

**SPECIAL MEETING OF**  
**WICKLOW COUNTY COUNCIL**

**ON**

**MONDAY, 12<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2022 AT 10:00 A.M.**

**MyClearText Ltd certify the following to be a transcript of the stenographic notes in the above-named action for communication support.**

**Nicola Dutton**

**Jen Sinnamon**

**Heather Casali**

CATHAOIRLEACH: [ Speaking in Irish] Members, thank you very much. A late start, but at least you weren't flying anywhere with Aer Lingus, you would have been out in the rain! Can I say thank you to the technical team for doing a great job. I know the pressure was on you, lads, well done. Ellen, do you want to start with etiquette.

ADMINISTRATOR: I would start by saying that mobile phones be switched to silent. That all members participating remotely leave their cameras on and microphones off and raise their hands if they wish to speak or participate. If you have any problem with your connection, please let us know straight away and we will try and get you sorted. I would remind the elected members, if you have anything to eat or drink, please, it's the technology. We don't want anything further to happen to it, we would ask for water only. Now I will commence the roll call.

[Roll call taken]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I believe we've got a vote of sympathy. Cllr Joe Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I want to propose a vote of sympathy to the family -- to Will Horgan on the death of his wife, Paula. Will Horgan was a town engineer in Bray for many years. His wife sadly passed away just before the weekend. Her funeral is this morning at 11 o'clock. I would propose a vote of sympathy to Will and his family on this sad occasion of Paula's passing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Anybody else? Cllr Vincent Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: Thank you, Chairman. I propose a vote of sympathy to the Douse family in Carnew on the death of Margaret Douse. They were involved in the housing project in Carnew all down the years for quite a number of years. And they were present last Sunday, and Joe went away there participating in the pageant. It was a sad thing yesterday morning that we discovered that Margaret had passed away. Thank you, Chairman.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Is that everyone? Yes. Can we stand for a minute's silence please.

[One minute's silence]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. First on the agenda is the section 140. Now, I'm going to propose, because of the delay and the importance, now I want to thank the members that have brought this Section 140 on to the agenda but I'm going to propose that we put it down below the development plan because this development plan has been in the training for three years and I want to get this over the line today, if possible. So, I propose that we will hear the first item on the agenda after the development plan.

Is everybody in agreement? Okay. Thanks a million for that. So, Teresa or Helen, have you something to read out of the development plan.

TERESA BYRNE: In advance of starting on item number two on the agenda, I want to remind the elected members, you all received an email in relation to ethics. I want to go through some of the issues in advance of the meeting.

When a matter comes before the meeting for consideration, if you or a connected person has a beneficial interest, you must disclose to the meeting the nature of the beneficial interest before discussion or consideration of the matter commences. You must withdraw fully from the meeting

until the matter is concluded. You must also inform the Council's Ethics Registrar in writing. A disclosure of absence from the meeting will be recorded in the minutes. When the item is completed, you will be advised by telephone and can re-join the meeting.

In relation to voting, you are advised to keep your microphones on for those who are in the Chamber, and your microphones and cameras on during the voting process for those who are remote.

Once an amendment is proposed and seconded, the Cathaoirleach will ask the elected members to clearly indicate, vote verbally and by way of a show of hands, on screen, if a member is in agreement with the amendment as put forward.

The response will be followed by a brief pause, following which the Cathaoirleach will then ask the elected member to verbally indicate if there is disagreement or dissent as to the proposal put forward. If one or more elected members indicates they're not in agreement, a roll call will be taken. If there is no dissent, the amendment will be considered passed. Is that clear? Yes. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Chief Executive, can I bring you in here please?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I would like to welcome all of the members here today for a very important day in the calendar. I just wanted to take the opportunity just to highlight one item of information, I suppose the last meeting we had on the development plan, we still had the draft guidelines were in situ at that time. Since that, we had started July, the final versions the Ministerial Planning Guidelines were issued and a circular letter was issued on top of that, so that made reference to zoned lands that were serviced and available for new housing construction within the lifetime of the plan. So just to inform the members, you probably realise that from the Chief Executive Report that there was a number of changes that were made from the last report in relation to some zonings on foot of those new ministerial guidelines. So, we can go through it in more detail with Sorcha when we get to the actual amendments. You will probably have noticed from the Chief Executive's responses, the ones where we changed or modified since the last time. I was just bringing it to your attention. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Breege, would you like to come in?

BREEGE KILKENNY: Members, this is an important day for all of us particularly, you the elected members, we, the Chief Executive, and the Council, but most importantly the people of County Wicklow. The County Development Plan is one of the most important policy documents you as elected members will make during your tenure and is one of the key features of the planning system. It is the main public statement of planning policy of our county, setting out the land use, the amenity and objectives and policies of County Wicklow and as the Council as the planning authority. It would be for a period of six years between 2022 and 2028. All planning applications are assessed against the standards and the objectives contained in the County Development Plan. So, today marks the culmination of three years of work to review the existing development plan and to prepare the new county development. This is the final report for your consideration in the plan making process where you will all vote on all of the amendments of the draft plan and to adopt the plan. So, hopefully by the end of the day, we will have our new adopted County Wicklow County Development Plan. I would just say, to point out to you what happens next is if the plan is adopted, it will come into effect within six weeks unless a draft ministerial direction is received in relation to aspects of the plan. In this case, it puts on hold any matters raised in any such direction but only for those matters. The rest of the adopted County Development Plan still comes into effect. At this

point, I would like to thank you all, the members, for all of your work and your co-operation in the plan-making process, giving of your time, attending the workshops that were set out, but in particular, making sure that all of the proposals have been submitted to the Forward Planning Team in advance of the Council meetings. This has assured the smooth working of our meetings and hopefully that will be the case today. I just want to say thank you very much and I will hand you back now to the Cathaoirleach and Sorcha to go through the amendments.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much, Director. Now, I will hand you over to Sorcha. Thank you to you and your team for all of the work you have done as well.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. What I'm going to assist the Cathaoirleach in doing today is going through each of the proposed amendments, the published amendments that were published earlier on this year and going through them one by one with you, the members. You will have to make a decision on each one. I know some of you have brought to our attention that the fact that we went through all of these amendments at the last meeting in March and asking why do we have to go through them again. But what was agreed in March was simply to put those proposes on display to the public, in order to assist you in making your final decision in whether you wanted to make that amendment and include it in the development plan at the end of the day. So, while it may seem like some repetition, it is important and necessary that we go through each of the amendments again and make a decision on whether to include them in the development plan or not. We won't be running through every amendment word for word. You have the document in front of you. We will start by saying amendment one, the recommendation is and then I will hand it back to the Cathaoirleach who will presumably hand it back to you on the floor to debate the matter. I will just do a brief overview of each amendment, but we will assume that you are aware of the amendment, you have considered it in full and considered the Chief Executive's advice and considered the submissions that came in, because it is set out in the report that was issued to you in July. We don't need to go over that unless you have a specific question.

I would like to point out again the importance of having reasons for all of your decisions that you make and putting those reasons on the record. So, for example, if an amendment was proposed last March and you set out clearly your reasons for proposing that amendment, of course that will be a matter for the record at this time. But now your proposal, if are you now proposing that we make that amendment, you need to, again, clarify your reasons, set them out clearly. Both of those records of those two meetings will form the full record of your decision-making at the end of the day.

We probably don't need to go over in the full detail or at length the reasons that we went through in March because that's already, obviously, on record. So, we would ask you to just set out your primary reasons for proposing something.

Finally, just to remind all of the members at this time that it is important and necessary that they take into account the assessment and advice set out in the Strategic Environmental Assessment, the appropriate assessment and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in making all of their decisions. Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you very much, Sorcha. So, can you call out the amendment and remind the members of the page it is in, if we get carried away with anything, because it is very mind boggling. A word that was used during the week was tedious. I support that word tedious. I totally understand where the members are coming from as well. Thank you, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: We shall get started. Thank you, Cathaoirleach. We will start on amendment one, which is V11. It is on page 3 of the proposed amendments document and then the Chief Executive's assessment of that amendment you will find on page 15 of the Chief Executive's report. We will move through the report in that way, amendment by amendment.

So, amendment 1 was in relation to deleting a sentence from section 2.2.2 of chapter 2. This was recommended by the Chief Executive in his second report, so it was discussed at the meeting last March. You, the members, agreed that amendment and so it was published as a proposed amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Have I got a proposer for that, please?

ADMINISTRATOR: We need a proposer.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Who seconded it, sorry? Thank you, Lourda. Thank you. Any dissent on that? [None]. Okay, that wasn't too bad for the first one. Only 132 to go now.

SORCHA WALSH: So, amendment V1-2, on page 3, it is adding two words into section 2.4.3, the Chief Executive's response to that is on page 15 of his report. This was also proposed by the Chief Executive in his second report and at the meeting in March was agreed by the members for publication.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Proposed by? Cllr Shay Cullen. Seconded by? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. All agreed? No dissent? [None]. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. Amendment V1.3 is on page four of the amendments document and on page 16 of the Chief Executive's report. This was to add some words and delete some words to section 3. This was proposed by the Chief Executive in his second report and was agreed by the members at the meeting last March for publication.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do I have a proposer for that? Cllr Tom Fortune. Secunder? Cllr Gerry Walsh. Thank you. All agreed? Show of hands? No dissents? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number V14 is an amendment to the section 3.2 under housing, this is on the core strategy chapter. This amendment related to adding additional words, revised tables and so on into the Core Strategy table. The purpose of this amendment was to update the Core Strategy in line with ministerial guidelines which applied at the time. This was recommended by the Chief Executive in his second report and was also agreed by the members -- let me double-check that -- it was agreed by the members at the meeting in March. We have received four submissions on that amendment that you will see on page 16 onwards in the Chief Executive's report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Members, do you agree with that? Proposer Cllr Irene Winters. Do I have a seconder? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All agreed? Great. Show of hands. Thank you. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 5.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Any dissent on that? [None].

SORCHA WALSH: Number 5 is getting a little bit more complex. Number 5 relates to section 3.4 of the Core Strategy and making a number of amendments including additional text and some deletions to the development plan text. There was a debate on this proposal at the time, when it was being considered by the members for publication and included some slight amendments to it at

the time by Cllr Edward Timmins. We did have some submissions on the proposed amendment then, we had a total of about eight submissions on this amendment and the Chief Executive is recommending that the amendment be made, as proposed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Derek Mitchell wants to come in there.

CLLR MITCHELL: Yes. I'm in support of what is in the book and the recommendations which have been made, that it be adopted. However, I'm somewhat happy with the population targets, because they're now quite out of date because the census has revealed, for instance, that in Greystones, the population target for 2028 has now been reached so we are actually at the stage of that population target.

I think I would like to have seen the population targets amended to do that. However, it has been explained to me at some length that really, we're being handed these population targets and really, they need to be agreed. So, what I've put is a minor amendment to this, that has been sent around to all councillors and I'm proposing that we change a section of it to add in, it is estimated that the growth in Greystones, Delgany will exceed this target range before the end of the plan period due to legacy housing developments in construction. There are about 1,000 houses being constructed in Greystones at the moment. I would estimate we be 4,000 people over the target by 2028. I'm keen that this is noted in the County Development Plan even if we can't actually change the numbers.

For other settlement which are well over their target, Newtownmountkennedy and Rathdrum it is noted in the existing plan. I'm asking that the councillors agree with this plan, it is important that planners can see that this growth has happened and that the plan is not really realistic, but it is simply a hand down plan from somewhere else. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I would like to second Cllr Derek Mitchell's amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Yes, I would also suggest that Kilcoole be included in that because you can't talk about Greystones and Delgany in isolation because the same principles apply to Kilcoole.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, is that agreed? Sorry, Sorcha, do you want to come in there.

SORCHA WALSH: The proposal from Cllr Tom Fortune is a new proposal we haven't had sight of until this moment, so I would suggest that we would have to get that written up and circulated to the members so they could actually see what it is that is being proposed before they could take a vote on it because we haven't actually seen it. This is the first we have heard of it. We have not been circulated with a proposal at this time.

CLLR FORTUNE: I take that point in principle but there's no rocket science around what I'm saying. It is the same as what went before us. There's no surprise in what I'm saying.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. You have heard what Sorcha said. We to have it typed up? Will we leave that one until, later, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: I think for the members to know what they're voting on; it will actually need to be a proposal written up by Cllr Tom Fortune and circulated. My team can assist him. Have it written up and what section of the plan and what he wants us to say. We can't assume the words of what

Cllr Tom Fortune wants. We have to put this item on hold and not decide on it until that is done and it might be in a few hours. We have to come back to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have you a seconder, Cllr Tom Fortune? Cllr Peir Leonard. Thank you.

