County Council, as has C11r. Behan and everybody. I wasn't at the meeting. I would get back secondhand what happened at the meeting. But I certainly as a Councillor, as I did on a Part 8 in Arklow, would make a submission and ensure that the views that were given to me by the public were reflected in my submission. So it is disappointing that there was only one submission from the Bray Municipal District.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Tommy Cullen.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Yes, Chairman. I, too, have full confidence in you and in your integrity as Chairman. I 19:12 think you have been a fair Chairman and you have acted honourably. There's issues, the issues that I see are issues of whether or not there was error in advisements, not the role of Cathaoirleach but errors
in advisements. I have read these two, one is a solicitor's letter to the Councillors and one is a Senior Counsel's opinion and they are diametrically opposed. But one observation I would have is that at the time of Matthews', Behan's, Thornhill's and Lawless' proposals, there was no proposal for the proposed section 179. Section 179 hadn't been activated. It wasn't activated, I think it was an hour and 32 minutes into the meeting. I think c17r. Behan's resolution was put 12 minutes into the meeting and Thornhill's was put 18 minutes into the meeting. So therefore at the time those proposals were made there was no Section 179 proposal active before the Council and I think that may be a significant point.

If the Section 179 had been proposed by c11r. Fox and cl1r. Vance prior to Thornhill's other resolutions, then that may have, the situation may have been different. But the fact that they weren't and it came so late in to the meeting, after four of the resolutions had been put forward, I think the timing is critical because at the time of those resolutions there was no formal proposal. The Section 179 wasn't alive. It hadn't been in the chamber. So I think that's, that, $I$ think, is a critical point to be considered.

There's issues, Chairman. I abstained at the last meeting because I really didn't know very much about it. The first document I got was last Thursday on it.

And I think the issues involved -- I have no -- there's two diametrically opposed legal views here tonight. I don't know which of them is correct. I don't know which of them is correct. You have a Senior Counse1, a very eminent Senior Counsel has said that the process is flawed. You have the Council's Law Agent who says that the planning process was correct. A reasonable person would say: 'We11, I'11 have to get some other opinion.' Chairman, I am of the hundred percent belief that you have no problem with an independent legal advice.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Cul1en, I have to stop you there. The two opinions are nothing to do with one another. The first opinion is in relation to the decision I made at the meeting. The Senior Counsel's opinion is in relation to the Part 8 which is history. So they're actually not related.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: But, Chairman, with respect to you, if the Senior Counsel's opinion was that, for instance, if the Senior Counse1, from what $I$ have just read, his main point is that there wasn't adequate site notice. The (inaudible) wasn't in place and there's a site note in the correct place and that the site notice wasn't up for a period of duration that it should have been. Now, as I understand, there was a High Court case in Bray, in Fonthill in Bray where a site notice wasn't up correctly and the High Court found that it had to be up and the application was dismissed. Now I know and you do too, Chairman, loads and loads, every
rural Councillor here knows that if site notices are not up properly the Planning office will send it back and to you and say it's an invalid application. That happens virtually every week in this Chamber and every rural Councillor here knows that. Chairman, I have no problem with getting independent legal advice. I'm sure every reasonable Councillor here in this Chamber has no problem with legal advice. I believe at the meeting you did give every Councillor a reasonable opportunity to speak and I've no criticism of you in that regard. But I do think, if -- the proposal is the need to have an independent oversight because we have two separate legal documents, whatever the difference is but I think it is reasonable that we would be given an opportunity. But I do think, the thing that would concern me is at the time those resolutions were moved there was no resolution for a Section 179 active or alive in the Chamber at the time and that did not come into effect for an hour and 32 minutes into the meeting. So when Councillor, the various Councillors were moving their resolutions there was no other proposal to move so the 179 . So the 179 at that time was effectively not alive. Thank you, Chairman. CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Fox. CLLR. FOX: Thank you, Chairman. We11, first of all, as you say the two legal opinions are not diametrically opposite. Mr. Sweetman's opinion is on how the meeting was conducted. okay. Mr. whelan's opinion is on the actual issues relating to the Part 8 . For me,
personally, I was quite happy with how you handled the meeting. I thought because you dealt with the meeting fairly. I think Mr. Sweetman's opinion has borne that out. So in relation to the process, I can accept C11r. Thornhill and others are opposed to the Part 8 proceeding, essentially when you pare everything down, there are a number of Councillors which I fully accept are opposed to proceeding. whether it is legal opinion or not, they are opposed to this Part 8 proceeding. okay. I proposed that it proceeded. It was supported by a majority of the Councililors. Okay. So the Part 8 is dealt with. So a number of speakers have effectively started to bring back up issues relating to the Part 8.

So in my opinion and I think that's borne out by a majority of the Councillors, Part 8 is finished. It's done and dusted. Now, that is subject to a judicial review and people can do that if they wish. From our part in the process it's done. So the only question is if there are issues relating to how you handled the meeting. As I say, I am quite happy with how you handled the meeting. I think you done exceptionally wel1. okay.

So my proposal, for what it's worth, if anybody wants to second it, that we accept Mr. Sweetman's opinion that you handled the meeting effectively and correctly. I'm proposing we accept Mr. Sweetman's proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Neil1.
CLLR. O'NEILL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Yeah, again, I fully understand the position of the Cathaoirleach and the decision of 12 th March. I voted against the demolition of the house at that meeting on the 12th but I kind of agree with my colleague, C11r. Sne11, in that this is going to drag out a bit tonight. Maybe if there was a compromise of any description or if we could make any sense of it.

I don't know what the urgency is as regards moving ahead with the demolition for the creation of a car park. I don't know what timescale you have there. But maybe if it would be a compromise that, I understand the position you are in, Cathaoirleach, the rules of our Chamber, and in respect to the vote on 12th March, which, again, I didn't agree with but whatever, I fully understand your position. If there was a case maybe that we could put a stay of execution on it as such that if instead, I don't know whether it's three months or six months or when it's intended to move ahead with this, but instead maybe if there was a breathing space there of 12 months and that it would go back to the Municipal District in Bray as well to discuss with the local Action Group and see if there is maybe a move from there to go to the courts with this. Instead of -- I mean if the house is flattened in the morning it's flattened, it won't come back, you know. So I think to be fair to everyone, while I fully understand your
position, $I$ think that there should be a little bit of breathing space here for maybe a period of six or 12 months or whatever and revisit it. Go raibh maith agat.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Vance.
CLLR. VANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Like what C11r. Fox was saying, the Part 8 was done on 12th March and effectively this Special Meeting isn't about the Part 8. I think there is the fact that it isn't about the Part 8 there's an acceptance there that the Part 8 is done and dusted, it's finished with. The actual, you know -- when you call a Special Meeting you have to give the reasons why you call the Special Meeting and obviously it's what measures the Council take with regard the conduct of the Wicklow County Council meeting held on Monday 12th March 2018 and whether the procedures were correct at that particular meeting or not.

I mean I'm happy that the meeting and how you conducted the meeting was exemplary to say the least. I think you went overboard in trying to accommodate people who had different points of view. One Councillor was actually was in six times, six times, in regard to that meeting. So nobody can say they didn't get a full, you know, full whack of what they wanted to say and get
their particular points across. And it was a meeting that went on for over two hours. There was some very important other items on the agenda that actually we weren't, we didn't get to, which I feel deserved, you know, a meeting like today. I was very surprised that we actually had a Special Meeting today on the item that was there before us when we had the National Planning Framework was on that same agenda which is absolutely vital for the next over 20 years in regard to wicklow and there was nobody even interested in it. They're more interested in what's happening in Bray.

In regard to this, the Florentine Centre is due to start at the end of June early July. By today, today we have an e-mail from a trader wanting to know exactly what the Council are going to do and what they're going to have in place for when that happens because of the fact that the traders are particularly concerned because when that florentine was closed down a number of years ago it devastated the town. The town suffered badly and it has still not recovered in regard to that. so there is an urgency in regard to this decision.

In regard to legal opinion. when the new manager came in last November, October I think it was, I made a statement at the particular time that I felt one of the main issues, one of the problem issues that we had in Wicklow County Council, my time here, was the amount of money that was spent on legal advice and various things
like that and I hope that with the new Management Team that we'd have in place that that wouldn't continue. My attitude like at that particular stage was we had spent a fortune, one won a few cases, lost a few cases and various things like that. But the amount of money that was expended was astronomical and could have been used, in my mind, could have been put to better use.

So effectively, my attitude to legal advice is that you can get all sorts of legal advice and legal opinion and it's all over the place in lots of cases but in this case it seems to be some Members' feeling is that you seek the legal advice and you keep on seeking the legal advice until the legal advice complies with what you want it to be in the first place.

Can I just say that I'm happy enough with the legal advice that is here today from our Law Agent. I'm happy enough that the decision that was taken on 12th march was a democratic decision. Democratic decision.