CLLR MITCHELL: I don't want to leave this meeting without it being circulated and the proposal being voted on. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. If you go back to 2004, it was three o'clock in the morning, so I'm not trying to be that marathon of a meeting. It will not be forgotten about, Cllr Mitchell. I give you my word on it. Thank you. Cllr Gerry Walsh wants to come in.

CLLR WALSH: [problem with sound] ... relative to what has happened or is happening, so, you know, I think both proposals should be included and passed. Because I mean, the figures are based coming from the MPF which is agreed now is actually out-of-date, with the population figures. It is another debate, and I won't go into it. What the two members is proposing here is factual and needs to be supported. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I will seek clarification. Is it okay to go ahead with this vote or do we have to see the written documentation?

SORCHA WALSH: We have to come back to number 5 later on because a sentence with regards to Kilcoole can't be added into this proposal by Cllr Derek Mitchell because this section of the plan doesn't relate to Kilcoole. It relates to the Level 3 settlements. It needs to be inserted elsewhere in the plan and it needs to be a standalone standard. We can't add in Greystones, Delgany and Kilcoole. If we move on to number 6, we can get number 5 written up and come back to it in a few minutes, if you wish.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: I'm obviously happy with that, but there's a broad principle here. At the end of the day, our whole county is now broken into districts and we're a district where I represent. Whatever would happen in Delgany or Greystones is logically going to happen in Kilcoole. That's why I say I don't see it as rocket science.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: In terms of the growth in Kilcoole, I don't have the figures to hand that would verify that the growth under construction in Kilcoole at this time will overshoot the targets for Kilcoole set out in this plan, but we have that data for Greystones and Delgany because Cllr Derek Mitchell came to us in a number of weeks ago and we were able to calculate that data and verify with him that the growth in Greystones and Delgany is likely to exceed the target. We haven't done that same process with Kilcoole. It could be done this morning and we could come back to it this afternoon and verify the sentence you want to put in is factually correct.

I have been able to verify Cllr Derek Mitchell's sentence, but I don't know the other data off the top of my head.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Number 6, please.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 6. So, we're now on to page 13 of the proposed amendments document and the Chief Executive's advice with regard to number 6 is set out on page 29 of the Chief Executive's report. This amendment relates to the Core Strategy and essentially has three elements because it all relates to the same section of the Core Strategy.

Element 1 of the amendments related to the order of priority in the making of Local Area Plans. The Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be made with that amendment so you will see that on page 13 of the proposed amendments document in the blue box.

Element 2 related to a sentence proposed to be in the plan which said, "Shall be assessed against the population and housing targets set out in the Core Strategy of this County Development Plan." You see that also on page 13. The Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be made without that additional sentence.

And then element 3 related to the deletion of a sentence. You will see it on page 13, at the bottom of the proposed amendments.

I would agree with Cllr Winters. I think we should be really clear about what it is we are doing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I want to say I was also under the impression that we were voting per element, at no stage was it stated that we were voting for all three together. I actually thought that is what was proposed that element one was proposed not the whole three, so there is a bit of confusion there, I think that might, I think we need to take it again.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Cathaoirleach, I did come in and propose it, but I was of the understanding I was proposing the first one, not the second and the third. It's only when the people passed it, I accepted it then, but just for my own purpose I want to have the record corrected that that is what I was voting for, or proposing I should say.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Now, Sorcha wants to come in here. Just on, we are on item 6.

SORCHA WALSH: It's a decision to be made, are we going back to item 6? I did say to you after Cllr O'Brien proposed and seconded, I said can I confirm that that vote covered all three elements.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I heard that.

>> At this stage we have voted on item number 6, but nor item number 7, there should be three different proposers and seconders and if there is any dissent it should be vote at this stage on which element.

ADMINISTRATOR: What elected members is very appropriate on how we move forward. This is where we need to take things very slowly. It's clear from page 33 and the other page in relation to the principles. So, it's one amendment, but if the elected members aren't agreeable with the three principles they need to say, I am not in agreement with principle number one or two or three and whatever and take the vote slowly. But the vote has been taken on the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I want to bring in Cllr Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Similar to others I thought we were proposing the first one. Just to say that there was discussion previously, I think that was before I was co-opted on to Wicklow County Council, so for me, it's a relatively fresh discussion that we are having on these items, so for me, I personally would like to hear what the members have to say on issues like that when that arises. So, I just wanted to mention that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much, Cllr Irene Winters.



CLLR WINTERS: I appreciate the vote was taken and it can't be changed, but I wanted to highlight I made it and that we don't make the same error throughout the rest of the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: I accept that vote has been taken as well, but just for the record I am not in favour of putting forward my proposal on the record, I am withdrawing my proposal, whether it's accepted or not, that is what I am doing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Just to make the point I would be of a solicitor view of Cllr winters for the Local Area Plans, so I would be of the same view as Cllr Winters and relation them to be subsumed into the current plan for future reference.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you very much, members. I am not going to rush this meeting. So, if anyone has anything to say, please feel free. I am going to hand you back to Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Cathaoirleach, in relation to number 6 and Cllr O'Brien wishing to withdraw it, everyone has agreed and at this stage 6 is dealt with and we are dealing with 7, but we should deal with it in three separate elements.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Sorcha, do you want to?

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Will I run through what the elements are of number 7 already, I have run through. So, I am just responding to the questions that were raised in relation to number 7. Cllr Timmins raised a point in relation to principle 1. The principle, if you go to page 14 of the proposed amendments document you will see Cllr Timmins's proposal there which was to change 1-4 to 1-5. So that was published, and the Chief Executive is recommending in his report that you go ahead and make that amendment, it's recommended that the plan be made with the amended text as displayed. There is no proposal, there, the Chief Executive is recommending it be made. With regard to principle 2, Cllr Mullen has indicated that he was in favour of this amendment being made, the Chief Executive wasn't in favour of it, but Cllr Mullen asked me to come in on the OPR's report on that.

The OPR has suggested that you can, may make this amendment, but with some changes that are set out at the top of page 32 there in the Chief Executive's report, Cllr Mullen does however indicate that he is not that happy with the words, the most proximate'. I would say, in those circumstances he probably shouldn't proceed with that, with the OPR recommended changes, he should proceed with it as originally proposed. If he is not happy with the word proximate, he should just proceed, because they are meaningless words, specific settlement, that is what it means, and it's inferred clearly from it. I would say there is no need for Cllr Mullen to start mixing and matching his proposal with the OPRs because there is no need he knows what he wants to propose. So, he should simply propose that the amendment be made with the proposed new text, so that he doesn't take the Chief Executive's advice.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Sorcha, we are going to vote for number 1 of 7.

SORCHA WALSH: Yes, principle 1 of amendment 7.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a proposer? Cllr John Mullen and seconder? Cllr Edward Timmins. Thank you. All agreed? All agreed. Show of hands. Any dissent? No. Part 2 of 7. Cllr Mullen. Just for clarity, at this stage if whatever amendment we pass, if we don't pass the OPR's recommendation on the change, then the OPR could overwrite it, is that correct? If we pass my original motion?

SORCHA WALSH: Cathaoirleach, after the plan is adopted or if it is adopted today a report goes back to the OPR on what aspects of the advice the members took and which aspects of the advice they didn't take. It will be up to the OPR then to decide whether they feel, if the members didn't take their advice, if they feel it's a particularly egregious decision to not follow the advice, but they would have to go to the minister and ask the minister to intervene and direct you to take the advice. So, I couldn't say whether the OPR would go to the minister on that proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you for that, on that basis would like to maintain the original amendment made by myself and agreed by colleagues. So that is where it is. It's not going with the OPRs, it's going with the ones we passed originally back in March/April if that is okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, I want a clarification, we are on number 4, not 3.

SORCHA WALSH: We are on principle 2.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We are on 2 now. So, have we agreed this one? We have a seconder? Have we got a seconder?

>> What are we...

CATHAOIRLEACH: We are agreeing with Cllr John Mullen has proposed. Is that?

SORCHA WALSH: Cllr Mullen has proposed that you do not accept the Chief Executive's advice to make the plan without the amendment. So, what he is proposing is that you make the plan with the amendment which is on page 32 in red font. So, his proposal is to include that sentence in red, without any amendments in the final plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you, Vincent Blake. Are we all in agreement? Show of hands please. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Then principle 4, the Chief Executive has recommended the plan be made with that text, so principle 4 relates to the sequential approach and it's a proposed new sentence that I believe was possibly, I think it was proposed by either Cllr Edward Timmins or Cllr Behan last March and it related to infrastructure assessments being carried out. So, the Chief Executive is happy to proceed with the plan. He is recommending that it be made with that change.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a proposer? Cllr Timmins. Is there anyone proposing this, lads and ladies? Yeah, Irene Winters. All in agreement, no dissenters. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: So, we are moving on to amendment number 8.

Amendment number 8 is to add two new tables into the core strategy which are replacing a number of other tables. We received a number of submissions in relation to that and the Chief Executive is recommending that you make the plan with those new tables. These tables were proposed by the Chief Executive in the first place in the second report and it was agreed at the meeting last March. Those two tables are on tables 19 and 20 of the published documents, two blue tables with red font in them.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Do I have a proposer for this? I propose Irene Winters. Seconded by Vincent Blake. All in agreement? No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: V19 we are on to, which was a proposal to add additional text into the core strategy section on transport and accessibility. The Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be

made with the amendment as published. This was originally proposed by the Chief Executive in his second report and was agreed by the members last March.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, do I have a proposer for this? Okay. Cllr Cullen, proposed and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. Are we all in agreement? Show of hands, please. Thank you. No dissent. Thank you, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Now we are on to number 10, and this is to do with the settlement strategy. Number ten relates to amending the boundary of Ballinaclash to include some extra land of approximately half an acre into the planned boundary. The Chief Executive, you will recall, last March did not support, was not in support of this proposal, which came from Cllr Bourke and the Chief Executive retains this for the reasons set out in his report. The Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be made without this amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Sorry, Sylvester Bourke, can you put on your microphone?

CLLR BOURKE: [inaudible]... due to not speaking into mic.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a seconder please? Cllr Kennedy. Are we all in agreement with this? Show of hands, please.

CLLR McMANUS: I don't agree.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Cllr Jodie... this will go to a vote. We want to be clear what we are voting for. Cllr Kennedy wants to come in here.

CLLR P KENNEDY: Just maybe Cllr Bourke wants to come in, this is not zoning extra land, it's just the boundary rectification to facilitate the bit of land that is already zoned. That is all this is.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Bourke, do you want to come in?

CLLR BOURKE: [inaudible]. Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We are voting to keep, if you are voted for this to be kept in the Chief Executive's we are voting for and against we are not voting with the Chief Executive. Is that right? Everyone clear with that?

>> No.

SORCHA WALSH: You are voting for Cllr Bourke's amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If you are in favour of Cllr Bourke's amendment you are voting for which is to reject what is in the Chief Executive's report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: See how I am getting explained and so I can understand the confusion. Cllr Neary, do you want to say anything on that?

CLLR NEARY: That was Cllr Grace McManus, not myself.

CLLR McMANUS: I support the Chief Executive's recommendation on this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. So, it's going to a vote then.

SORCHA WALSH: Are we all clear on what we are voting for? So, Cllr Bourke has proposed that we reject the Chief Executive's recommendation. So, if you agree with Cllr Bourke that we are rejecting the Chief Executive's recommendation, you are voting for. If you agree with the Chief Executive's recommendation and against Cllr Bourke, you are voting against. Is that okay?

[Vote taken]

HELEN: Vote: 24 for, 6 against and 2 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Just as we move on to number 11, I like to remind the members again and you have referred to it yourself, to clearly set out reasons for the proposal you want to make, particularly if not consistent with the Chief Executive's advice, it's important that that is on the record. We are on to number 11 now and this relates to Kilpedder Willow Grove, this relates to three mapping changes in relation to the boundary of that village you will see on page 26 you have A which is to extend the village boundary at the northern end, the Willow Grove end by three acres. Part B, that was proposed by the members, I think that was Cllr Cullen, by the members at the last meeting. Part B is to extend the boundaries by 7.8 acres, that was proposed by the Chief Executive as it reflected an existing built-up area and part C was to reduce the boundary as shown in pink on the map which was to reflect on area of land due to the presence of a high voltage power line. We would need to vote on that in three stages, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Would it be right to say part 1... Shay Cullen wants to come in here.

CLLR S CULLEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. This land is at the edge of the existing settlement and will provide an opportunity for three sites for the existing landowners family. As I say, it was passed in our March vote. So, I will be supporting the same vote as before. So maybe just clarify in terms of our voting pattern, please.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Like the previous supporter I supported this, I will be happy to second it. I supported at the last meeting we had on this topic. I know it's a process that we have to go through, but the reality is we have made all the arguments at the previous meeting, we gave our reasons and we defined why, and I think it will be all logged and categorised from that meeting, so it is unfortunate that we have to go through this, we were told the last time the reasons why it shouldn't happen. We actually supported this, we will be told again, and I am sure we will be told at the planning regulator and the minister if they are not happy at the end of this process, still have the option to come in and undo what we have done. So, from that perspective, it's crazy really that we spent two-and-a-half years trying to do something to be told at various stages that if you don't do what you are told, ultimately, someone above will have the final say on it. Yet, when we come to the next one, which is amendment 11B, we are only doing in amendment 11A the same as what the Chief Executive is recommending in 11B. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: To the second part, the Chief Executive is recommending the extension of the village boundary by 17.8 acres. This first part of the proposal from Cllr Cullen is three acres and, as I said, I agreed with the proposal at the last meeting and I continue to support it, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: I want to clarify, I recall proposing I think it was B and C, definitely B at the last meeting, so I am prepared to propose those again that they be left as they are.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I, we are, in relation to just the proposal A on this amendment that I would agree with the Chief Executive's response and request it goes to a vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. So, we are going to go for a vote.

SORCHA WALSH: If I could come in, Cathaoirleach, if you don't mind. Just in relation to Cllr Snell's point, we do accept that the member's set out their reasons for suggesting the proposed amendments at the meeting in March. However, that meeting was essentially to propose something to go on public display to let the public see them and you could take into account then if any submissions came in. Because you may change your mind in light of what the public might say. That is why this is an important stage, even if you feel you have debated the matter and decided it. You are not supposed to have decided it until today. You did get two submissions on this that were against it, now you have to make a balanced decision on whether you want to proceed with it. As the Cathaoirleach said it might be tedious, but the idea is you have now seen what the public or stakeholders have had to say and that has influenced your final decision.

With regard to comparing item, element A with B. Element A is undeveloped greenfield land, and your proposal is to include that in the village boundary so it can be developed for new housing. Element B which was proposed by the Chief Executive is already built out. So, there is no proposal for new housing in element B. So, you are comparing apples and oranges there. They are two completely different things.

Just to be clear, element A is for the provision of additional housing and extending the extent of the village. So, Cllr Cullen proposes and seconded by Cllr Snell is to reject the Chief Executive's advice on Part 8. So, the Chief Executive's advice was not to proceed with Part 8. Like the last time, Cllr Cullen's proposal is to make the plan with this boundary change, so it's to reject the Chief Executive's advice. So, if you are for Cllr Cullen's proposal that you want to extend the village boundary, you vote for this proposal. Is that correct Helen?

HELEN PURCELL: Yes, we are dealing with part 8 Cllr Snell is rejecting the Chief Executive's report in relation to A. That clear to everyone? If you agree with Cllr Cullen, you are voting for.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: There are 23 in favour, 7 against and two not present. That is in relation to A. Now we can discuss B, please.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen.

SORCHA WALSH: I think at B and C it's a matter of having a proposer and seconder. For B and C, I think it's a matter of getting a proposer and seconder for each and seeing if the members agree or want to vote on each one.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, do we have a proposer for B, please? Sylvester Bourke and Cllr Snell second. All agreed? Agreed. Show of hands, please. No dissents. Okay, thank you. Number C, Sorcha, do we have a proposer, please? Cllr Bourke. Secunder? Cllr R O'Connor. All agreed? Show of hands, please.

SORCHA WALSH: You are proposing to reduce the extent of the village boundary by 11 acres as shown in pink.

>> What was the previous vote on the last occasion?

SORCHA WALSH: You agreed that.

>> We agreed that.

SORCHA WALSH: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have a proposer and seconder; we are waiting for all agreed? All agreed. Any dissents? Thank you. Okay, I am going to remind the members, please do not be afraid to stop the meeting to ask a question. There is no such thing as a stupid question. Cllr Cullen just proved that, thank you very much, Shay and it wasn't a stupid question, by the way, but thank you for clarifying it! No, that wasn't meant to be a joke.

CLLR CULLEN: You are making me feel good, Tommy.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If there is anyone in this chamber can take it, it's you, Shay.

HELEN PURCELL: Would you mind putting your hand up, I know you are putting it up physically, but can you put up the yellow hand too.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. Back to serious business.

SORCHA WALSH: This relates to extending the village boundary of Laragh by 1.5 acres. This was proposed by Cllr Cullen at the last meeting and there was a vote on it, as there was some dissent. The Chief Executive is not recommending you proceed with this amendment, so you make it, the plan without this change.

For the reasons set out in the Chief Executive's report page 41.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: As previously passed in our March meeting, just a brief outline. This is to propose an opportunity for a site suitable for a development for a one-off house for the residents of Laragh Castle and in turn Laragh Castle will be opened up as a tourist destination for the public and I know we had a vote and I think it was Cllr Snell seconded it the last time, so I am going against the Chief Executive and with the previous vote that was taken on this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Connor.

CLLR O'CONNOR: I would like to express dissent on this. I think it was outlined by the Chief Executive quite well about the close proximity to the Wicklow Mountains and in general the kind of environmental impact this could have.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Thank you, for the reasons outlined by Cllr Cullen but just to explain to the members in case they forgot the debate the last day because it was a long time ago now. The reality is that this is one unit, one housing unit. People in the uplands are entitled to a roof over their head as well as people in the urban area. I know some people find that very hard to believe that they want to build a home around where their family members are, where they went to school, and they were reared.

This makes good business sense in that regard from a heritage point of view. That Laragh will be opened up to future generations and we all know that Laragh, Glendalough is the jewel in the crown in regard to tourist in this county. This is one housing unit. I would ask you to think about that. We are not talking about large scale developments like Strategic Housing Developments. That has bypassed these chambers and their planning section and gone to the board and got planning from

multiple hundreds of units. Yet we have members here scratch their head and wondering why people can't have one housing unit, apart from the financial implication that it could have for the local population and bringing in more tourists.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: I agree with the two councillors. It is one unit. It will have the potential to increase the tourism value of Laragh and I think it will be well worth it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I just note in the response, it is noted that the land within the existing village boundary is owned by the same landowner and would appear to have scope to provide for the desired additional family dwelling without undermining the tourism development. It is not just one house on one site. It appears that the landowner in question does have options. I would question, I don't remember seeing any business plan, any suggestion, anything relating to the use of this castle. I'm just wondering has anybody else. It appears to have been floated out there as if we get to build this house, we will hand the castle over, but I don't recall seeing anything concrete about that. If anybody has any information on that, I'd like to see it. It is not just one house. One house here and there has an accumulative effect. It has an environmental impact.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Doyle. Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

CLLR KAVANAGH: I was going to ask a similar question. Has there been any legal undertaking or understanding or commitment that Laragh Castle will be developed as part and parcel of this whole planning application or rezoning? In other words, is it just word of mouth, or has there been any kind of official declaration been made?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: Thanks, Chairman. On a point of clarification, the other lands that are owned by the family in question are not suitable for development. They're wetlands and that's why this particular map or site has been chosen. It's the only site that is suitable for development for a one-off house. I want to emphasise this is a one-off house for the owners of Laragh Castle as quite rightly was said earlier, to provide a tourist destination. It is a magnificent building and can be opened up to the public and will be an added attraction for the Glendalough and Laragh area. It is a one-off house, to reiterate. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much, Cllr Cullen.

Okay, we will go for a vote. Sorry, Mary. Can you answer that?

SORCHA WALSH: Cllr Mary Kavanagh has a question about the business plan, but it is not a matter I have in front of me. The landowner didn't make a submission in relation to this proposed amendment with a business plan. The only submission we got was from the Wicklow Planning Alliance. The proposal is to change the village boundary. It doesn't restrict the development of the land to the owners of Laragh Castle. They could in theory sell a site to a third-party, so it doesn't tie this site to the owner or to the future development of Laragh Castle. It is a simple boundary extension, so they're not tied together.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Where was it mooted that Laragh Castle would be open to the public?

SORCHA WALSH: This was a proposal from one of our fellow members at the March meeting to extend the village boundary to accommodate additional development on this site. It was discussed at the meeting in March. The proposer at the time would have set out their reasons for their proposals in relation to the opening up of the castle and so on.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Right. With other ... can we put a condition in at this stage?

SORCHA WALSH: All that is being considered now is to extend the village boundary or not. You can vote to accept the proposal, reject the proposal or do a minor modification to it. To add an extra caveat, such as a legal requirement, would be more than a minor modification.

CLLR KAVANAGH: With some of the other amendments, the developers had given an undertaking, they've actually given an undertaking they will develop, say, a sports community centre or whatever. I'm just wondering is there any actual undertaking that Laragh Castle will be developed? That's all I'm asking, either a yes or no.

SORCHA WALSH: No such undertaking has been given to us, the Executive. All that has been proposed is the extension of the village boundary.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Yes, I'm not sure who proposed it before, but I would like to hear from them, if we're extending a village boundary for the benefit of one individual, I would like to have more information about this proposal. I can't remember who it was, but I'm sure that person has more information on it. Just so we have it here clearly stated on the record, the reason for this amendment. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in Cllr Miriam Murphy. I will ask Cllr Cullen, who has already spoken twice on this, I will ask him again, because he did explain it, Cllr Doyle.

CLLR MURPHY: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I certainly agree with the tourist aspect of it, but I just ask, like, what, I suppose, condition is the castle in? In two years' time, will there be a time limit of when the castle will be opened for tourism?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Shay Cullen, I did hear you, but I'm not sure if the members have heard it.

CLLR CULLEN: Today is the third time I have clarified this situation. I have clarified it twice in previous meetings, right. The land in question is for a one-off house. We're looking to extend the boundary so that the people who are living and own Laragh Castle can build a house for their own use in terms of living in, to open up Laragh Castle to the public. It's very clear, very straightforward, as Sorcha has outlined. It is a boundary change to the village of Laragh, simple as that, for a one-off house.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Yes, just very briefly. I think this discussion is going on and getting too complicated. This is a simple village boundary extension. It's not earth shattering. We should be looking to extend villages all over the place to help villages develop. A simple, small village extension. I propose we go ahead with it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Yes, like previous speakers, we've moved boundaries there at the previous vote, the Chief Executive recommended. In fact, I supported that, as did all of the



colleagues here. I know the argument will be it is already residential, likewise. We move boundaries all of the time. This is to move a boundary in a rural area for one house. The reality is if I, or other councillors here, explain this a hundred times, it is not going to sink in with the people who don't support it. So, if you don't support it, your option is to vote against it. If you do support it, you support it like you did last May or March, or whenever the meeting was. But the reality is that this is good for the area, good for the county, and I will be seconding this, as I did back then. I think we need to take a vote on it, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr John Snell. I will bring in Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: For clarification on the house itself, Laragh Castle, is the intended use to make it into accommodation for tourism or as a kind of visitor attraction? Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. That's been answered from the floor, Cllr Peir Leonard. I will bring back, Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Two councillors ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I ask you to speak up a little bit?

CLLR DOYLE: Can you hear me, okay? Two councillors have insinuated the response has been given. They are not answering the question I asked. Has any concrete proposal been put forward or is in writing anywhere at all to do anything with Laragh Castle?

The second point is, it's being stated this is a boundary extension to build a house. No permission has been given to build a house as far as I'm concerned. Sorcha just clarified the landowner could sell this on. It is not a boundary extension to build a house. There is no permission or plan to build a house. It is a boundary extension full stop. Unless the other councillors know something, I don't know about any permission given, that's not the case.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Thank you. I want to support Cllr Snell and Cllr Dunne's proposal. It is the jewel in the crown of Wicklow's tourism. It is a one-off house. If it is granted, you know, it would be good for the whole area. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Grace McManus.

CLLR MCMANUS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. You said that Cllr Leonard's question was answered from the floor. I didn't get the answer. Could it be repeated, please?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I said it was answered from the floor. Sorry, Cllr Snell, you answered Cllr Leonard's question. Would you mind repeating it with your mic on so the people at home can hear it?

CLLR SNELL: Yes, a visitor centre, that's the plan. That's what the family have planned for this. It is a tourism attraction. The potential is there for a tourism attraction. From a heritage point of view, it is hugely valuable property. It is something that we on the heritage Council would be anxious to see something happen with and open it up to people who have an interest in it. I think from a tourism point of view as well as we have already outlined. The reality is, Cathaoirleach, you either support this or you don't.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you very much, Cllr Snell. Sorcha, would you like to come in?