A vote from this Council. We're all democrats. And I'm also happy, very happy the way you handled that particular meeting on that particular day and I would like to formally second what cllr. Fox has proposed. Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhill.
CLLR. THORNHILL: Cathaoirleach, go raibh maith agat. I would just like to make a couple of points. In relation to cllr. Fox. Yes, he's quite right, there
was a vote on Part 8. That was done, right.
Democratic vote. But it was the way it was done. It was the way it was done. There was a proposal put to you and if you hadn't interfered and put it out to the reasonable Members of this Council why wasn't it done? Also, I will say in this case there's an awful word about process. We11 I'11 te11 you now, I was 30 years in the guards, right, and I'm a retired garda but we have another retired garda here in the Chamber, Cllr. Gerry walsh. And we all know when you go to court and if you hadn't got your Ts crossed or your Is dotted and if you don't follow the process everything falls. There's a legal obligation on the person. I took an oath at the time when $I$ joined the guards and the same thing applies now and I will say to maybe people like C11r. Walsh, the same should apply to C11r. walsh and everyone. At the end of the day we're talking about transparency. C11r. Vance has mentioned about St. Paul's, or the demolition of St. Paul's and the urgency. The thing about it is this, are we -there's loads of people here and they're interested in the heritage of Bray. I mean I have met people that are here from across the pond over in London and to think that they'd knock something like this over in England. That just would not happen. We must realise we just can't do things like that. I said this before but at the end of the day I will conclude and say that we are only being reasonable in asking for independent legal advice. why would people be afraid of that? Go
raibh maith agat, Cathaoirleach.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Lawless.
CLLR. LAWLESS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I know this meeting was called in regards to the Part 8 and the process of the Part 8 and I would just like to point out, and it's been pointed out before, the Part 8, we can either accept it, reject it or amend it and on the day mine was actually an amendment to leave the house as is and go ahead with the proposa1. And we have done this before, $I$ only done it on a Part 8 a couple of months ago on a housing project, but yet it was rejected and no vote was given on it.

Also, $I$ know it's not contained in what C11r. Thornhill was talking about as in today's Special Meeting, but the information from the Senior Counsel points out some very serious issues regarding the Part 8 and I'm afraid 19:30 this actually cannot be ignored. And whether we discuss this here or whether we get more, as we were looking for, independent legal advice on this, I think we should do and if it requires another Special Meeting in and around this whole process of this planning
application, and the Part 8 and some of the serious issues that has been raised, I think we should call another Special Meeting for this.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Just to come back on a point. I
believe that your proposal, Nicola, was dealt with and that it's on the Law Agent's opinion.
CLLR. LAWLESS: It was an amendment to the Part 8. CATHAOIRLEACH: We were advised at the time that was a new proposal and it wouldn't be taken. C11r. Fortune. CLLR. FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, I'11 try not repeat what was said and also (inaudible) I certainly have no issue with you, Cathaoirleach, and (inaudible). It seems to me there is gross unfairness going on with the Executives of the Local Authority who are relying on Section 179 to make their case, if you look at it. I think Cllr. Tommy Cullen has dealt with that very well.

So I think my view is that because of the way the
meeting transpired and again, you would have been advised on the day, we could all see you getting advice on the day, that it took a certain direction. I think C11r. Thornhill's proposal the last day was very reasonable and he read it into the record at the meeting. He was asked to hand it up to yourselves and it should have been voted on. Why it wasn't voted on, I just think it's wrong.

I read Mr. Sweetman's 1etter. Again I have no issue with Mr. Sweetman as a legal person, that's what Mr. Sweetman does. But like he says "I am instructed and "I am this and I am that", that doesn't seem fair in the whole scheme of things to me. That's part of my
unfairness comment.

I'm also looking at Mr. Whelan's, Senior Counsel's submission that he made and while $I$ know it has been thrown back, we dealt with Part 8, Part 8 is gone. But 19:32 I don't think, in fairness, you can look at them in isolation. It's all part of the one cake. The last day, if you remember, when we were talking about the Florentine Centre and as I said that day and I say it again, everybody in this room is in favour of the Florentine Centre being developed but we were only told at the eleventh hour that St. Paul's had a play in that. And when you read the actual background documentation we were actually looking at buying a second house so we were going to spend quite a lot of money and I wonder why that didn't happen? I think you have to read Mr. Whelan's submission because it is related to everything we're talking about because we're saying we need St. Paul's knocked to provide 45 car park spaces. But when you read Mr. Whelan's submission 19:33 it's very clear that there is proper alternatives in the town that could more than make up for it. I think that argument doesn't stack up at a11.

Really, I think, and I think very strongly, that there should be an independent Senior Counsel put in place to adjudicate on this matter, take everything into account, agreed by the Local Authority and agreed by the residents. I think, also, I more than think, I
believe that if the residents had been allowed to make a straightforward presentation to the 32 Members we probably wouldn't be still sitting here this evening having this conversation. Again, I don't think that was dealt with properly because my understanding from what I have seen, is that the residents requested to make an address as far back as 12th February. So as regards Standing orders and as regards notice and everything else, they done everything right. I don't know why it is, Chairman, but for some reason and to be fair, like it's not everybody, there's certain parts of our Local Authority, for whatever reason, don't seem to want to enter into proper, what I would call fairness on issues and listen to people. At the end of the day we all in this Chamber are elected to represent our constituents and when I come in here and when I make statements and when I disagree with officials and when I make cases, I'm making it on behalf of people who I represent and that's what I'm here for. The Executive are here for their own job, but there has to be fairness. And this thing is not fair by any stretch of imagination and we can hide behind this meeting and we can hide behind this and we can throw out 179, but at the end of the day $i t$, as far as I'd be concerned, and I don't profess to be a legal expert but I understand a 19:35 certain amount of things, due process and fairness was not done, as far as I'm concerned and that should be acceptable, in my opinion, to anybody in this Chamber. And the fairness way out of it is, I think the
resolution that c11r. Thornhill put forward and also cl1r. O'Connor put forward a second one, I think that's a very reasonable approach and I think it should be agreed by the Members to go and get that advice and
make a call on it. And in the process of doing that allow the residents to have a say. Because when I listened here the last day, the meeting that was to happened on the 5 th and then moved to the 12 th, as somebody said it mightn't have been Cllr. Fox but somebody said the meeting was coming to come up in April and all of a sudden it was on the agenda for the 12th. Look it --
CLLR. FOX: I didn't say that.
CLLR. FORTUNE: I don't think it was you but someone said it. Let's be fair here, I just think there's gross unfairness going on here. I think that's what's going on. Gross unfairness. I'm at a loss to understand why.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Shay Cullen.
CLLR. SHAY CULLEN: Thanks, Chairman. Just to make a few points. First of a11, I didn't want to put my mic on to speak on this issue but just I think it's important that C11r. Thornhill would clarify his comments about Cllr. Walsh. I don't know what exactly he was insinuating.

I suppose, first of a11, we have to get back to the reason we're here today and that is "what measures the Council will take with regard to the conduct of, the Wicklow County Council meeting held on Monday, 12th March 2018" and I suppose, Chairman, that has really been, I suppose, tailored towards yourself in that you didn't conduct yourself correctly. I think that couldn't be further from the truth. I mean you got whatever advice that you needed from the top table with regards to the Section 179. You conducted the
democratic process with regards to the Part 8. You gave everybody ample time to have their say. The whole agenda item took we11 over two hours and I think nobody could suggest that they didn't get enough time to put their points forward. As has been said earlier, some Councillors got more than two or three opportunities to put their facts forward. But I think, Chairman, I just want to make the point that, you know, you handled your position extremely well. I think that has to be put on record. You couldn't have done anymore to be fair to people. And I think that has been demonstrated by the legal opinion of Mr. Sweetman and he has given his professional opinion in how you dealt with the issue and how you conducted the meeting and I think we have to take his opinion as fact. At the end of the day that's why we're here. We're not here to discuss the Part 8. As far as I'm concerned the Part 8 is done and dusted. It's voted on. Clear majority on the day. And, you know, this is the issue about how you
conducted yourself and I just want to reiterate what I've said is, I think you done a super job and couldn't have done anymore and got the advice that you needed. Thank you.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Walsh.
CLLR. WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Just in relation to cllr. Thornhill's comments I just want to put on the record I take exception to them. I take it he's calling into question my motives and my decision at the last meeting. If the record will show I did speak at the meeting. I outlined my position. I outlined the need for the Florentine Centre, how Bray declined over the years et cetera and the need for parking.

I did serve as a member of An Garda Síochána for almost 32 years, 18 of those as a sergeant and I can assure cl1r. Thornhill I always acted in accordance with the law.

Cathaoirleach, the request for this meeting, as I read it, you know, it was a sleight on you as Cathaoirleach. It called into question the way you conducted the meeting. We voted here, the majority of us shall we say voted here, to elect you as Cathaoirleach last year. We had confidence in you then that you would do the job and we still have confidence in you. You have only been accommodating and in your own words, you do not close down debate. As I say, we have confidence in
you then and we have confidence in you now. Thank you. CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. o'brien.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: Cathaoirleach, I'd like to second C11r. O'Neill's proposal that we need space to be given for this to sort this thing out. We have voted on the Part 8 and that doesn't stipulate, though, when you're going to knock the building down. So I would suggest maybe a ten-year breathing space before knocking it down to see exactly how the Florentine Centre progresses and, also, it would give the opportunity to people to put forward their ideas of alternatives, if they could be put into operation because I can't see how 45 car parking spaces is going to be the death of the Florentine Centre. It couldn't be. Okay, we voted but that doesn't mean -- I would love a stay. I would say ten years but maybe C11r. O'Neill would have something else to say. But I do think that breathing space is needed. I mean there is no proof whatsoever what benefit knocking down the house and what the 45 car parking spaces is actually going to do for the Florentine Centre. None whatsoever. I haven't seen any documents putting forward saying what the great benefit would be and how you would make it so I'm seconding C11r. O'Neill's proposal.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY.]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. o'Neill, could you put your proposal in writing. Cl1r. Cullen.

CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, yeah. I don't want to see this Council being accused of being architectural heritage Bulgarians and I don't want to see -I actually went and looked at this house there the last day and the architectural heritage of this house is quite unique. It's around the name sake of your own, the Edwardian time, that was a very narrow time of architectural development. It started from somewhere around 1903 to 1914. So there was very few houses like that house actually in Ireland. This is a pristine example of that very unique and very small amount of Edwardian heritage. It's very difficult to find, this house was done, as I understand, by an Edwardian architect of high renowned. I just think that a -it's something perhaps, it's something, I wouldn't look -- is it possible that this meeting could be adjourned to give the Chief Executive and Mr. O'Brien and yourself, Chairman, an opportunity to look to see can there be an alternative arrived at in Bray? And come back to us with their decision because simply because Part 8 is approved doesn't mean we have to press the button. But I just think that, I know -- I don't think there's actually anyone in this room wants to see that building demolished. I think it's a pristine example of very unique Edwardian heritage and architecture. I think we just should pause, just press the pause button for a month even and see can an alternative space be rented for a couple of years by the Council. For instance, where the Bray Wanderers' ground, there's 230
car parking spaces there, could the Council lease 40 of those? It's only a couple of hundred yards from the florentine Centre. There has to be some alternative because I tell you the big thing is going to be when the bulldozer goes in and starts taking the roof off that building and they'11 say what was the wicklow County Council doing? I actually think that everything should be pulled back and that we should look to see can we press the pause button and adjourn this meeting to see can the Chief Executive and Mr. O'brien and yourself, Chairman, go and see can we look for an alternative because I don't think any Councillor wants to demolish this house. I really don't think anyone wants to do this. It's a unique part of the heritage. I think it was only 13 years of that architectural development in all of Ireland and Bray is fortunate to have a pristine example of that Edwardian architecture. It wouldn't be touched anywhere else. I really think that the Chief Executive officer and Mr. o'brien and yourself, all intelligent, capable people, should go and not just simply we're going to push this through, that we should look, press the pause button for a fortnight or three weeks and come back and see can there be some alternative got in the meantime. I think that's what we should I think be looking at, not postpone the decision for a year or two years or five years, but just for a couple of weeks to see can we look for something to protect and save that house because I don't think anyone wants to be accused of
becoming an architectural vandal of wicklow's unique heritage and particularly that Edwardian house which is outstanding. It's our heritage and it's everyone's heritage and I think we're all capable and grown up adults that we could work out some solution. That house, I have no problem with the Council buying the house. I have no problem whatsoever. I think it is important that the Council buy houses, but to buy a house just to demolish it, I don't think -- and such a unique house. Chairman, I would ask you to take the lead on this, of trying to save St. Paul's because it's not beyond saving because the Council's not going to lose any money by saving the house. The house is still going to be there and the capital asset will still be there for the Council so we're not going to lose any money. But I would ask the Chief Executive officer to see could we hit the pause button on this meeting tonight and come back to us in a fortnight or three weeks and get your brains together and see can we come up with some form of a solution without rushing along with it because I think it would be dramatic to see the bulldozers going in on that house, Chairman. Maybe you might consider that.
[APPLAUSE AND CHEERS FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just in relation to that, i'11 just bring Lorraine in to see what's possible and what's not possible.

MS. GALLAGHER: Just in relation to what Cl1r. Cullen has suggested and it probably pertains to
Cl1r. O'Neill's proposal and Cllr. O'Brien's which is that the Part 8 decision on 12 th March should not proceed and the Bray Municipal engage with the Action Group regarding the legal advice and there should be at 1east a 12 -month breathing space. I will just read out paragraph 15, motions to amend or revoke resolutions. CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: I'm not proposing to amend or revoke.

MS. GALLAGHER: Yeah, but the Members passed a resolution at the meeting on 12th March.
"A motion to revoke or amend a resolution can only be made on notice inserted in the agenda, and such notice shal1 specify the resolution to be revoked or amended and furnish the terms of the motion to be made; but no such motion should be allowed to appear on the agenda to revoke or amend any resolution of the Council within six months from the date of the adoption of such resolution, except with the written consent of not less than 16 Members of the Council. A resolution may not be revoked after the meeting at which it has been adopted. It shal1 be necessary for adoption of the motion to revoke or amend a resolution of the Council, that not less than 16 Members and not less than half of the total number of the Members of the Council vote in favour and subject to any statutory requirements." CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Blake.

CLLR. BLAKE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks for the meeting here this evening as well. I read a lot of stuff, a lot of documentation we got in regard to the Part 8 from the officials of the Council here and as Pat Fitzgerald has said there there was a lot of comments made there with regards to the development. I read them all and equally so $I$ read all the e-mails we've been getting over the last few weeks. I got a lot of information. I read them all.

I think this evening here, what's before us here this evening is actually a resolution as regards the conduct of yourself as Chairman at that meeting of the 12th. It's very clear, what I have heard anyway, everybody has said you conducted yourself in a proper manner. You certainly gave everybody a great opportunity to speak on the occasion and gave some people six or seven opportunities. The meeting went on for two hours. We're here this evening for almost two hours so certainly you have conducted yourself in a very, very proper manner in giving everybody an opportunity to speak hear in regards to it. I would support Cllr. Fox's resolution that we support the fact that you did conduct the meeting of 12th March in a proper manner. Thanks, Chairman.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Whitmore.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Thanks very much, Chair. I would also like to make that point. I don't think anyone here would question, $I$ wasn't at the meeting but $I$ have gone
through the transcript in great detail and you did provide everyone with an opportunity to have their say. I do think there is confusion about what Councillors can and cannot do when a matter of Section 179 comes up on the agenda and I do think that this not only relates to the last meeting but it relates to all Part 8s going forward and I do think we're going to have some clarity on that. If we go by those rules that means that any Section 179 that comes before us that we cannot amend or we cannot provide any alternative motions, we cannot 19:50 defer it. We cannot do anything other than agree to it, or agree to not go ahead with it or to amend the actual proposal. So we can't every seek legal advice on it, we can't defer the decision. I think that is something that we're going to have seek clarity on because if that is the case, us as a Council body will not have an opportunity to discuss and have a back and forward discussion and debate on any Part 8s or Section 179s and I think that's really important that we do need clarity on that. I do think, as

C11r. Cullen was saying that actually in this instance, that the motion put forward by C11r. Thornhill was put forward prior to the sort of formal Section 179 discussions and my reading is that that should have been heard. However, perhaps that's not the case and I 19:51 do think that we need legal clarity on it.

I would also agree with C11r. Cullen, I think we need to -- if we step back and just from the debate of today
and the previous weeks. The objective of the Council is, you know, there's many aspects to it. I think the primary one is that it wants to provide parking space to facilitate development and approve the retail offering of Bray and to encourage economic growth in the town. That's really valuable and it's vital that it happens. But perhaps there are alternative ways to do that other than (inaudible) this house, which is, it's a gorgeous example of a house that's in a prime area and rather than knocking it there actually may be other ways and other things that house could be used for that would actually add a huge amount of value to the Town of Bray and to the retail offering of Bray.

I think we're going to have start getting a lot more innovative in how we deal with our retail areas and how we drive economic growth in our towns and I have spoken to the Chief Executive about this, and I've spoken to the Bray Chamber about it as wel1. I think there are options for that house that would be really valuable assets for the Town of Bray such as having a co-working space there, having a click and collect facility there or something like a crèche where people can drop their children in and then go shopping for an hour or two, the way they do in Dundrum. I think that's actually what we should be looking at for that house. I think there are other areas that are less valuable, where there are potential for car parking spaces but actually that house has huge value in its own right and, you
know, from talking from the Chamber they were keen on looking at exploring new ideas for it, and regardless of what happens with this debate I'11 be doing that. I do think we need to step back and look at exactly what the objectives are because we're really caught up in this now and whether or not going ahead and knocking this building is what's best for the town.

## [APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Thornhil1. Brendan, this is your fifth time in and I'm letting you in to be fair to you, as I was the last day. Just to say to the Members, can we try and focus our minds a little bit? And let's come to some kind of vote, some kind of conclusion. cl1r. Thornhill.

CLLR. THORNHILL: Okay. Yes. I know it's something that people are making remarks about coming in but some people have been speaking and they can speak for hours, I might come in and only just make a few points. I would just like to clarify something in relation to cllr. cullen and his remark and what I said when I mentioned C11r. Walsh and it was in this way that I meant it was, we are the only Council in Ireland that has two ex-gardaí as elected Councillors. And the point I was only making, just that we are the two people that probably would have been brought up and I mentioned the question about process, I mentioned if you go into court, nothing else, I wasn't casting
anything on C11r. Walsh's character or anything, just the fact was that we should really appreciate that process should be followed. That's the reason why I keep going back, that we should be going for independent legal advice. Go raibh maith agat, Cathaoirleach.

## [APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Brien.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: C11r. Vance mentioned earlier that the Florentine Centre would begin in June and my question is if that's the case if it is beginning in June then somebody somewhere must know when is it intended to knock down St. Paul's? That's the first question. The 19:55 second question is that C11r. O'Neil1 suggested there, we're not suggesting revoking anything. We're suggesting the Part 8 has been passed but what we're saying that doesn't stipulate the time when you have to knock down the building. We're saying that a stay be put on that for I think it was 12 months to sort the thing out probably because $I$ think in fairness to the residents that's what they're asking, they're asking for breathing space. That's what we're asking, we're not asking to revoke anything.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY.]