SORCHA WALSH: I will come in quickly, just to confirm that when the draft plan was published, a submission was made, number 252 by Janet Halpin, who is I assume the landowner, setting out their vision and their proposals for Laragh Castle and the area. That is on page 693 of the second Chief Executive's report, which I assume none of you have in front of you, but you all got it at the time related to land at Laragh Castle, they set out that the castle is a family home and if developed as a tourism offering, the adjoining lands would be needed to facilitate a one-off house and have requested the village boundary have been extended. It is for light tourism use and some other requests and so on. It was on foot of that submission that the proposal was made to zone this piece of land or extend the village boundary. I would just clarify that the request from the landowner was for a much more extensive area to be zoned or included in the village boundary, and in fairness to Cllr Cullen who proposed this, he what regard to the fact that the area, I recall in March, he didn't believe that such an extensive area was needed to accommodate the type of development that the landowner had envisaged and a smaller area was zoned and an area much closer to the village centre. So, there was a submission, it did set out in detail their proposals.

In terms of the actual proposal in front of you, all that is being proposed is a village extension. You are either for or against that. It is not tied to the landowner doing anything else on their land or particular sequence of events or them developing Laragh Castle or opening it up. That may well be what the vision is, but your proposal is quite simple, to extend the village boundary or not.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you very much. Is everyone clear about that now? Okay. And, as I said, don't be afraid to ask a question. We will go to a vote, Helen, if that's okay.

HELEN PURCELL: It is on V1.12.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're voting for Cllr Cullen's amendment.

HELEN PURCELL: If you vote for, you are in favour. If you vote against, it is with the Chief Executive's suggestion.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I had to clarify that myself.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 27 for, 4 against, and one not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sorcha, number 12.

SORCHA WALSH: That was number 12. We're on number 13 now.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, I can't keep up now sorry.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 13 is a proposal to extend the village boundary in Johnstown, down in the Arklow MD, by 7.4 hectares, as shown on the map in your proposed amendment document.

We received two submissions in relation to this proposed amendment. The Chief Executive's not in support of this amendment, as set out for the reasons on page 43 of his report. The Chief Executive's recommending that the plan be made without this proposed amendment. This was proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke at the March meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Bourke would you like to come in on this?

CLLR BOURKE: Yes, I proposed this at the last meeting. It was agreed by the members. It is an extension. There's infill between two lots of houses in the village. It extends the boundary to allow for people who qualify under Level 8 villages can't get sites and, basically, it's going to create an

extra site that I know several people who have been unable to get sites because the existing village boundary is pretty much built up and the other sites are not available. And that's why I proposed this. Again, I propose that we reject the report on this particular one.

The boundary probably should include, there's a little batch of houses, four houses on the top left-hand corner and the line that is shown on this map here, goes right through the middle of a house, so it probably would be sensible to include those four houses. It would have been my intention to include those existing houses that are built there in it, so that's linking up all of the houses that are built and creating an infill for probably one more house.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Burke, you know that can't be done at this stage, changing that. I have asked Sorcha to explain it, but I think you know yourself.

CLLR BOURKE: I thought it could be a modification. So be it, if it can't be done.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you have a seconder?

CLLR MURPHY: I will second it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are we going to go for a vote, Helen?

HELEN PURCELL: So, we're on V1-13, proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke, seconded by Cllr Miriam Murphy, to reject, again, the Chief Executive's report.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 23 for, 7 against, 2 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Sorcha, next one please.

SORCHA WALSH: So, we're now moving on to chapter 6, amendment V1-14, on page 29 of the published amendments. And we're now on to page 44 of the Chief Executive's Report.

It was a proposal for some extra text to be added to section 6.2 of the housing strategy section just to clarify some additional updated information with regard to HNDAs and about the new provisions with regard to the possibility of the 10% social housing being increased to 20% in certain circumstances. The Chief Executive recommended this additional text in his last report and is still recommending it and it was agreed by the members at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Have I got a proposer for this? Thank you, Cllr John Snell. Secunder? Cllr Gerry Walsh. Are we all in agreement? Sorry, Cllr Joe Behan, I didn't see your light there. Cllr Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: I remember we had a discussion about this issue on the last occasion, which is this Housing Needs Demand Assessment and the fact that theoretically this development plan should not even be taken until that Housing Need Demands Assessment was done. We were told we had to begin a development plan process not knowing what the housing need was going to be in the county at the time. We all now the huge housing need there is in the county by virtue particularly of us being on the periphery of Dublin. However, we were told we had no choice but to proceed with the development plan.

Can I ask, has that housing needs assessment process begun yet or when is it likely to begin? I don't plan to vote against this at the moment. We don't know what the housing need is in the county officially. Just to make that point. I'd like to know where is that demand needs assessment currently, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can you take that, Sorcha?

SORCHA WALSH: I can, indeed. There is no requirement for us to do a HNDA because the development plan process commenced prior to the legislation and the guidelines regarding to the HNDAs coming out. Once we had needed the development plan process, we had to continue and adopt the development plan. The HNDA has not been commenced. The HNDA is not superseding the Core Strategy. It does not set out a different outcome to the Core Strategy housing growth targets. The HNDA brings it down to a finer grain in that it does a new type of analysis in terms of housing needs, in terms of affordable, social and two beds, and so on. Most of what is in a HNDA is set out in our existing strategy. A HNDA is an elaboration or a development of the housing strategy we have done for many development plans. So, the number of houses that are targeted to be delivered in the county as set out in our development plan, would not be changed by a HNDA because it is set by the Core Strategy and the NPF and the regional plan. The HNDA provides more data where we should target social housing or one-bed housing and so on. Most of that is done in our housing strategy already and in the plans of our housing directorate. There'll be no fatal flaw in adopting a County Development Plan without a HNDA being done. It will be done in due course and brought to the members as required by the legislation governing it. One will be done but there is nothing impeding the adopting of the development plan without a HNDA.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. So, we have a proposer and seconder. Are we all in favour? A show of hands please? Any dissent? Okay. Thank you. Cllr O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: I was following Helen's instructions, putting up my digital hand.

HELEN PURCELL: My apologies.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Amendment 15. It relates to 6.3.5 of chapter 6, set out on page 30 of the Proposed Amendments Document. The proposed amendment is the addition of a sentence at the bottom of the table there, that the Chief Executive recommended to you in his previous report and the members agreed at the last meeting. The Chief Executive is still recommending that amendment for the reasons set out in his second report and is still recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have we got a proposer for that? Anyone objecting to it? All in favour? We need a proposer? Cllr John Snell is proposing. Secunder, Cllr Gail Dunne. All agreed? All agreed. Show of hands. Thank you. No dissents. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Number V1-16, on page 31 of the proposed amendments document and page 44 of the Chief Executive's Report. This proposal was to delete or omit an objective that was in the published draft plan. I'm sure you will recall that this proposed objective, number 6.2, had drawn a number of submissions from the public.

Following the debate in March, the Chief Executive had recommended that you delete this objective and there was a vote on it in the Chamber the last time. We have received two submissions on it. Particularly the Office of Planning Regulator has supported the proposal which is to delete this objective. The Chief Executive is still recommending you delete this objective. He set out clear reasons in his second report. We recommend you make this amendment as published.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: Yeah, I was the one that brought this forward in the first place as an amendment. It was defeated by the members on our last vote. I accept that vote. But I suppose I just want to make

the point before we move on that, you know, I think with the housing crisis we're in, we should be building houses for the people of County Wicklow. I make no apologies for that. That's why I brought this forward at the time, to have a certain restriction, to make sure people from a local area could possibly buy a house or afford a house in their own local area. I accept the vote was taken on the day. I accept of result of that. I wanted to make that point, that was the reason behind it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you, Cllr Cullen. A proposer, please? Cllr Vincent Blake. A seconder? Cllr Edward Timmins. Okay. All in agreement? A show of hands? Thank you. No dissent? Okay.

Cllr Derek Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: This is number 16, is it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR MITCHELL: I'd like to say that I think the national policy is that apartments can be purchased by --

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, you are on the wrong one, Sorcha is telling me. That's 16.

CLLR MITCHELL: Which one are we on?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sixteen.

CLLR MITCHELL: We just finished it.

CLLR MITCHELL: I missed it, yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going on to 17. Cllr Joe Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Can we talk on 17 now?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No.

SORCHA WALSH: 16 is done.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will get an introduction, thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: So, 16 was agreed. Number 17, this is a proposal to add a new objective into the housing objectives of the development plan.

We're going on to 17.

CLLR BEHAN: Can we talk about 16?

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have just finished. We will get an introduction.

SORCHA WALSH: This was agreed. This was an objective on the housing development plan. This was put forward by Cllr Behan at the March meeting and there was a vote on it. You will see the Chief Executive's response to this and his advice with regard to same was set out on page 49 of his report. We received a significant number of submissions on this proposal, and you will see, you will know yourself from having read those submissions that significant number of them would be setting out their concerns with regard to the proposal including the office of the planning regulator. The Chief Executive is recommending for the reasons set out in his report and for the March meeting, he is

recommending that you do not include this proposal in the final plan. So, you make the final plan without this proposed objective. That is set out in page 49 of his report. Cllr Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. We had a good discussion on this issue on the last occasion, Cathaoirleach. Really it was an attempt and a recognition by members of this Council that young people in this county are being competed with by, competed for new housing units and new apartments in many cases by property investment funds. At the moment the Government has allowed a planning, if you like restriction, that when it comes to housing developments they can be sold singly, the council can put a condition to that effect, but not so with regard to apartment developments. So, what we actually agreed was on the last occasion the sale of all developments of residential units whether houses, duplexes or apartments to commercial institutional investment bodies shall be prohibited." Because this is the only way we, as the local representatives of those young people can do something about helping them, because of the fact that these multi-million funds are able to come in and snap up entire developments and not allow them the opportunity to buy them. Now, I want to read out, because it has already been done on a previous one. I want to read out the names of the people or the bodies who submitted objections to our amendment. Have a listen. You may recognise some of them. Avonvard, Covemore Limited. DRES, Dunmoy Properties. Irish Home Builders Association. Hooke & MacDonald. Cairn PLC. Glenveagh Properties Limited. Cosgrave Property Limited. Ingaro, Ardale, Ballymore Group. Every one of them seriously concerned about the fact we might be able to protect young, first-time buyers in our county.

It's quite vehement, even in the wording which has been paraphrased by the Chief Executive. They strongly object. They are seriously concerned. Why are they seriously concerned? These are privately profit-making entities who are seriously concerned we are going to do something to level the playing pitch for our young people in this county. It's beyond disgraceful, in my opinion, that both the office of the planning regulator and the Chief Executive are using the property developer's argument against us by saying it strengthens their arguments to get rid of this amend. I for one believe that the office of the planning regulator and the executive of this council are there to serve the public and the public's need at this time in this county is the opportunity to buy their own home, even a starter home as an apartment.

So, I would urge members, I would please with members, please leave this amendment in. Do not allow it to be taken out of the development plan, because it is one of the last chances young people in this county are going to get. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Behan. You are getting very near your three minutes there. Cllr Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I can see this was passed last time. I want to say that I have no great interest in the property development, nor in the various funds, who have made submissions, but I think it's important that there are properties available to rent in county Wicklow. I am conscious that in particular in the case of apartments that it can work quite well, as far as making accommodation available. One of the blocks at Greystones Harbour was bought by some fund or other and there are now loads of apartments available for people to rent, loads of people living there, I know a few people living in this block of apartments and they are very happy to have been able to rent there and live in the area and it seems to me that to ban them living in the area because the property wouldn't be available to rent I think is a mistake and I don't think we should be doing it.

I think we need all forms of accommodation built, be they apartments, public and private, be they institutions owning them, be they council houses and lots of private houses as well. So, I think that

to ban a particular ownership and one that I have seen, and I know people are quite happy living there and have been happy to be able to do so would be the wrong thing to do. So, I don't agree with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I just want to support what Cllr Behan said. I too noted with interest, and I think he used a great word there, the "vehemence" with which the developers and their representatives submitted to this. For me it gives a strong indication that there is no "In this together" when it comes to solving the housing crisis with these people. They don't give a fiddler's who buys their properties as long as they can be sold. I think it's important we take a stand on this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: I just want to strongly support Cllr Behan's and I think when you sit here and listen to the names that was read out, it just shows you how the contractors are watching the development of our development plan and last week we had a meeting here about a housing body and a lottery for the applicants and it certainly seems it will be a lottery for those contractors. We have to think for our young people, there is nothing for them. It's quite painful when you see your family members not being able to get on the housing ladder and they leave the country. So, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr M Kavanagh.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I just want to support Cllr Behan; I think it's very brave motion to put forward. I think that the point is that we actually don't need houses to rent, we need affordable houses and I think when, when the likes of these properties are built and bought up by investment funds, vulture funds, whatever you want to call them, that takes away the opportunity for young people to buy and forcing them into rental accommodation. As we all know, rents at the moment are far higher than mortgage charges. So therefore, people are actually ending up in a position where they can't even afford to save for a deposit because they are having to pay exorbitant rents. So, we need to start trying to move away from that model and try and provide more affordable accommodation.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: I would agree 110% with what Cllr Behan said. I am not going to repeat it, because I agree with every word of it. I would make a couple of observations. I wonder how many HAP applications we have approved for the harbour properties in Greystones. I would like to know if there is a figure on that. I know it's away from what we are doing today, but I would like to know. Because the costs of rents are far exceeding the cost of getting a mortgage. On a totally different issue, I cannot for the life of me understand how our financial institutions don't accept people who pay regular and consistent high rents when they are looking at assessing people for mortgages, but that is a different debate. The office regulator frustrates the hell out of me, I must say, or whatever he is called, the planning regulator. I know the answer to it is well then, they do a job and pass it on to the minister's office, well then, the minister is out there pontificating and making statements about stuff that, to me, seems to contradict stuff that the Regulators people talk about, so there is a lot of confusion there.

So, I am a bit frustrated at well with this process. I think the likes of the planning regulator and Wicklow Alliance should appear in the chamber and tell the members the rationale of where in coming from so that the members can grill them and talk to them. The process I find frustrating. We

do it in March and we end up with five or six books. I know the members try to make it as simple as we can, but it's difficult to come into a chamber today having discussed something three months ago and try and recall what was agreed or disagreed. So that is why we do need to be spoon fed in a very basic way to make sure it's done right. Our responsibility here today is to the people of this county and the young people of the county and affordable housing is a massive issue and it's disgusting to see some of these submissions who have come in from people with a vested interest. As a local authority we should not be supporting it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Fortune. Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, just in relation to this, in one sense I can understand where Cllr Behan is coming from, but on the other hand I would have some concern about the motion in terms of its ability or the possibility of restricting or inhibiting the supply of housing. I mean the crux of our housing problem is supply. All commentators would agree that to address our current housing situation, supply obviously is crucial. As Cllr Mitchell quite rightly pointed out, there is a need for apartments in certain areas. People need to rent in some circumstances and our housing, our local authority housing supply is unfortunately there is a dominance of HAP properties there, a lot of them are apartments. We also have the situation of inward migration for employment purposes. People coming here to work, but some of our financial institutions, IT institutions, etc, etc, looking for properties to rent. I would be concerned about the impact of proposals such as this would have on parts of our county. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Walsh. Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Again, I understand what Cllr Behan is trying to do here and I like the spirit of his motion, I agree with. I would have serious concerns on the practicality as Cllr Walsh said. Building apartment blocks, as many of you know, apartment developments are particularly expensive, that is why it tends to be done by large building companies. I am not going to get into the demonisation of large building companies. Builders build house, we need houses. I know in fairness what Cllr Behan is trying to do, but I think a flat-out prohibiting of the sale of these houses would in effect stop their development by these builders. I think that is cutting off our nose to spite our face. I do think national policy should be influenced by what the spirit of that motion is, and I do think local authorities should be empowered themselves to buy huge elements of these apartment buildings to ensure on an affordable basis that we have affordable houses. The way you have affordable houses is to build more houses. I don't see how this motion, if it's just left like that, helps that. I understand the spirit of it in fairness to them, but it will stop private companies building those apartment blocks until the issue is clarified. That is the reality. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Grace McManus.

CLLR McMANUS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I want to speak in support of Cllr Behan's proposal. I am in that, I might not be young anymore, but I am in that generation that doesn't like they will ever be able to afford their own home or even have affordable rental. If I stopped on the street and asked people my age and a bit older, would they prefer to be renting from an institutional investor or something that is affordable, I know what they would say. I know some people are happy at the moment, but maybe they are happy because they have no other choice to take what they are given. I don't think this will stop any rental properties available. There are many people in the game, but institutional investors are in it for the profit and the people lining their pockets are the people who are paying the represent. We need to broaden our scope when we are talking about what we want affordable rental to look like. So, I would agree with this amendment and thank the speakers to be so passionate about it, it means an awful lot to people in this situation.



CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: One thing crossed my mind, given that the population figures we have adopted show that most of the population growth in Greystones and the north end of the county like Newtown will be exceeded, is it likely that people coming in with proposals for large-scale apartment blocks will be refused planning permission because the numbers won't allow it? So is there any point in having this even put into the plan, if the numbers are already way in excess, in that area where the demand will be, because I know developers don't want to build those kinds of apartments outside of that area from speaking to some of them. Also, the very high cost of building them, surely it would be better for society to have the suburban semi-Ds for people to own themselves, rather than have all of our housing allocation, or a significant amount of it tucked away in apartment blocks, large apartment blocks when hundreds of people can rear a family in semi-Ds throughout the county in suitable locations. Why would you want to corral them all into a limited number of apartment blocks? It doesn't make sense. I am inclined to lean towards Cllr Behan, and we probably should leave this out in the best interest of the county.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Bourke. Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy.

CLLR FLYNN KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I would support a lot of what Cllr Behan has said and the other speakers. I am looking for clarity on an item, I brought it up the last time and just to be fully transparent I do work for an approved housing body. I just want to clarify if this will have an impact on approved housing bodies because the large developments of apartment blocks are one of the options utilised for the local authority to provide much-needed housing. So, when the proposal refers to institutional investors, I am assuming that does not apply to an approved housing body buying a block of apartments, maybe Sorcha could clarify that for me?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Go raibh maith agat, Cathaoirleach. I just wanted to support what Cllr Behan has outlined so movingly. I know what it's like. We need to send a clear message to the young people. I personally know what it's like. After my term of office when I was mayor of Greystones, within a few months I moved to the UK and bought a house in Bury North Manchester. The prices there, you can still buy there for under 100,000 two-bedroom house in Greater Manchester. That is what we need to be going towards as a society. Affordable for the people, not necessarily for the developers. But we do need our developers of course to build, but we need to send a very clear message to the young people that we are on their side. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Stokes. Cllr Edward Timmins, please.

CLLR TIMMINS: Thank you, chairman. I don't disagree with this motion, but I don't think it's as black and white as people are portraying it. Like it's not going to, it may or may not help the problem, it may exacerbate the problem, I don't know, I probably will support it when it comes to a vote, but when you make all of these rules, there are all of these unintended consequences, we see it with rent controls, landlords exiting markets and stuff like that. We are targeting one group institutional investors. That is fine. But there is lots of other people competing with young people who want to buy affordable houses. The County Council themselves seem to outbid young people who are trying to buy houses in western parts of the county. So, it's not that simple. Will it discourage investment, will it discourage apartment blocks? It may well do, no one can predict the future. But I would generally caution when you make rules and restrictions like this, they may have some good effects, but they may also have some downside effects that we can't foresee. I think we need to think through more about what possible consequences, different rules and regulations make.

As I say, there are lots of people competing with young people and in a way this motion is triggered by the fact that we haven't succeeded in bringing affordable houses to the public in County Wicklow. There is a lack of house building, but I think we are damned if we do and damned if we don't on this proposal. I support the spirit of it. I have spoken about affordable houses here for years and years and how slow we are getting off the ground. Great to see something happening there a week ago, but this is because we haven't got up to speed on affordable houses. That is why this has been brought in, but it's not going to solve the problem.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Edward Timmins. Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I want to speak and note my support of this motion. I agree with what a lot of previous councillors have said and supported as well. Just looking at our area in Greystones and there is reference made to the big apartment block that was sold off to some vulture fund down in the marina. While obviously the people who are renting there are welcome in our community, the fact is they don't have security of tenure, a lot of people can't afford to rent there to start with. As local rep, I am constantly getting emails, really heart-breaking emails from constituents who are being forced to leave the area. We are talking about young people. Also talking about young families where they have kids settled in school, they have their friends and supporting clubs etc. They have been served notice on where they are renting, and they can't afford to rent in the area or buy in the area.

If they are on HAP, or eligible for HAP the situation is worse, and they have to up sticks and move wherever they can go. They are uprooting children and the family. So, we have a completely and utterly unsustainable housing system as it is. I don't know what the answer is. The answer is to be sought nationally. I think this will, will it solve it or not? I don't know.

What Cllr Timmins said about unintended consequences is probably true enough. We do have to stand up and say something needs to be done to support people in our constituencies to be able to live in the area they have grown up or moved to and developed roots. So, I would support this. I do have one question; I do note that the OPR says that legal advice should be sought in relation to the vires of the planning authority. So, I want to ask the question has legal advice been sought and if there is any response in that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Ferris, sorry.

CLLR FERRIS: I thought you were forgetting about me and other people who are on teams. There are two things, Cathaoirleach. Firstly, in relation to going through the amendments, could I ask Sorcha to indicate. I know she says it was passed by the members, but can I ask letter to indicate, if there had been a vote on each amendment? That is the first thing.

The second thing is in relation to this motion proposed by Cllr Behan. I completely am 100% agree with the motion. A lot of members here have spoken about how difficult it is for people to find affordable rented accommodation. I mean, Cllr Mitchell mentioned the apartments in Greystones. No-one on be an average working wage would be able to afford one of those apartments in Greystones. There is nothing in Bray, we all see the headlines. There are very few apartments available to rent in County Wicklow. It's the same right around the country.

We have to acknowledge, I smile, I even laughed when I heard some members say about developers may stop building. Of course, they are not going to stop building, that is their raison d'être. This is why they are in business. It really knocks people out of the market. Young people cannot afford to buy in Wicklow and are forced to move further afield. This is for me, an immoral situation. I think developers who are contributing to this by buying up apartment blocks are contributing to this. I

think it's really fundamentally wrong and we have to stand up and say, "No, that is not good enough for the people, no matter what age they are, trying to get on the housing market. Trying to afford to be able to pay rent." I mean it's absolutely ridiculous.

I fully support Cllr Behan's proposal and I don't think this is going to have any detrimental effect on the developers who build in county Wicklow at all. I think that they should realise how bad things are and perhaps maybe grow a social conscience. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I would like to come in on two points in relation to this. I really strongly support Cllr Behan and I want to commend him for putting this forward. I think it's really brave, but really essential. I worked in the construction industry for 17 years throughout the Celtic Tiger. There is no reason why these companies can't build like they did then, housing apartments and sell them to individuals. Any housing department, all the apartments in Arklow that I know that were built were all sold individually, and people still made the profit out of the developers and the estate agents and the whole shebang.

My daughter is 24 and she is one of the categories of people that will probably never be able to invest in owning her own home. She works hard and any money she is looking to rent now as it's her own option to start her own home with her partner. It's her and the generations like her that we are prohibiting from being able to invest in themselves. The hard work and the money they earn out of their hard grafting needed to be invested in themselves. The only way to do that is by providing a situation where we can have affordable housing for them to buy and not feeding the pocket of the big guy all the time and creating the divide in society. A huge divide where all of the investment is going into small mine ort of big business instead of our people.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Leonard. Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you, Chair. Much of what I was going to say has already been said. I support the spirit of the motion absolutely. I don't think there is anyone who wouldn't. I think if we were to just vote on whether we agree with it or not, I think it would just pass unanimously. What I am wondering about is what is this motion and the, in terms of our development plan and what will actually happen, particularly with regards to the legality of it and the advice from the OPR. If we vote this through, what does that mean? Because it seems to be against all advice and is it even legal. So where does that leave us legally if Sorcha could respond to that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Thank you for that, I am concerned about supply. I think two weeks ago there was 711 houses to rent within the country. In a draft report, it shows you there is no houses to rent around the place. Cllr Scott and Cllr Doyle have mentioned the legal implications and I have a concern that there would be implications and I would be worried about this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Look it, I suppose I do support this. I hope the members support it. I believe that irrespective, if this was passed today, I do believe that the planning regulator will step in, as will the minister. But let them do that if that is their role and function, let them step in. You are sending out a signal here today to the people of this county and beyond that actually we are fully behind them and supporting them in getting on the property ladder. It never fails to amaze me in regard to this chamber and, I suppose it happen all over the country in regard to people from Government parties who try and use their own local authority as a mudguard to

safeguard their colleagues in Government, when they talk about a lack of affordable housing within our county and other counties, the reality is there was no affordable scheme there for well over a decade.