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have a number of proposals here and
the first one of C11r. Thornhill I already brought in the County Manager on and Lorraine and I'm not sure I'd be able to take the proposal. Could I ask maybe that Members would come up with a simple proposal looking for, you know, it seems, the spirit seems to be that you want independent legal advice in relation to the opinion offered by the Law Agent in relation to the decisions made at the meeting on 12th march. I'm not putting words in anyone's mouth but $I$ have to get a proposal that is actually acceptable and that I can legally take. I think that's the spirit anyway of what people want to propose.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, could you come up with a proposal yourself?
CATHAOIRLEACH: You're much better at that than me.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, can I just say I proposed, I'm not --
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. whitmore is ahead of you. CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, all I'11 just say is this: I don't honestly believe that there's no
official or County Councillor here tonight wants to knock that house down. I don't think none of us wants to do that. I have no problem with the house being bought but what I would suggest, for everybody's sake, is that we would adjourn this meeting tonight and that we would ask this Chief Executive Officer to come back in a couple of weeks' time, it's not going to be the end of the world, to see can we get an alternative? If we can't we can deal with it then but at least we
should be seen to be trying to save that house, Chairman. I think that's a reasonable proposal to see can we find an alternative. There are very brainy men here and it's not -- there's lots of alternative places -- and women of course as well.

CLLR. WINTERS: One of them has the floor.
cllr. Cullen, cl1r. Whitmore has the floor and you won't let her talk.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: I don't think that's correct now. CLLR. WINTERS: That is. Her light's on, yours isn't.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Cllr. Cullen.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, I was speaking to the Chairman. I would propose --
CATHAOIRLEACH: If you have a proposal put in writing and submit it to me.
MS. GALLAGHER: You need to put it in writing.
CLLR. WHITMORE: I have some wording. I don't know if this is correct or if it fully grasps what we're trying to do. Is that wicklow County Council seek independent legal opinion on the ability of Elected members to propose alternative motions other than that specified in Section 179 during the consideration of agenda items relating to the same. I don't know if that gets it or not?
MR. CURRAN: I think Section 179 is very clear. It's actually quite straightforward: that the members of the Local Authority - this is what happened at the last meeting - as soon as may be considered the proposed development - which in this case was the proposal of
the car park and the demolition of the house, et cetera, and the report of the Manager. So as soon as possible to consider that and then following consideration of the Manager's Report and the proposed development, they can recommend that the Members can vary it, decide to vary or modify development or decide not to proceed or to proceed. It's relatively straightforward.
CLLR. WHITMORE: But that's the thing, it says "following consideration of it". Had the consideration 19:59 been complete at that point or were we still in the process of considering because I think --
MR. CURRAN: Two hours of debate when the vote was taken.
CLLR. Whitmore: as we heard the first mention of
Section 179 was an hour-and-a-half into the discussion. MS. GALLAGHER: No, it was on the agenda. It was listed as an item.
CLLR. WHITMORE: That's the thing, is it the agenda item is 179 or is it an agenda item discussing 179? I think that's the legal thing we need to clarify because otherwise as Councillors we will never ever be able to put forward any alternative motions other referral or seek legal advice on any Section 179 which to me seems to override our responsibilities and legal obligations
under the Local Government Act.
MR. CURRAN: There's absolutely nothing at the last meeting allowing the Members not to proceed with this development. If the Members voted not to proceed.

Done and dusted, no issue. If members wanted to make an alternative or if Members wanted to vary or modify the development --
FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Could we heard what the County Manager is saying please? we can't hear at the back.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, it's my fault. I forgot to light up his microphone.
MR. CURRAN: So at the last meeting the Members could have decided not to proceed with the development; they could have decided to proceed with it; they could have decided to vary the proposal as presented, that was also open, when you're dealing with a Section 179. That wasn't decided. The decision was made to proceed with the development, as proposed. That was the decision that was made.

CLLR. WHITMORE: They're very black and white points do you know what I mean? You know, what if the Councillors want to have a discussion on development? It just, it seems very, you know, one way or the other and I don't think that that is really the intent of the Act. Like that's my personal opinion but I think that's what we need to seek legal advice on and as a Councillor I would like clarity on. Whenever we have a Section 179 on the agenda, wel1 what can my input be on 20:01 it? If that was the case why was C11r. Thornhill's motion, why did you request that a seconder be found and that it would be written down and handed up because it was never ever going to be eligible under Section

179 of the Act?
CATHAOIRLEACH: we had to see it in writing before we could make a decision.

MS. GALLAGHER: Standing Orders sets that out. It does.

CLLR. WHITMORE: That's my two cents on it.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Cl1r. Vance.
CLLR. VANCE: Chairman, could I just be clear on this. The Part 8 is completed and has been voted on and what we have before us today is the reasons why a Special Meeting was called. Most people, a lot of people here have actually talked about the Part 8, not exactly what this meeting was called for. This meeting -- it's down very clearly what this meeting is called for. It's not about revisiting the Part 8 again. That's finished.
That was -- the vote was on that. That's the democratic decision. The reason we're here today, according to what we have here and what was written down when it was requisitioned at Special Meeting is in regard to the conduct at the meeting and there's a proposal from Cl1r. Fox there, and it's very clear in regard to it and I seconded it and I'm asking you to take it. You know, I think it's reasonable and it's very clear and I think if you read it out and we have a vote on it. If there's a vote on that and it's passed, 20:02 fine, that's it finished with. If it doesn't then, that's it that we have to do something else in regard to it. But this is not a vote on the Part 8. The Part 8 is finished and has been voted on. This is
about the procedure that was adopted at the particular meeting, not a part 8.
CLLR. o'NEILL: Cathaoirleach, again -CATHAOIRLEACH: There's someone ahead of you.
Cl1r. Kavanagh.
CLLR. KAVANAGH: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Obviously we're not going to revisit the Part 8 here at this meeting but this meeting has arisen out of the Part 8. so it's disingenuous to say that they're not related.
They very much are.

C11r. Cullen has pointed out that the Section 179 was not actually live at the time that c11r. Thornhill made his proposal or his motion which wasn't voted on. That's one thing. There were also a number of other issues arising out of the Part 8 which is the reason why some people are asking for the house to -- that there's a stay on knocking down the house simply because it may be visited or revisited legally because of a number of issues that arose out of the planning
process. Now, we all know that if the house is knocked then there's absolutely no point trying to close the stable door after the horse has bolted. The fact of the matter is a lot of people, including legal people, have a problem with the planning process and the timing 20:04 of everything and with procedures and this is all about procedures. So I think it isn't unreasonable to at least have a vote on the length of time that will be allowed before the house is knocked or even considered
being knocked.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Neill.
CLLR. O'NEILL: Again, I think I would like to formally put my proposal there. A11 I'm seeking for is a
12-month stay on the demolition of the house. There's talk here about next month or the month after. So if we get the 12 months there. I understand we're not revoking the Part 8, you know, so it can go back to the Bray Municipal District, with the Action Group and whatever, maybe with the CEO here, and look at the situation over a period of only 12 months. It's just to hold the horses for those 12 months. That's all I'm asking for. I think that's a sensible proposal and I'm formally asking now, $I$ 'm asking that motion to be -I'm proposing it, it has been seconded. I'd like to put that on the floor. I don't think I'm breaking any rules or regulations by putting that simple motion there what that it's a stay of 12 months.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY.]

CATHAOIRLEACH: I've one more speaker. Are you finished Gerry? Are you finished? You're not finished, are you?
CLLR. O'NEILL: I am. Go raibh maith agat.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I have one more speaker and I'11 then suggest that I go through the different proposals and try and make sense of them to see what we can do. C11r. Kennedy.

CLLR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I think you have just answered what I was going to say. I think you have given everybody a fair hearing tonight. This has gone on for over two hours already. You have a number of proposals and I would propose that -- I would 20:06 suggest to you that we just move on with the proposals that are put up to you and we move on with the meeting. Everybody is coming in for the sake of having something to say. I think you should just move on with the meeting and with the proposals that are put forward. MS. GALLAGHER: Cathaoirleach, we have four proposals that were put forward. The first one was from C11r. Thornhi11, seconded by C11r. Kavanagh; the second one was proposed by C11r. Lawless, seconded by C11r. Mary McDonald and C11r. O'Connor; the third one proposed by C11r. Fox and seconded by C11r. Vance; and the fourth one was put forward by C11r. O'Neill and seconded by Cl1r. O'Brien. I will start with the fourth proposal first if that's okay to get agreement on that.

Proposed by C11r. O'Neil1 and seconded by C11r. O'Brien that the Part 8 decision on 12 th March should not proceed until the Bray Municipal District engage with the Action Group regarding independent legal advice and 20:07 there should be at least 12 months breathing space. Now, having regard to Standing Orders in relation to revoking a motion I think the Members will be agreed that we can't take that motion.

FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed.
MS. GALLAGHER: I think that's agreed.
FROM THE FLOOR: Agreed:
CLLR. LAWLESS: Can you explain why you can't take it again?

MS. GALLAGHER: Okay. The reason is that the Part 8 was passed by resolution at the last meeting and Standing Orders specifically says that a motion to revoke -- you're effectively asking to revoke that motion.

FROM THE FLOOR: No.
MS. GALLAGHER: To revoke that motion or amend the resolution and that cannot be done within a period of six months unless 16 Members, and not less than one-half of the total number of the Council vote in favour and subject to any statutory requirements. FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Get them to vote. CLLR. SNELL: Sorry, Cathaoirleach, he's not asking to revoke that. Nowhere --
MS. GALLAGHER: The resolution was passed. Was passed. 20:09
CLLR. LAWLESS: There is nowhere in his motion to say to revoke it.

MS. GALLAGHER: The Part 8 should not proceed. But you did vote for it to proceed at the last meeting. If Members want to come in.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Brien.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: There wasn't any timeframe put on it. I asked the question which I didn't get answered I said if it's starting in June when is it proposed to knock
down the house?
CLLR. RYAN: Nothing to do with this meeting.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: I think that's what the people back there would be very interested to know what's
happening. They don't know what's happening. We don't 20:09 know when it is going to be knocked down. We're not asking to revoke anything, we're just saying don't do it for this year. I don't think there's anything unreasonable in that, considering we've waited 20 years for the Florentine Centre in Bray. FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Hear, hear.