When you talk about the HAP and how it's unaffordable for people to achieve HAP, HAP property, the threshold they get on the HAP scheme is not enough. Go and have a conversation with your colleagues in Government, go and have a conversation with your ministers, because they know what is going on, on the ground.

I do have one little concern and I know it was outlined and it was clarified at that meeting that we held before, which was in regard to approved housing bodies, because I support approved housing bodies being in the market when they are regulated properly. The reality is we get the nomination rights for people off our social housing list to go forward for approved housing bodies. But what this is suggesting is not that. I think you can clarify that, Cllr Behan, as you did at the previous meeting, but the reality is all the builders who are mentioned here who made submissions, as is their right, they will continue to build and in fact it might enhance and support more units coming to approved housing bodies because it won't be going to the big investors in America and all sorts, all over the world who are pumping money in here and God knows what is going on behind the scenes, but the reality is it's not addressing our issues on the ground for local people to get on the property ladder, whether it be rental or otherwise.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Pat Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: I will support this as well to be honest with you. If there are changes, let the minister or OPR step in and make the changes. I think Cllr Behan has been consistent in his proposals or support for other proposals, in relation to extending boundaries, extending a little area for a house there, or rectifying boundary maps to allow people build in the villages. I think the spirit of what Cllr Behan is trying to do here is right. I meet young people every other day of the week and they just cannot afford their rent, let alone buy a house. I will be supporting this.

Cllr Behan, I commend you for bringing this. I also understand where other people have said there may be concerns down the road in relation to developers building properties. We can't always look into the future either. We can only plan for the future and try to help the young people in this county. I will be supporting Cllr Joe Behan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: I'll be brief. As someone who rented and now had the good fortune to be able to buy my own property, I fully support Cllr Behan. There's a house here in Wicklow Town, a three-bed, the rent is €2,000 a week, that's double my mortgage. So, to bring on more supply for individuals can only help the situation. That's what we should be here for. If the ministers want to be step in, let them. Let the message be here today that we're here for the people.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr O'Brien. Chief Executive, do you want to come in?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I want to make a response to Cllr Behan's statement. I would like to say I totally understand the sentiment behind the proposed amendment, but I want to say that the outline had nothing to do with supporting developers, as stated in the report.

One of the questions that was asked about legal advice, whether we got legal advice or not. We didn't. We feel it is a matter for OPR. It was raised by them. There are a number of checks and balances that will have to go through in the process. So, I think it is more advisable to let them if

they need to get legal advice on the matter, if it is voted through, then I think that's a matter for them.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Last word to Cllr Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, thanks for all the contributions and the support as well. What you actually said in your report was, your position is now reinforced by the submissions received. That's your wording. So, what I'm saying is, you're using the developers --

>> The OPR --

CLLR BEHAN: It says submissions, plural.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: It says the OPR, if you read it.

CLLR BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, if I could just continue. The point is that all of these submissions were seen by the Chief Executive as reinforcing his position that we shouldn't do this. It is quite obvious from even the people who may have doubts about it, everyone around the county I think would support the principle of it. Now, I agree fully with what Cllr Snell has said. Let us for once make a decision. Let it go back to the regulator and let it go back to the minister if they have a problem with this and we will challenge it when the time comes. We have a chance here now to make a stand and I'm certainly hoping and confident having heard what people have said that we're going to make that stand. I want to clarify what Cllr Flynn-Kennedy asked and what Cllr Snell referred to. We did discuss the issue of the housing bodies on the last occasion, and we specifically changed the wording so that it changes to "investment bodies". I think the wording we have which we agreed on was "the commercial institutional investment bodies". Housing bodies are not commercial institutional investments, they are there to provide housing as a social need. On that basis, Cathaoirleach, I want to propose that we retain the amendment as we had agreed on the last occasion.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Helen, will you go to a vote please?

HELEN PURCELL: Yes. Cllr Dermot O'Brien, are you seconding the motion? Yes. Okay. So, it is V1-17, proposed by Cllr Joe Behan, seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien, to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 26 for, 3 against, 2 not present and 1 abstaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, members. We will continue for another little while. Would you like to stop for a short break? Yes, okay. We don't have to go for a vote then! Sorry, I just wanted to tell the Zoom -- the people at home, what time will we be back at? Quarter to two, members. Would that suit everyone? Okay. Thank you very much.

CLLR MURPHY: Unless we get a better offer.

HELEN PURCELL: For those present, there is lunch provided in the canteen and tables have been reserved.

[Lunch break]

HELEN PURCELL: Apologies. I will start again. [Roll call taken]

If we could just talk about the length of the meeting and how long we're going to go today. There are sandwiches available for those in the Chamber at five o'clock. We would just like to get an idea of whether or not the members are available to work to conclusion or whether you want to wait until five o'clock and make a decision then.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. When you say, "work to conclusion", we're not talking two or three o'clock in the morning, are we having a cut off time, like?

HELEN PURCELL: We will review that at five o'clock depending on where we are.

CLLR WINTERS: I'd say we go no later than eight o'clock regardless.

HELEN PURCELL: Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Derek Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: I propose we go until we conclude, whatever time it is. We have done it before, and we should not be coming back again to deal with this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: I think we should go with what Helen said and we decide at five o'clock. On a personal basis, I can't stay beyond six o'clock.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Behan --

CLLR BEHAN: Chairman, I don't mind. I would like to see it finish but I also want to point out, I didn't attempt to impede your request that we put the Section 140 to the end of the meeting, but it is vitally important it is taken at some stage today --

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

CLLR BEHAN: -- as part of what was agreed. I wouldn't be happy that be deferred to another day now.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I would like to finish the meeting. This process has now gone on for over three years. It is vitally important we actually conclude this process. There are other plans waiting on this to be finished as well. If it is after ten o'clock, maybe I'd be sort of saying we might have to break, but I'd like to try to get this over with. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Grace McManus.

CLLR MCMANUS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I wouldn't support going into the middle of the night. I think if at five o'clock we have a few amendments left to go, I don't mind. Some people have to work tomorrow and things like that. I wouldn't agree with going into the middle of the night. I don't think the best decision making happens then when you've been on Zoom all day in or in person for such a long meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Jodie Neary.

CLLR NEARY: Cllr Grace McManus said that very perfectly. People have work commitments, children. Again, I don't think we're going to be making our best decisions at 2.00 or 3.00 in the morning. I support the reviewing at five o'clock and then see how far we are in that process.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: Let's decide at 4.30 pm today, you know, whether we stay on or not. I think that's the best. It might entice us to get through these as fast as we can in the meantime.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I will bring in the Chief Executive please.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just in relation to the Section 140, just explain, there is no timeline on this. By all means, if we have time, we will hear it and it is not an intention not to hear it and it will be heard. But, like, there is no decision, this was based on an information session that was presented about the possibility of bringing charges in 2023. It is not as if something has been done or a decision has been made next week or the week after. So just to be aware, there is no major deadline that has to be decided today. I don't see what the rush is on it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Joe Behan?

CLLR BEHAN: I do see the rush, I want to give the opportunity to give a directive to the Chief Executive as if there are charges and then to be told to be taking it out, to cut something else. It should have been taken at the beginning of the meeting, to be reasonable we said we leave it until Okay. I do not accept it bows to another day, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, I give you my word. I give you my word, that this will be heard today.

>>: Can we have the legal position?

HELEN PURCELL: The Local Government Act 2001, a motion to pass a resolution under the section shall be considered before any other business at the meeting other than the selection of the Cathaoirleach or any other business that the elected council or joined body may decide should take precedence. So, it was decided that Section 140 would be taken as second item on the agenda and the County Development Plan take precedence.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on. Thank you very much. Oh, she will be back. Sorry, I didn't get to introduce you. We were talking about you, Sorcha, what was keeping you! No, we were doing a bit of housekeeping, Sorcha. And as decided we will go on to 2pm in the morning, Sorcha, away, right! What are we on now, Sorcha? 18? Oh, we are flying.

SORCHA: 18 ... thank you, Cathaoirleach. We are on V118 on page 31 of the proposed amendment document and on the Chief Executive's Report it is on page 49.

So, this amendment, number 18, is just an extra sentence to ensure that the plan takes into account the affordable housing act in 2021, enacted during the course of the development plan to ensure where allowed we could take 20% of the social housing to part 5 whereas before it was 50%. It was proposed by the Chief Executive and agreed by the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we in agreement? A proposer and a seconder? Thank you, Cllr John Snell. And ...? Cllr Irene Winters. Okay. All in agreement. A show of hands. No descendants? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 19, Cathaoirleach. Number 19 is a proposal to amend the wording of objectives, CPO6.20. The key change that is proposed here is that rather than social infrastructure audits being required for certain developments, or just only where specified about the planning authority it is a requirement that all new residential developments shall be accompanied by a social infrastructure order. But the plan clearly defines what a significant resident or a mixed-use development is, set out in the foot note. Coming about because of submissions from the communities who felt large developments were given the go ahead without a proper community

and social infrastructure. So, this is a recommendation by the Chief Executive the last time and was agreed by the members. Sorry, there was a vote.

The last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a proposal for this please? Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I have a question on it, does it apply to council-owned housing developments?

SORCHA WALSH: Yeah, it doesn't distinguish between them. This as a housing development.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Burke Cllr Sylvester Bourke?

CLLR BOURKE: What about rural housing? In the foot note it says I think, if it is more than 500 metres away from the public transport service it has to have one. So most rural applications are in excess of 500 metres from the public transport service, so is this a new charge to incur, to carry out a social audit?

SORCHA WALSH: No, it is for residential developments, housing developments.

CLLR BOURKE: It is "all" developments, it does not say at the end of that on page 32, the definition of number 17 says 50 units in settlements 1-4, hiring, 25 units, level 5-10 but then it says all developments after that. It can be construed as meaning rural one-offs.

SORCHA WALSH: It is not the intention it is objective with regards to housing developments as in significant residential or mixed-use development proposals. If you want to add in a word, maybe "all significant housing developments" in a foot note it is not a major modification, but the understanding is clear we are talking about housing estates. With proposals to have social infrastructure orders.

CLLR BOURKE: Can I propose that we do that to make it a little more clarified?

SORCHA WALSH: So, "multi-unit housing developments"? Something like that. So, it is clearly not a one-off.

It has been defined as over 50. And 25. And ...

CLLR BOURKE: It could be that somebody is coming in with one or two units having to go to an extensive social order process.

SORCHA WALSH: Do you want to say all "multiunit housing developments in excess of 25 units"?

CLLR BOURKE: Fine.

SORCHA WALSH: To be clear it means in a small place that may only have 10 houses already, if somebody wants to apply for another 10 houses that they do not have to do any assessment of the impact, if the new residents can access public transport services, for example.

So, if you are giving 25, it will apply to towns of 200 or towns of 10. So ... it is not a relevant number, it is a fixed number. Happy with?

CLLR BOURKE: Happy with that.

SORCHA WALSH: Defined developments in excess of 50, with the 25 housing units in levels 5-10 and all multiunit housing developments in excess of 25 units in excess 500 metres from the public transport service.



CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, a proposer?

CLLR BOURKE: Seconder? Cllr Shay Cullen. All agreed? Show of hands. Thank you. No descendants. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: So, moving on to number 20, Cathaoirleach. This is proposed amendment to objective CPO3.64 on page 33 of the document. It relates to is clarifying the wording "support the change of use of vehicle purposes outside of the core retail area" at the moment people perceive difficulties in turning commercial premises into residential units in towns because there has been resistance, I suppose in the past to allow commercial units to change into housing units as it will diminish vitality and retail function of town centres. But to clarify we support the change of use of outside of town and village centres proposed by, proposed by the Chief Executive in the last report. Agreed at the last meeting. The number 20 agreed by the members of the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A propose for this, please.

Cllr Shay Cullen? Sorry, Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy and seconded by ... Cllr Tom Fortune. Thank you.

Agreed by all? Agreed. Show of hands. Thank you. No descendants? Okay.

Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on to 21. Relating to our policy relation on rural housing. Proposed amendment to the policy set out in page 35 of the document of proposed amendments document. Entailing to add two bullet points proposed by Cllr Joe Behan at the last meeting, there was a vote on it. In the Chief Executive's report on page 51 and 52, the Chief Executive does not support the amendments to recommend it is made without the plan be made without the amendment and may bring to the attention of the members at this point as well that we have been assured by the department that new guidelines on rural housing are imminent. So, it may well be that we will know sooner when adopting the plan there maybe new guidelines on rural housing that may require us being in line with the guidelines or to amend the plan somewhere down the road. That is not known. So, I flag anything adopted today, within the next 6 months to a year may need to be revisited to let you know in case it does happen.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Joe Behan?

CLLR BEHAN: Thank you, chairman. We had a good discussion on this on the last occasion, I do not propose to drag it out again. But to reiterate what it stated and was agreed. That local applicants intrinsically linked to the local area, and while not exclusively involved in agriculture or rural employment have access to an affordable site and that the local applicants providing care services to family members and those working in healthcare provision locally.

Now, the regulator summarises what we agreed that the material alteration 621 seeks to widen the qualifying cite years of rural housing to improve access to affordable site who are carers and working in healthcare settings. That is true. That is a good description. We are trying to widen access for genuine people who are intrinsically connected to the local, rural area who need an affordable site, who have the possibility of getting it. In the context of COVID, one of the things we all did was to clap for carers, we said that we appreciated the work that the carers did. Particularly during the COVID epidemic or pandemic.

So, in that context it was that we made the decision to put that amendment in, I would like to continue to keep it in at this stage. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Irene Winters?

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, I would like to second Cllr Joe Behan's proposal. And I realise that maybe the rules and the regulations will change but we can't have a crystal ball. We cannot predict. We certainly will not be voting today for a 6-year plan that the minister can change it with a flick of a pen in 6 months' time to show basically, [distortion of sound] to a large extent how undermine our County Development Plan is when we spent 3 years preparing it and we are sitting here voting on it until ... but, ach, listen it may change. We cannot control that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Shay Cullen?

CLLR CULLEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I'm a bit surprised that these new guidelines are mentioned today.

I suppose on a broader point, in our current development plan we have a HD23 policy on rural planning that sets out clearly 16 points of qualification for rural planning. I will read out one if you can indulge me. A permanent native resident seeking to build a house for his or home family not for speculation. A permanent native resident is a person residing in the rural area of County Wicklow in total including levels of resident 8, 9 or rural in the area for 10 years total prior to the application. I wanted to broaden it out. The reason that I push for the policy of economic or social policy in terms of rural planning, is unfortunately, our current model of HD23 we are working off is not being adhered to by the planners in Wicklow. Sorry to have to say it but it is a reality. When applicant comes to seek support, the first thing I would do is to put them towards the County Development Plan. and particularly obviously, what I have suggested in HD23.

As I have read out, it is clear for an applicant's qualification but unfortunately, it is not clear when it comes into the planning department. I will give a quick example, chairman. Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy and I support an applicant living in a rural area 17 years and gifted a site from the family farm and the family farm is 45acrer and refused 3 times on qualification. I can give a lot more examples. But my main point today for raising this, is this development plan is for the people of County Wicklow. if we can't get the plan right in terms of what is in that plan, when we ask an applicant to go and view the guidelines for qualification for rural planning, or failing the applicants, or the applicants for we are failing ourselves and it is not justified. The system clearly states, if an applicant qualification in the HD23 and I home and I will seek clarification, that the new economic and social or social need to live in a rural area will basically be adhered to. As unfortunately at the moment, I feel that our guide is not adhered to. I suppose that I want assurances before we vote this day, and we will be asked to vote on the plan. I want assurances not so much for myself but the people that we represent. That when they go to the new planning guide it will be implemented by the planners of Wicklow County Council. It is a very simple request. I am not entirely convinced of Cllr Joe Behan's proposal of healthcare workers; I feel there is a lot of other people who need to be taken into the net. But my point is that if somebody clearly lives in a rural area for a minimum of 10 years in the day that I am speaking of it is 17 years, they should qualify under the guidelines we are putting in place. Chairman, this is about the public having confidence in what, the plan that we are making for the public. That is what this is about. I want to make that clear. Strong on the rural planning. I have tried to work with planners along in terms of working with the economic or the social need. But I need assurances for the public that this will be adhered to going forward. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Shay Cullen. Cllr Derek Mitchell?

CLLR MITCHELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I would like to say that I am not in favour of making this change. I feel it is very easy to allow people and seeing the sympathetic side to build one-off houses

in the country. But if we allow too many people to do that, we just have a long line of bungalows, certainly in North Wicklow and maybe in a quite a bit of other parts of Wicklow too. All of these people that will live in rural areas in the one-off houses they want footpaths, in the areas where people are on to me in rural areas or some of the areas that I represent. They want footpaths as people are take more exercise and they want to get the children to school without the car, et cetera, which is a good thing to do. But we cannot provide fat paths across the whole county, every road. I think it will be wrong to have people just living along the whole of the length of the roads, certainly, as I say, in north Wicklow. Looking at a county like Donegal, we can see there are many places where there are long, long lines of people just living on that and it impossible to walk along the road. I think at that it could seriously damage County Wicklow by allowing people to do this. On the other hand, I am prepared to vote for most of the proposals here that involve 1 or 5 houses on the edge of the settlements that the planning regulator row posed as it looks to me that in almost all of the cases that a footpath can be provided where the children can go to school on it and people can do their exercise, et cetera, which cannot be done in a one-off house. So, I think that is where I differ from you on that. But on this one, I do not agree we should relax the conditions for one-off houses. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Vincent Blake?

CLLR BLAKE: I never heard of anybody in the rural part of Wicklow looking for footpaths, and the planners do provide footpaths, but I support the proposal from Joe. But we are back to a situation again where we trying to put in something that we have been doing, with the plans in the past as well, to accommodate people. That is what we are doing here again with regards to this one. Look, I will rehash what Cllr Shay Cullen has said. We have 10 years, he said 17 years, I have 15 years in a rural why where people cannot get planning permission on family-owned land. It is a disgrace and hammering us in Wicklow and those on the border where people are going across the border, they are going out of their own county in order to get planning permission. It is disgraceful.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: I concur with what was said. This applicant has 17 years living in a rural area. We gave them planning permission for a rural business but not planning permission for a rural house. Yet they are farming on the family farm, and they have been gifted a site and cannot get planning permission. I have to disagree with Cllr Derek Mitchell, I was born and raised in the rural area and never heard tell of anyone in the rural area to look for a fat path. They do not look for a fat path nor public lighting. I question why rural people, getting rural planning permission are paying levies. They are providing their own water, sewage and maintaining that, and why they are paying levies in the first place is beyond me. I cannot understand that. I think that Cllr Joe Behan has the right approach here in some ways. And as Cllr. Vincent Blake has said as well. It is a scandal to think that people who are born and raised in a rural area, which provides the necessary documentation, cannot get planning permission to build, not a house, Cllr Derek Mitchell but a home. A home. Which is more than important than a house. The houses can be built anywhere. Homes are built for the future. Where they can rear families, look after their elderly parents and contribute to the local community. And this thing you are putting in that people are look footpaths in the rural areas is rubbish.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle, please?

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you, Chair. I would like to agree with a bulk of what Cllr Derek Mitchell said. It is the accumulative effect. It is never one house for one person. We have discussed a few of these but there are hundreds or thousands. Donegal is a great example. My sister is living in Donegal, the rural areas are destroyed with monstrosities and the effects that come with it. I cannot speak for

individual cases, there is an individual mentioned here but mostly people are accommodated but also to say if someone is refused repeatedly imagine it is a good reason. Because someone is gifted land there is no given right to build on it if it is not the overall right thing to do. I question as well as the inclusion of health workers, we support the health workers and have been in the headlines, but it seems random to me, why are we not including X, Y, what is a healthcare worker? It is a very broad definition, even if there is one. I will not support this. Thank you, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen?

CLLR MULLEN: Yes, again, I was not going to talk but I have to support the motion. I have to support my colleagues, what they have said about, the big difference between being from rural Wicklow and urban Wicklow. That is now an established fact. When I hear about bungalows and people looking for footpaths and rights I grew up in a bungalow in a cluster of houses, homes, and at the same time, it is completely daft, a rural, our rural housing strategy. It does not listen to the people of rural Wicklow, and the people of rural Wicklow are frustrated year in, year out by the demeaning comments made of lines of bungalows. The bungalow that my father built with his brothers, that I was reared in, it was not a monstrosity, it was my home. We were reared there. People wishing to live in rural Wicklow want to live there to keep the rural Wicklow alive. It is a tradition, a landscape, it is a living place. That is what we trying to do to tease it out. I accept the professionalism of the planners, there are lots of Rickey things to do with qualifications and colleagues educated me over the years, but the language used sometimes about people who are from and who live in rural Wicklow, it is appalling. We need to be cognizant of that. The central people of a policy that we implement to a County Development Plan they should be the ones listened to so the people of rural Wicklow should be listened to first.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr John Mullen, Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I was not going to speak. But it is emotional. I am on the council for 18 years. Every week I follow rural plannings like some colleagues. It is the toughest and the most personal job you can do, actually, I have done it over the years. It is really, really difficult. Like some people have applied maybe five times before getting planning.

Now, would that not have been solved earlier? Without too many exchanges? We have put in lots of reasons in HD23, and I put in a few in 2005 when trying to understand and to give opportunities for people in rural Wicklow, and the opportunity to get planning. A lot of them, people had good reasons for taking them out of a development plan in March. I opposed it but lost the vote and HD23 has been simplified I support anything that adds to the mobility of people getting planning in the rural amendment, but it is frustrating. The current development plan as it stands, HD23, it gives opportunities for the planners to grant planning but does, those opportunities are not being taken for various reasons that I never fully understand to be honest. We put it in our development plan, we worked hard on it. We came up with the ideas, they have been rejected part of the problem is clearly a national planning framework issued in 2018, February 2018 if that undermined our development plan and the talk on rural planning, we could talk all day and then the national planning frameworks are quoted, and we are thrown out of the window. It does not matter, so what we do here is being undermined. The national planning framework has a section in it to describe every part of County Wicklow other than one town, Lansdowne, Tinahely under urban pressure that is a reason that An Bord Pleanála are refusing the appeal. It is nuts. And classified urban pressure, because of a European definition, that is narrow, if 15% of the work force work in a town of 10,000, it is way too low. West and Southwick low are rural areas, there is no big town from Blessington to Arklow, there is no sizeable town. It is rural and yet we are deemed under urban pressure. The

national planning framework has been telling thaws is being used to refuse plannings. It is frustrating. Over the years we worked with the planning to get some through but not others. In a lot of years, it is worse, and we are struggling to help people in rural Wicklow who we know deserve planning and my colleagues, in the area who have the same, the same issue but we are struggling in the last few years on genuine applicants. And it is really, really difficult.

Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Edward Timmins, a point well made. To bring in Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Sorry, I spoke already.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry. Cllr Mary Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: Chair, I will not keep you long. I sympathise with the rural dwellers trying to get planning permission. For the life of me, I cannot understand it. I know that beauty is in the eye of the beholder but when people make comments it is ruining areas, what areas are you ruining? They are just country roads. If there is a house placed along the way, I don't see how that takes from anything. We are not talking about West Cork or Kerry, known for the scenery or Wicklow Gap or Glen Cree we are talking about country roads. I do not see the problem in putting houses up in areas where people live on their farms besides their farms for their families, whatever. I can never understand it, I fully support the motion.

CAITHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I want to fully support this. I have a unique perspective in the sense I come from Wicklow Town, an urban dwelling. I took it for granted that people could buy houses near where their families were. It was only when I moved to Red Cross and I have seen people that can't buy or build a house. Quite frankly, I'm sick and tired of having to see families waving off their kids to head down to north Wexford and so forth to buy a house. This needs to be fixed, you know.

I live, as I say, at Red Cross. Between Red Cross and Avoca, there's no footpath. I have never heard one resident complain there is no footpath. Anybody who lives out in rural Wicklow respects the area. They don't want to look for concrete jungles, they are looking for fair play. I fully support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Gerry O'Neill.

CLLR O'NEILL: I will be brief enough. I want to support motion 2 there. For years, I'd been involved in this. My argument is that the planners here in Wicklow, you know, they are up against it to a certain extent because you have these other groups waiting in the long grass. I think they have to notify something like ten different bodies. In our area of West Wicklow, the likes of Dublin City Council and you have An Taisce and all of these. It makes it very difficult to grant the permission.

Like, I have a few cases there in my area where Wicklow County Council granted permission for a little bungalow there for a family member and these decisions were appealed by the discreditors of An Bord Pleanála and they won their cases, you know. I fully understand where planners are coming from. That they have to be on the ball. If they're not on the ball, there are other lads in the long grass waiting for them. I think, you know, if you look as a man from the country myself, if you travelled to Ballinastockin or wherever and you see the amount of old houses, the ruins. So, going back to famine times or after that you had plenty of little thriving villages and that's all we want. We want to be able to get the people to live at home, you know.

There's this stuff coming out of Green Party, day in and day out. I think they should be completely ignored. They're in cuckoo land, absolute cuckoo land, and they sit in their little castles there in well-established urban areas and they like to get to the country for a day. If they get to the country, they are meeting people who are living in the country, people of the country, people who have their jobs in their locality and that, I would ignore the type of stuff they come up with.