## [APPLAUSE AND CHEERS FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

MS. GALLAGHER: Moving on then to proposal number 2, that the Executive of Wicklow County Council seeks independent legal advice on the issue of procedures carried out at the meeting of 12th March 2018 as they relate to the issue of St. Paul's in Bray, and just part B for the sake I'm calling C11r. Thornhil1's motion, that this opinion will examine the issues of transparency, fair procedures and compliance with statutory provisions and obligations, and to include compliance with Standing Orders in relation to issues pertaining to the procedures adopted in the course of the discussion of Item 5 of the agenda of the said meeting 12th March 2018. Would you agree that they are one and the same?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yeah.

MS. GALLAGHER: They are. In fairness, I'm just trying to decipher through the motions. would you agree so we're left with two motions? So we're left with two motions. The motion put forward by C11r. Thornhill, seconded by Cllr. Kavanagh, I'm calling them part A and 20:11 part B. That Wicklow County Council seek an independent legal opinion from a Senior Counsel with regard to the compliance of the Council, statutory requirements of the planning process in connection with the Part 8 proposal, planning reference number $2017 / 171478$ as discussed under Item 5 of the agenda at the Wicklow County Council meeting on Monday, 12th March 2018 part A. And part B, that this opinion will examine the issues of transparency, fair procedures, compliance with statutory provisions and obligations, and to include compliance with Standing Orders in relation to issues pertaining to the procedures adopted in the course of the discussion of Item 5 of the agenda of said meeting, Monday, 12 th March 2018. And then the second proposal submitted by C11r. Fox and seconded by C11r. Vance: I propose to accept Mr. David Sweetman's legal opinion that the Chairman conducted the meeting correctly and in line with legislation and Standing orders.

So the proposal, the part B of the proposal in C11r. Thornhil1's proposal and seconded by Cl1r. Kavanagh is the direct opposite to the proposal to accept Dave Sweetman's legal opinion that the

Chairman conducted the meeting in line with the legislation and Standing orders.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I think part A.
MS. GALLAGHER: So we're left then with part A.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I think that's already been dealt with under part 8. I don't think we can take part A of the proposal.
MS. GALLAGHER: Because the Part 8 was discussed and passed at the last meeting.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Can I put my proposal?
CLLR. BEHAN: Chairman, on a point of order. On a point of order, now. what C11r. Thornhill is saying is that we want to get an independent legal opinion on whether the process was legally sound. That's really in simple language. So we know you're saying it was passed and I voted for it, but I said already and I'11 say it again, I want to know that it was legally sound when I voted for it. So it is not fair or not correct to say that that cannot be taken. It absolutely -MS. GALLAGHER: We didn't say part b couldn't be taken.

## [APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CLLR. BEHAN: And in relation to the second part. C11r. Fox is accepting the legal opinion of the Law Agent and saying he agrees with it. He's right, okay. whereas C11r. Thornhill is saying that a legal opinion will examine the issues. So C11r. Thornhill is not actually preordaining anything, whereas C11r. Fox is
saying he has already made up his mind.
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CLLR. BEHAN: Cllr. Thornhill's actually is a fairer one because it's examine the issue. what is wrong, after two and a half hours, with us just getting an independent legal advice on this? what are we afraid of?
CATHAOIRLEACH: Independent legal advice on what?
CLLR. BEHAN: On the process, as it is there worded, Cathaoirleach. I'm saying what that really means, you tried to get down to brass tacks a few minutes ago and you said, like what are we really saying? what we're saying is, was the process legally sound? Yes or no and we want an independent legal advice on that. CATHAOIRLEACH: Just to be clear, let's try and thrash this out. The process of how the Part 8 was conducted, how the meeting of 12th March was conducted? FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: How you didn't get C11r. Thornhill's proposal.

CLLR. BEHAN: What I'm saying is, the process that was undertaken on the day was dependent on the process of the Part 8 being done properly. The points that Mr . Whelan made was that there was certain legal issues 20:15 he saw with how the notices were displayed, et cetera. Now they were not addressed by an independent legal opinion. We got his opinion. We got Mr. O'Brien's opinion. We never got an independent opinion. was the
process, from beginning to end, legally sound?
CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we now in danger then, that's outside the realm of this meeting? Am I not right in saying that?

CLLR. BEHAN: Look, I'm trying to suggest the reason

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Cullen.
CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: Chairman, I think C11r. Behan is right, you can't take one if you can't take the other. They both cance 1 each other out.
CLLR. FOX: They don't. My proposal is on the direct meeting properly. That's effectively what C11r. Thornhill is suggesting. I felt you did and Mr. Sweetman has said, in his opinion, that you carried
out the meeting correctly. That's what my proposal is. MS. GALLAGHER: And in line with legislation and Standing Orders.
CLLR. FOX: Not on the issues of the Part 8. okay. It's on the fact that you conducted the meeting properly. That's my proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That's the purpose of this meeting. CLLR. FOX: Cl1r. Behan is suggesting otherwise. That I didn't do that. That I had formed my opinion on any other matters on the Part 8. I am directly proposing that we accept Mr. Sweetman's opinion on what C11r. Thornhil1 has suggested.
CLLR. BEHAN: Well then if that's the case they're not direct opposites then. Part $B$ is not a direct opposite of what you're saying, which is what Ms. Gallagher said. It's not a direct opposite.

CLLR. FOX: Part A is not a direct opposite. Part A affects the Part 8. This in relation to the Part 8. MS. GALLAGHER: I will just read C11r. Fox's proposal again which says:
"I propose to accept Mr. David Sweetman's legal opinion that the Chairman conducted the meeting of 12th March correctly and in line with legislation and Standing orders."

That's seconded by C11r. Vance.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Connor. I'm trying to get to an end here.

CLLR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I think the proposal that we put forward is as simple as a proposal possibly can be. All we're asking for is independent legal advice of the procedures that were carried out by this Council and by its Executive at the last meeting. That's it. By the way I should point out that contrary to how it's been painted by some individuals in the bigger parties in this Council Chamber this evening, right, this isn't about you and your chairmanship at this whole meeting. It's nothing to do with that. It's about the procedures. And the likes of the two bigger parties in this Chamber are trying to paint this as being some sort of an attack by us on you and you're a fundamentally decent man, is absolutely appalling.

```
[APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]
```

CLLR. O'CONNOR: Finally, Cathaoirleach, I would ask that our proposal, which is as simple as it could be, be voted on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. O'Connor, you phrased your proposal there a minute ago. Maybe write that down because that's a little bit different to what we have here. It does sound closer to what we're looking for. cllr. Snell.

CLLR. SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I agree with a lot of what's been said. But just in regards to your own opinion and I fee 1 I must seek that clarity from you in regards to why you feel, as Cathaoirleach, that
you can't take the proposals in regards to seeking that independent advice that most Members seem to be asking for. Even people who had voted in support of what was put in front of them here at the last meeting are saying that independent legal advice would be the road and should be something that we should be seeking and you seem to be indicating there from the Chair that you don't think you can take that, you don't think that you can take that vote or you feel that you might be on unsound footing by seeking independent legal advice. This could have been thrashed out in the first 15 minutes of this meeting.
CATHAOIRLEACH: You know I'm open to taking any proposals and I have never deliberately blocked any proposals. The only way -- I base my decision on what's right and correct and what's proper. Now this meeting is about the decision that was made here not to take Cllr. Thornhill's proposal on 12th March. It's not about the process in relation to the Part 8. That's not what this meeting is about. Therefore, if we're bringing up looking for independent legal advice in relation to something outside this meeting I don't believe $I$ can take that.
CLLR. SNELL: So you're not against seeking independent legal advice?
CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm not against a proposal to seek independent legal advice that pertains to the purpose of this meeting. In other words, independent legal advice. We will see o'Connor's submission in a second
but it deals with the issue around whether a decision on 12th March not to allow Cllr. Thornhill's proposal was correct or not. That's -- the legal advice should be, it appears to me, should be limited to that.
CLLR. SNELL: Can I just follow that up on Part 2 of my 20:21 question which would be in regards to proposal 4 put forward by C11r. O'Neill and C11r. Oliver O'Brien to have a 12 -month stay. Again, it seems to have been ruled out from the top table in regards to, I don't believe that they were trying to infringe on the

Part 8. It wasn't trying to change the democratic vote but they were clearly just asking for 12 -month respite. Could I have perhaps, for the next Protocol meeting, where the assumption that that couldn't be taken or the legal advice from the Law Agent or otherwise that that is in contrary to moving or effecting the Part 8 -CATHAOIRLEACH: will retry and answer it now.

## [APPLAUSE FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

MS. GALLAGHER: I'11 just read C11r. O'Brien's and Cl1r. O'Neill's proposal again. The first line says: "The Part 8 decision of 12 th March should not proceed until the Bray Municipal District engage with the Action Group regarding independent legal advice and there should be 12-month breathing space."

I would reiterate again that the resolution was passed. I will refer again to Standing order which says that:
"In relation to resolutions, motions to amend or revoke resolutions" and basically, again, "it shall be necessary for adoption for a motion to revoke or amend a resolution of the Council by not less than 16 members and not less than one-half of the total number of Council members to vote in favour and subject to any statutory requirements."

And it also says that:
"No such motion should be allowed to appear on the agenda to revoke or amend any resolution of the Council within 6 months of the date of the adoption of such resolution, except with the written consent of not less than 16 Members of the Council a resolution may not be revoked after the meeting at which it has been adopted followed by part (inaudible).
CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you have c11r. o'Connor's revised proposal? Just read it out.
MS. GALLAGHER: So this is from Cl1r. O'Connor that this Council seeks independent legal advice to consider the procedure of the meeting of 12th March 2018 proposed by C11r. O'Connor, seconded by C11r. Lawless and Cllr. McDonald.

C11r. Fox has a proposal to accept that the Chairman conducted the meeting correctly.
CATHAOIRLEACH: It appears to me that I can accept Cllr. O'brien's proposal. It appears to me I can.

CLLR. LAWLESS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. whitmore.

MS. GALLAGHER: Cl1r. Whitmore has proposed that Wicklow County Council seek independent legal advice on the ability of Elected Members to propose alternative motions other than that specified in Section 179 during consideration of the agenda items relating to same. That's more general. Have you a seconder for that? CLLR. WHITMORE: No. I need one.

CLLR. TOMMY CULLEN: I'11 second it, Chair.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm not sure I can take that. Can you read it again read again.
MS. GALLAGHER: That Wicklow County Council seek independent legal advice on the ability of Elected Members to propose alternative motions other than specified in Section 179 during the consideration of agenda items relating to same.
CLLR. WHITMORE: On the date of 12th March and then it's relating to the meeting.
MS. GALLAGHER: Is that the same then as
Cl1r. O'Connor's motion.
CLLR. WHITMORE: It's more specific.
MR. CURRAN: I think that's a separate issue than the business of the meeting. The business of the meeting is the conduct of the Chair, et cetera, as is set out. This is different.
CATHAOIRLEACH: It's deviating a bit from it.
CLLR. WINTERS: Chairman. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.
Because we are so confined by the subject of tonight's
meeting, surely it would be possible at our next meeting in April to bring forward any motions or have put on the agenda the consideration of say what Jennifer whitmore is talking about.
CATHAOIRLEACH: That thought crossed my mind.
CLLR. WINTERS: So that we can just vote on what we can vote on this evening and the rest we can actually put on the agenda in April. Other than that we're going to do something that we're not allowed to do and it will be pointless.
CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks for that help, c11r. winters. I'm going to go to a vote now.
CLLR. WHITMORE: Can I just ask --
CATHAOIRLEACH: There's two people ahead of you, Jennifer. Guys, can I just say to you maybe one minute ${ }^{20: 27}$ oliver and John you haven't spoken.
CLLR. VANCE: How many times have people to get in.
CATHAOIRLEACH: John Ryan has spoken.
CLLR. RYAN: I just want to say if you take cllr. Fox's proposal and it fails, well then you can go on to
discuss, you know.
CLLR. LAWLESS: Our proposal is in first.
CATHAOIRLEACH: The way I'm thinking now is I'11 take both of them because they're not diametrically opposite.
CLLR. RYAN: If you take C11r. Fox's first.
CLLR. LAWLESS: Our proposal was in first. No way. No way.
MS. GALLAGHER: I will leave that to the Elected

Members.
CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm not going to argue with you. You put in a proposal and then C11r. Fox put in a proposal and then you changed yours. If you want to take it first we can.

CLLR. LAWLESS: We'11 go first.
CLLR. BEHAN: Just on a point of order. I do not accept your ruling that C11r. Thornhill's proposal cannot be put to this meeting and I would like to put it on record that $I$ am objecting to you not taking that 20:28 proposal.

FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: Hear, hear.
[APPLAUSE AND CHEERS FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY]

CLLR. BEHAN: what the Chief Executive has said, I don't know if everybody heard, but what he said was this is really about how the Chairman conducted the meeting on the day and nothing else. The point of C11r. Thornhill was we want to look at the validity of everything that happened in the process. We're not being allowed a vote on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: And I have already answered that. CLLR. BEHAN: And you've explained. I'm just putting on record that I'm objecting to it.
CLLR. O'BRIEN: I'm coming back in again because the question I asked wasn't answered. The question I asked, obviously we know when the Florentine is proceeding. We also know when St. Paul's is going to
be knocked down and I'm asking when is it going to be knocked down? Put a timeframe on it. We could wake up in the morning and that could be knocked down. That's the problem.

CLLR. RYAN: That's nothing to do with this meeting. CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to go for a vote. CLLR. O'BRIEN: The question hasn't been answered. CLLR. WHITMORE: Can we suspend Standing Orders to address something outside of the remit?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No, not at this meeting. Members, I'm going to -- it's 8:30, I'm going to deal with the two proposals. The first one by C11r. O'Connor and then there's going to be a second proposal by Cl1r. Fox. MS. GALLAGHER: Proposed that this Council seeks independent legal advice to consider the procedures of the meeting of 12th March 2018. [VOTE TAKEN] That's 13 for; 16 against; and 3 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposal by C11r. Fox, seconded by Cllr. Vance.

MS. GALLAGHER: "I propose to accept Mr. David
Sweetman's legal opinion that the Chairman conducted the meeting of March 12th correctly and in line with legislation and Standing Orders" proposed by C11r. Fox and seconded by C11r. Fox. [VOTE TAKEN] That's 17 for; 11 against; and 4 not present.
CATHAOIRLEACH: C11r. Fortune.
CLLR. FORTUNE: It won't take long. Just a question I meant to ask you when I was talking earlier, I'm just curious why there was a security on the door tonight

and guards? what was the rationale from the -FROM THE PUBLIC GALLERY: The citizens are here. That's one reason. And believe in democracy but it doesn't happen here. All them parties gang up and do what they like. No democracy here.
CATHAOIRLEACH: The meeting is now finished. Thanks everyone.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:11 } \\ & \text { developer }[1] \text { - } \\ & 25: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { [1] }-34: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 27,50: 2,50: 3 \\ & 52: 13,64: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $53: 17,54: 2$ <br> effect [2]-19:1 | $25: 3$ equality [2] - | 40:24 exercise [2] - |
| $25: 5$ <br> Development | discuss [7] - $3: 22,10: 8,39: 24,$ | door [2] - 66:23, | 37:19 | $\begin{array}{r} 12: 16,12: 17 \\ \text { equally }[1]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:2, 16:10 } \\ & \text { expended }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| [9] - 5:21, 6:5, | $57: 17,81: 21$ <br> discussed [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:29 } \\ & \text { doors [1] - 25:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 78:16 | $56: 7$ | 42:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 29,7: 13,8: 14, \\ & 9: 7,15: 1,19: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | effectively [8] - | equivalent [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expert [1] - } \\ & 47: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20:12 <br> development | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13:19, 21:28, } \\ \text { 21:29, 23:28, } \\ \text { 30:24, 32:16, } \\ \text { 71:11, } 72: 8 \\ \text { discussing }[3] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 12 \\ & \text { doubt [2] - 12:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 21,37: 23 \\ & 38: 13,38: 28 \end{aligned}$ | error [1] - 34:28 errors [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expertise [1] - } \\ & 17: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[33]-6: 8,6: 10,} \\ & 6: 12,8: 24,15: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 10 \\ & \text { down [32] - } \\ & \text { 18:20, 22:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 11,42: 9,69: 9 \\ & 74: 27 \end{aligned}$ | 34:29 | experts [1] - |
|  |  |  | 74:27 <br> eight [2]-31:8, | essentially [1] - | $22: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:6, 17:19, } \\ & \text { 17:20, 17:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $32: 15,33: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:20, 22:24, } \\ & 24: 3,24: 5,24: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $34: 1$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38: 6 \\ \text { et }[5] \end{array}$ | explain [1] - 69:4 |
| 18:6, 18:9, 18:10, |  | 24:19, 24:23, | $\begin{gathered} \text { either [5]- } 5: 12, \\ 27: 14.32: 1.33: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $50: 13,63: 1$ | explained [1] |
| 19:18, 19:20, |  | 25:20, 25:26, | 27:14, 32:1, 33:8, 44:10 | $73: 26,80: 25$ | 82:24 |
| 19:23, 19:25, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 27,38: 6 \\ & 41: 19,50: 29, \end{aligned}$ | 44:10 <br> elect [1] - 50:2 | euro [3] - 24:4, | exploring [1] - |
| $20: 3,20: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & -5: 15,8: 4,8: 25, \\ & 9: 1,13: 28,15: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 19,50: 29 \\ & 51: 7,51: 9,51: 19 \end{aligned}$ | elect [1] - 50:25 <br> Elected [7]-3:1, | 24:12, 24:23 | $59: 2$ |
| $24: 18,52: 8$ |  | 60:15, 60:20, | 16:4, 19:2, 62:20, | evening [8] - $17: 11,47: 3,56: 2,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extra }[3]-15: 13, \\ & 29: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 53:16, 56:6, 58:4, | $64: 19,70: 26$ | 61:22, 64:28, | 80:5, 80:14, | 56:11, 56:12, | extremely [1] - |
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| 35:10, 35:11, | 71:2, 71:3, 71:4 | necessary [2] - | $8: 7,69: 19,69: 21$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 15,67: 22, \\ & 67: 26,68: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| 37:19, 73:13, | 79:1, 80:6, 80:15, | 55:24, 79:3 | number [16] | 59:5 | 68:14, 68:15, |
| 77:12 | 81 | $12$ | 10:18, 13:18, | obligation [1] - | 68:17, 69:15 |
| , |  |  | 15:4, 28:22, 38:7, | 43:13 | 70:28, 73:6, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:9 } \\ & \text { mouth [1] }-61: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $31: 28,32: 28$ | 38:12, 41:19, | obligations [5] | 74:23, 79:5, 80:9, |
|  |  | 32:29, 37:12, | 55:27, 60:29, | $13: 25,15: 23$, $63: 25,70: 23$, | $81: 15,83: 12$ |
|  |  | 46:19, 50:12 | 66:15, 66:20, 68:5, 69:15, | $71: 15$ | one's [1] - 27:23 |
|  |  |  |  | observation [1] | one-half [2] - |
|  |  |  |  | obtained [2] -$16: 3,16: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:15, 79:5 } \\ & \text { one-sided [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { one-sided [1] - } \\ & 27: 17 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:17 } \\ & \text { ones [1] - 33:22 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:29 } \\ & \text { obvious [1] - } \\ & 31: 19 \end{aligned}$ | open [2]-64:13, |
|  |  |  |  | 77:13 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | operation [1] - |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| prejudiced [2] - | $83: 15$ | $56: 15,56: 21,$ | propose [10] - | $72: 22,73: 3,$ | $40: 3,42: 27,44:$ |
| 7:2, 20:13 | proceed [20] - | 56:24, 77:16 | 13:11, 61:12 | 73:20, 74:14 | 60:5, 67:25 |
| preordaining [1] | 5:9, 6:14, 15:4, | properly [7] - | 62:13, 62:21 | 76:16, 78:19, | raised [2]-3:10, |
| - 72:29 | 15:5, 15:6, 17:25, | 16:13, 30:11 | 68:5, 71:21 | 82:12, 82:14 | 44:27 |
| epared [1] - | 19:24, 20:2 | 37:2, 47:5, 73:24, | 75:22, 80:5 | 84: | rather [3] - |
| ```8:4 present [5] - 12:14, 21:3, 30:28, 83:17, 83:25 presentation [1]``` | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 5,63: 7,63: 28, \\ & 63: 29,64: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 74:27, 75:6 } \\ & \text { proposal [119] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:15, 83:20 } \\ & \text { proposed [40] - } \end{aligned}$ | pulled [1] - 53:8 purpose [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 17,32: 14 \\ & 58: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 64:11, 64:14, } \\ 68: 24,69: 23, \\ \text { 69:24, 78:23 } \\ \text { proceeded [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 2,3: 23,3: 26 \\ & 4: 22,4: 23,4: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $4: 29,6: 3,6: 8$ | $3: 21,10: 21,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { rationale [2] - } \\ 18: 22,84: 1 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | 11:14, 74:19 |  |
|  |  | 5:1, 5:3, 5:4, 5:5, $5 \cdot 9,5: 10,5 \cdot 17$ | $6: 25,8: 20,15: 2$ 17:19, 17:20 | $75: 7,77: 27$ | read [33] - 4:9, |
|  |  | 5:9, 5:10, 5:17, | 17:19, 17:20, | push [1] - 53:21 | $9: 27,9: 28,10: 6,$ |
| - 47:2 <br> presente | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38: 10 \\ \\ \text { proceeding }[4] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 18,6: 9,6: 26 \\ & 7: 4,7: 6,8: 1,8: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 5,18: 9,1 \\ & 19: 9,19: 12 \end{aligned}$ | put [58] - 4:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 27,9: 28,10: 6, \\ & 10: 12,10: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| 12:6, 12:22, 13:1, | 38:6, 38:8, 38:9, | 8:20, 8:21, 8:24, | 19:17, 19:20 | 15:3, 16:29, | 14:13, 15:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:12 } \\ & \text { presenting [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | process [45] - | 13:18, 17:20, | 20:21, 20:22, | 18:18, 22:18, | $35: 1,36: 21,$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27: | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 12,3: 15,7: 2, \\ & 7: 19,7: 22,9: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 18:7, 18:16, | 30:18, 35:7, | 24:20, 26:10, | $45: 20,45: 25,$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 18,19: 9 \\ & 19: 19,20: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $35: 16,38: 10$ | 27:28, 29:14, | $46: 13,46: 17$ |
| 52:21, 52:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 19,7: 22,9: 8, \\ & 9: 20,11: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 19:19, 20:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 24,61: 17, \\ & 62: 28,63: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 10,35: 11, \\ & 35: 21,39: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 20,50: 21 \\ & 55: 7,56: 2,56: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:9, 53:22 } \\ & \text { previous }[3] \end{aligned}$ | 13:17, 14:26, | 22:18, 22:29, | 64:15, 68:14, | $42: 7,43: 3,43: 4$ |  |
| 11:10, 11:19, | 20:7, 20:14, | 23:21, 23:22, | $68: 16,68: 22,$ | 46:26, 48:1, 48:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 9,65: 24 \\ & 75: 19,78: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $58: 1$ primacy [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 10,25: 2, \\ & 31: 25,33: 1,36: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 4,28: 6,29: 18 \\ & 29: 19,31: 1,31: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 29,79: 23, \\ & 80: 3,83: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 48:24, 49:14, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 79:19, } 80: 12 \\ \text { reading [3] - } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 7,38: 4,38: 20, \\ & 43: 7,43: 12,44: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 4,33: 5,33: 17, \\ & 33: 19,35: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 83:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 8,51: 11, \\ & 51: 12,51: 28, \end{aligned}$ | 18:6, 32:18, |
| 58 | $44: 25,47: 26$, $48: 5,49: 11$, | $35: 13,35: 23$ $37: 11,37: 22$ | 38:29, 55:9, <br> 67:15, 75:10 protect [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 22,60: 21, \\ & 62: 14,62: 16, \end{aligned}$ | realise [1] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 5,49: 11, \\ & 59: 28,60: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 11,37: 22, \\ & 38: 26.38: 29 . \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:25 } \\ & \text { really [20] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $63: 12,66: 21$ | $43: 3,44: 12,45: 1$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63: } \\ & \text { 67: } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 12,66: 21, \\ & 66: 25,71: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | 53:28 <br> Protocol [1] - | $68: 10,68: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 20,27: 17, \\ & 30: 17,30: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:25, 71:9, } \\ & 72: 14,73: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 5,45: 19,51: 4 \\ & 51: 24,51: 29 \\ & 55: 3,57: 13,61: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 78:13 | 68:17, 69:27, | 31:20, 35:28, |
| 24:6, 24:7, 24:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 15,73: 18, \\ & 73: 22,73: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | provide [4] - | $71: 4,72: 10,74: 6$ | $46: 25,49: 5$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 22,73: 23, \\ & 74: 1,74: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 4,61: 10, \\ & 61: 14,62: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $57: 10,58: 3$ | 81:3, 81:7, 82:3, | $53: 13,53: 18$, $57: 19,58: 6$, |
| pı | $77: 19,82: 21$ | $62: 14,62: 29$ |  | 82:9, 83:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 20,59: 5,60: 2, \\ & 64: 21,72: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $25: 14,27: 3$ |  | 64:12, 65:21 | provided [4] | putting [5] - |  |
| pristine [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:12 } \\ & \text { process' [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 14,67: 4 \\ & 67: 13,68: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 12:19, $27: 28$ provides [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 19,51: 22, \\ & 61: 9,67: 17, \\ & 82: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 82:18 |
| $52: 10,52: 24$, $53: 17$ | $4: 29,6: 3,6: 24$ <br> procurement [3] | 70:15, 71:10, |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:17 } \\ & \text { problem [11] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 15,71: 10, \\ & 71: 20,71: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 7:10, 7:12 providing [1] |  | realms [1] - |
| 16:15, 34:13, | $\begin{aligned} & -6: 19,19: 11, \\ & 20: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 72:7, 72:10, | $17: 1$ |  | 74:12 |
| 41:27, 54:6, 54:7, | profess [1] - 47.25 | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 21,74: 18 \\ & 74: 25,75: 1,75: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $8: 7,16: 21,16: 22$ | questions [2] - | 47:10, 47:12, |
| 61:23, 66:25, | professional [3] | 74:25, 75:1, 75:6, 75:19, 76:2, | $5: 20,13: 25$ | 4:10, 22:11 | 49:2, 60:3, 65:17, |
| problems [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:23 } \\ & \text { profit [2] - 24:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 19,76: 22, \\ & 77: 18,77: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $15: 23,70: 23$ | quick [1] - 10:6 quickly [2] - | $66: 16,69: 6,74: 5,$ $84: 3$ |
| 27:5 <br> procedure [2] - |  | $78: 2,78: 6,78: 22$ | 71:15 public [4]-3:11, | $32: 9,32: 24$ <br> quite [10] - | reasonable [10] |
| 66:1, 79:22 <br> procedures [19] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:24 } \\ & \text { progresses [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:29, 81:20, } \\ & \text { 81:22, 81:27, } \\ & \text { 82:3, 82:8, 82:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 20 \\ & \text { PUBLIC }[29]- \\ & 14: 1,17: 6,21: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 31:18, 32:3, 32:9, $32: 24,38: 1$ | $37: 14,43: 5$ |
| - 12:28, 13:24, | 51:10 Project [1] - 8:23 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 24,38: 1 \\ & 38: 22,42: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $48: 3,62: 2,65: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 27,15: 22, \\ & 15: 25,27: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { project [2] - } \\ 34: 6,44: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 3,82: 8,82: 11 \\ & 83: 13,83: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  | $46: 15,52: 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 48:3, 62:2, 65:23 } \\ \text { reasons [8] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 27:26, 30:12, |  | proposals [14]- | 31:15, 40:6, 44:3, |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 11:29, 21:28, } \\ 21: 29,22: 2, \\ 26: 21,32: 21, \\ 40: 16,65: 10 \\ \text { received }[3]- \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 20,66: 26, \\ & 66: 27,70: 17, \end{aligned}$ | proof [1] - 51:18 proper [10] - | 3:25, 34:9, 35:6, 35:12, 60:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 20,51: 26 \\ & 54: 25,59: 9,60: 8 \end{aligned}$ | R |  |
| 71:14, 71:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { proper [10] - } \\ 3: 29,14: 21, \\ 16: 12,16: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 27,68: 5,68: 6, \\ & \text { 68:10, 68:11, } \\ & 77: 1,77: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 27,64: 4, \\ & 67: 20,69: 17, \end{aligned}$ | raibh [9]-14:11, |  |




| 48:20, 51:26, | thrown [1] - 46:5 | towns [1] - | 71:11, 72:6 | 65:7, 68:16, | $66: 14,72: 16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:25, 59:9, 60:8, | Thursday [1] - | 58:17 | undertaken [1] - | 71:21, 75:27, | $72: 18,76: 20$ |
| 60:27, 64:4, | 35:29 | trader [1] - 41:15 | 73:23 | 83:19 | 77:3 |
| 67:20, 69:1, 69:3, | tied [2]-12:15, | traders [1] | unfair [1]-28:13 | VANCE [5] - | votes [4]-5:11, |
| 69:11, 69:17, | 12:25 | 41:18 | unfairness [4] - | 11:1, 40:9, 65:8, | 5:12, 9:4, 16:15 |
| 70:11, 70:13, | timeframe [2] - | raipse [1] - 74:9 | 45:9, 46:1, 48:16, | 74:20, 81:1 | voting [2]-24:3, |
| $70: 29,72: 22$ | 69:27, 83:2 | transacted [1] - | 48:17 | vandal [1] - 54:1 | 30:9 |
| $74: 14,76: 16$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { time } \\ 39: 13 \end{array}$ | transcript [3] | $12: 1$ | 37:20, 41:29, | W |
| 78:19, 82:12, | timing [2] - | 18:7, 18:18, $57: 1$ | unique [6] - | 42:5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 82: 14,84: 2,84: 9 \\ \text { THEN [2] - 11:4, } \end{array}$ | 35:21, 66:25 | transcripts [1] - | 52:6, 52:11, | $\text { vary }[7]-6: 12$ | waited [1] - 70:9 |
| $84: 9$ <br> therefore [4] | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 16,11: 14 \\ & 11: 15,16: 13 \end{aligned}$ | transparency <br> [8]-13:24, 15:22 | $54: 1,54: 10$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 63:6, 64:2, } 64: 12 \\ \text { view [13] - } 6: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waiting [1] - } \\ & 24: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 8:6, 21:3, 35:12, | 23:26, 41:5, 41:6, | 24:27 | 6:11, 17:22 | 6:28, 7:19, 19:13, | wake [1]-83: |
| 77:20 | 41:14, 42:18, | 31:26, 43:18 | $19: 21,69: 14$ | $20: 11,29: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WALSH [1] - } \\ & 50: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| thinking [2] 26.18, 81.23 | 49:2, 57:29, | $70: 22,71: 14$ | unnecessary [1] | 31:10, 34:5, | Walsh [6] - |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \mid 26: 18,81: 23 \\ \text { third }[1]-68: 15 \end{array}$ | 65:10, 65:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { transpired [1] - } \\ & 45: 16 \end{aligned}$ | - 30:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 26,45: 15 \\ & 74: 8,74: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 10,43: 16$ |
| Thornhill [38] - | 44:18 | tried [1] - 73:13 | [2] - 66:27, 70:9 | views [5]-5:29, | $43: 17,48: 27$ |
| 3:6, 3:10, 3:24, | toget | 49:8 | unsound [1] | 22:24, 30:20 | 50:5, 59:23 |
| 6:16, 9:13, 9:14, | 54:19 | $\text { try }[5]-27: 18,$ | 77:10 | $34: 19,36: 2$ | Walsh's [1] - $60: 1$ |
| 10:9, 13:8, 14:15, $14: 17$ 14:19, | toilets [1]-24:9 | $45: 6,59: 14$ | $\text { up [37] }-9: 20$ | vires [3] - 6:6, | 60:1 <br> Wanderers' [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:17, 14:19, } \\ & \text { 16:26, 18:7, } \end{aligned}$ | Tommy [2] 34.23, 45:12 | $67: 28,73: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:12, 16:22, } \\ & \text { 16:23, } 24: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $8: 13,19: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wanderers' } \\ & \text { 52:29 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $18: 24,19: 27$ | 34:23, 45 | [12] | $24: 21,25: 2$ | $37: 4$ | wants [8] |
| 21:9, 22:4, 31:2, | 9:11, 10:2, 10:11, | 5 | 26:5, 26:18, 27:1, | visited [1] | 38:26, 52:23, |
| 33:5, 38:5, 42:26, | 10:28, 34:24, | 62:18, 66:22 | 29:26, 33:6, | 66:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 12,53: 14, \\ & 53 \cdot 2958 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 44:17, 48:1, | 36:18, 52:1, 55:9, | 71:1, 74:5, 75:28, | $36: 24,36: 27$ | $\text { vital }[2]-41:$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 29,58: 3 \\ & 61: 21,61: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48: 26,50: 18, \\ & 57: 22,59: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 61:13, $61: 16$, $61: 19,62 \cdot 9$, | $76: 12,78: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 28,37: 2, \\ & 38: 13,45: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $58: 6$ | 61:21, 61:22 WAS [1] - 84:9 |
| 59:16, 61:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 19,62: 9, \\ & 62: 12,74: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Ts [1] $-43: 1$ | $46: 22,46: 23$ | $4: 1,4: 3,5: 10$ | water [1]-26:2 |
| 66:13, 68:13 | 80:10 | $\text { rn [1] }-12: 2$ | 48:10, 54:4, | 5:17, 8:25, 8:29 | ways [2] - 58:7, |
| 71:4, 72:12, | tonight [12] | twice [1] - 18:23 | 54:20, 57:4, 59:5, | 9:3, 15:6, 18:26 | 58:11 |
| 72:27, 72:28, | 30:28, 31:6, | two [34]-4:27, | 59:27, 61:4, | 20:26, 21:11, | Wednesday [1] - $4: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 74: 28,75: 12, \\ & 82: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $32: 10,32: 22$ | $9: 1,9: 5,9: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:13, 64:8, } \\ & \text { 64:28, 68:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 23:2, 26:23, | week [1] - 37:4 |
| THORNHILL [7] | 54:18, 61:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 13,11: 8, \\ & 14: 18,22: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $74: 7,77: 21,78: 5,$ | $32: 4,32: 20,$ | weeks [7] |
| - 9:15, 13:9, 14:3, | 61:25, 68:3, |  | 83:2, 84:4 | 32:23, 32:24 | 11:17, 34:8, |
| 22:5, 31:13, | 83:29 | $32: 15,35: 1,36: 2$ | urgency [9] - | $32: 28,39: 16$ | 53:23, 53:27, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 42:27, 59:17 } \\ \text { Thornhill's } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tonight's [1] - } \\ & 80: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 36:13, 37:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:10, 15:12, } \\ & 20: 29,27: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 21,43: 1,43: 2, \\ & 44: 15,55: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 54:19, } 56: 8,58: 1 \\ \text { weeks' [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 19:8, 30:9, 33:17, | too | $49$ | 29:14, 29:28, | 59:15, 63:13, | 61:27 |
| 35:5, 35:11, | 43:14, 45:18, | $53: 26,56: 18$ | 39:11, 41:22, | 65:16, 65:25, | whack [1] |
| 35:17, 45:19, | 49:13 | $56: 19,58: 24$ | 43:20 | 65:28, 66:28, | 40:29 |
| 50:7, 64:26, | top [3]-32:10, | 59:25, 59:26, | utterly [1] - | 69:15, 69:17, | whatsoever [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 70: 20,71: 27 \\ & 73: 5.73: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $49: 9,78: 9$ | $63: 13,65: 6,68: 4$ | 12:25 | $69: 24,77: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 18,51: 21, \\ & 54: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:18, } 78: 2,82: 8 \\ & \text { thrash [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { total }[3]-55: 27, \\ & 69: 15,79: 5 \\ & \text { totally }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 3,73: 7,76: 11, \\ & 81: 14,83: 11 \end{aligned}$ | V | 78:11, 79:6, 81:6, $\begin{aligned} & 81: 7,81: 12, \\ & 82: 22,83: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Whelan [4] - } \\ \text { 11:9, 11:27, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73:17 } \\ & \text { thrashed [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 19$ | U |  | VO | $12: 20,73: 25$ |
| $77: 11$ | $53: 18$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:20 } \\ & \text { valuable }[3] \end{aligned}$ | voted [21]-3:26, | 37:28, 46:3, |
| 17:27, 17:28, | 49:6 | $5: 8,5: 9,15:$ | $58: 6,58: 20,$ | 18:25, 26:17, | whereas [2] - |
| 18:1, 18:23, | town [5]-41:20, | $\text { ultra }[3]-6:$ | 58:27 | $39: 4,45: 22$ | $72: 27,72: 29$ |
| 31:21, 32:15 | 46:22, 58:6, 59:7 | 8:13, 19:15 <br> under [8]-7:12 | 58:29 | 49:28, 50:24, | whereby [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39: 20,49: 16 \\ & 53: 23,54: 18 \end{aligned}$ | Town [3] - | $8: 4,13: 19,20: 21,$ | Vance [9] - | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 25,51: 5 \\ & 51: 14,63: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 15:2 <br> whichever [1] - |
| throw [1] - 47:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 16,58: 13, \\ & 58: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 63:26, 64:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 17,40: 8 \\ & 43: 18,60: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 65:9, 65:29, | $22: 9$ |