There is one issue I would crib about too, I don't know how it comes about, but there are so many people again in my area and they don't avail of any services at all and the developing levies can be very, very high, you know. I know in some cases where people are paying 10,000 or 12,000 development levies and they have no water, no electricity, no footpaths, no roads even. So, I don't know how we come to the conclusion of paying out such money as development levies.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Gerry O'Neill. Thank you. I will bring in Sorcha for one second please.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I asked the Cathaoirleach if I could come in for a second. I know there are more of you who want to speak.

The only thing up for discussion are the two additional bullet points proposed by Cllr Behan. The vast majority of you who have spoken have not mentioned those bullet points which are the only matter you're deciding today. There's been a lot of points raised about rural housing generally and about An Bord Pleanála and particular individuals who have applied for permission. All of that is extraneous to the debate we have today. You should focus your comments and your decision making on the actual proposal that is in front of you rather than any grievance or any issue you have with the rural housing policy generally. The only two matters for discussion today are these two bullet points and that's thank you is in front of you today. I want to make that absolutely clear. We're not revisiting the rural housing policy from scratch. That's not on the table today. It is only these two bullet points left to decide whether they go in the plan or not.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: Yes. I was just supporting it but I would be conscious I think of just including a category of people like the carers. I think that could be open to question. I'm just wondering on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I'd like to support Cllr Behan. You know, I'm very aware of the environment and stuff like that but with modern technology and stuff like that, there's no reason not to be able to build sustainable houses, using innovative technology so that they can be self-sufficient and surely to sustain the communities we already have is so important for the whole circular economy and sustainability, people supporting each other. That needs to be intergenerational and it also needs to have the right people living within that community, like health workers and other family members, who can help prevent the need for people to be taken from their own community where they can be looked after, to have to go into more built-up urban areas. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I wasn't going to speak on this but seeing as certain members are slagging off particular political parties, I thought in case you think I'm living in cloud cuckoo land at my desk. I'm born and reared in rural Laois in the countryside. I'm living now in North Wicklow. I have also supported and I will vote against one-off rural houses in some of the previous amendments and will continue to do that, but I have also supported constituents in my community

that have approached me, who have a job housing need and, you know, have the site on their land and are connected to the area and can fulfil what is laid out in our current rural policy. I see how hard it is for those people to stay linked to their area and build a house and remain there. I have sympathy on this.

To speak specifically on the two red amended pieces. I suppose I've been reading and re-reading them as we've been having this debate and before we came here today. I suppose while I appreciate the sentiment, I do think, you know, it is just a little bit woolly for me, I think, to support. I think particularly, you know, the idea of accessing affordable local site, I think I know what the intention is behind that but again what constitutes affordable, we know what affordable housing is being listed assist, over 400,000 from the national guidelines which I wouldn't consider that affordable. I think there's a real query about that sort of language.

The second thing is, much as I support the sentiment, I wonder how loosely this is worded. Local applicants who provide care services to family members, you know, I suppose that could be interpreted in a number of ways and I think it could be open to misinterpretation so I just have concerns really about how specific those two pieces are. But, as I say, I do have a sympathy and I appreciate the intent behind it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. Cllr Rory O'Connor, please.

CLLR O'CONNOR: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I wanted to come in about these two points. I'm a bit conflicted about it because I completely agree with point 1 but point 2 just seems very loose to me, especially for the line "who provide care to family members". I think it is loose and could be taken advantage of quite easily. I don't think I support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks. I will be supporting what has been proposed. I don't think there's anything flaky about what is in this at all. Obviously, local applicants, for example, I would be assured that when planners are looking at something, they have to get detail about what it is about and that's easily dealt with. I would totally also agree with what Cllr Timmins said earlier. I think this is something we have to sort and everyone's got political beliefs and some people are members of groups and things like that and that obviously maybe influencing some of their thinking. At the end of the day, this is about people. I've had the experience of it even close to Kilcoole, crazy stuff, it is outside the boundary and you can't apply. We have to get sensible and practical. I'm in favour of changing that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Patsy Glennon.

CLLR WALSH: It is Cllr Walsh. I'd broadly be in favour of this proposal. I'd also like to give the example of Gardaí who are stationed in a rural area, they might have been moved there over a number of years, still not qualified to live in the area they're living in and commuting from nearby urban areas and, you know. Again, the service they provide and having them living in the area they police is good. I have several examples of that throughout the county. I will make that point. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay. Members, we have had a good debate on that one, I feel. We will go to a vote. Sorcha, have you got any questions you'd like to answer there?

SORCHA WALSH: No. As I say, I don't think any questions came up on the proposal. The Chief Executive has clearly set out he doesn't support this proposal, in that he retains even after all of the arguments have been put forward, we believe that the first category that people who are

intrinsically linked to a rural area are covered by the policy and this amendment is not necessary. The reference to an affordable site we think may trigger issues with EU law which we discussed in March. The second category, some of the members had referred to concerns about it being unnecessarily vague perhaps and that it could be open to exploitation because of that. So, the Chief Executive is not in support of this but it is with the members to decide.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. We have a proposer. Have we got a seconder. Cllr Irene Winters, okay. We will go for a vote then.

HELEN PURCELL: V1-21 to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation, proposed by Cllr Joe Behan and seconded by Cllr Irene Winters.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 26 for, 5 against, 1 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, please.

SORCHA WALSH: We're now moving on to chapter 7, amendment 22, on page 36 of your document, and on Chief Executive's Report. This was proposed by the Chief Executive at the last stage and was agreed by the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: I'm happy to propose this, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will let you propose that, Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Your light was on first. Can I have a seconder? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All agreed? Show of hands? No dissent. Thank you very much.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Number 22 is section 5.3.5 of the plan. This was recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report to add some extra sentences with regard to community gardens. This was agreed by the members at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Seconded by Cllr Peir Leonard. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. No dissents? Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 24 is a proposed additional paragraph in section 7.3, with regard to swimming. The chapter at the moment already describes a number of different types of sports and doesn't say anything on swimming. This was proposed by the Chief Executive in his last report and is still recommended. It was agreed the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr John Snell. Seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All agreed? All agreed. Show of hands. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Number 25 is an amendment to CPO7.1 and it was to make reference to the national governing bodies of sport when consultations have been carried out with sporting bodies. This was proposed by the Chief Executive in his last report and agreed by the members of the last meeting and is still recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Proposer, Cllr Shay Cullen. Seconded by Cllr Gerry Walsh. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. No dissents? Thank you.



SORCHA WALSH: Number 26 relates again to social infrastructure audits. It is the same thing we just debated because it appears in the housing chapter and also in the community chapter. Essentially, you've already taken a vote on this, but Cllr Bourke had requested an amendment about the footnote. So, we could potentially take it that this has been agreed as previously and I will transfer the same amendment across as if the members want to agree this as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Do you want to propose it and agree it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer, Cllr Irene Winters. Seconded by Cllr John Snell. Thank you. Agreed by all.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: So, number 27, Cathaoirleach, is to add an extra sentence in objective 7.14 in relation to schools and community facilities. This was recommended by the Chief Executive in the last report and agreed by the members at the last meeting. It is still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. A proposer, Cllr Irene Winters. Seconded by Cllr Gail Dunne. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: So, now better on number 28 which again is to include reference to the National Sports Policy in objective 7.31 recommended by Chief Executive and agreed the last time by the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr Shay Cullen. Seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, number 29, makes reference to adding some more wording to objective 7.43 in relation to sports complex in West Wicklow. Recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report and is still recommended and agreed by the members the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr John Mullen. Seconded by Cllr Gerry O'Neill. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. Show of hands. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay. Number 30 is in relation to community gardens. This was recommended by the Chief Executive and, I believe, Cllr Scott might have come in at the last meeting with some amendments to it but it is still supported by the Chief Executive and was agreed at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay. Finally, under the community chapter, we have a proposed amendment which is to zone land for a nursing home at Killmullen in Newcastle, approximately two hectares. This was proposed by Cllr Derek Mitchell at the last meeting and agreed by the members.

You will see in the Chief Executive's Report, page 57-59, that the Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be made without this amendment. The Chief Executive did express his opposition to it at the March meeting and you will recall his reasons, no doubt. Reasons for opposing this are set out in the Chief Executive's Report from page 57 on. If it is a good proposal, it could be judged on its

merits based on the policies that are already in the development plan that do support nursing homes at appropriate locations though we don't agree that it is necessary to zone this land or appropriate to zone this land at this time. You will see that the Office of the Planning Regulator has come forward with a submission against this proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Derek Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: Well, I'd like to propose it again here and I just want to say this is to put a nursing home immediately next to Druids Glen golf club and the land was previously zoned as part of the Druids Glen resort, which is a big hotel and golf course, two golf courses I think, and quite a bit of other accommodation with lots of paths, et cetera, in it. It was to be originally part of that, but that hasn't happened. But the people who are reviewing this and being negative about it are writing about it as if it is in the middle of absolutely nowhere. I wonder have they visited the place because Druids Glen is a big resort, a big hotel, big swimming pool, food, walks, golf, there's paths, there's lights. So, the people who are in this nursing home who are fit enough can easily use this resort without going into cars and it is also the whole area of Druids Glen is a significant employer. It is not in the middle of nowhere. It seems to me that this would a suitable proposal next to such a resort to put that. It doesn't seem in any of the reviewing that people have actually noticed that and that's unfortunate. I want to propose that we keep it in and I think it is a good place for a nursing home. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: I second that proposal, Cathaoirleach. Like Cllr Mitchell, I think the location, it is not remote. It is equidistant between and in close proximity to Kilcoole and Newtownmountkennedy. The existing zoning on that land is tourism. Again, I would second that proposal, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. We have a proposer and seconder. We can go for a vote, Helen.

HELEN PURCELL: V1-31 to reject the proposal, proposed by Cllr Dermot O'Brien and seconded by Cllr Gerry Walsh.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 27 for, 4 against, 1 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha, please.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, we're now building on to built heritage, we're on page 40 of the Proposed Amendments Document. Amendment number 32. It is proposed to -- the proposal is to enhance the wording of this objective with regard to public access to an interpretative signage at national monuments and other sites. This was recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report and agreed by the members at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Do I have a proposer please? Cllr Irene Winters. Seconded by [inaudible]. All agreed? Agreed. Cllr Stephen Stokes wants to come in here.

CLLR STOKES: I was just trying to second it there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry.

CLLR STOKES: That's okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed on that one.

SORCHA WALSH: We're on to 33, page 41 of your amended documents and page 61 on the Chief Executive's Report. This is a proposal to zone land for a motorway service area at The Beehive. This was proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien at the last meeting and there was a vote on it. The Chief Executive does not support this amendment. You can see that in his report on page 62. The Office of the Planning Regulator has raised concerns, as has the NTA and TII. The Chief Executive is not supportive of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I acknowledge the objections. It is becoming a built-up area, this area of Wicklow. Sorry, Cathaoirleach.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Anyone coming from Rathnew into Wicklow will have seen it is built up. Although it would have been the gateway to Wicklow in the past, a lot of people bypass it and come in through the exit at The Beehive. The last thing we want to see is another derelict building on the N11. I drive past Lil Doyles every day and it is a shame to see it falling into the ground really. The one thing that COVID has taught us is that we need to be creating jobs more locally and we don't want to see more people having to travel up the N11 into Dublin and this will do so.

I know there was concerns the last time about the proximity of what this would be to the N11 or M11 but just for the record, the garages are actually further away from the M11 to where this proposed site would be.

This is basically what makes sense to me in the sense that it is the gateway into Wicklow Town now. We need to enhance it, not destroy it, I believe this will enhance it. As we all know as well, since Brexit, Rosslare to Dublin has become increasingly more populated with traffic. Anyone that says at a the M11 or N11 is getting quieter hasn't travelled down this far. I think Ross latter, correct me if I'm wrong, has gone from seven sailings to 32 sailings a week increasing the volume of traffic along the M11. I would invite anyone to come down and see what I'm talking about. Anyone objecting to it hasn't seen what I have seen. I would appeal to my fellow councillors to back me up on this one.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr O'Brien. Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Yeah, I would second this proposal and I think it is a good proposal. What baffles me about the commentary from the various agencies or quangos, whatever you call them, TII, I'm wondering how does it compare to sites in other areas throughout the country and it is a no-no for Wicklow, and why are these developments are a no-no for Wicklow. I think this is an essential piece of infrastructure and it should happen. It would be good all round, as Cllr Paul O'Brien has outlined. I would positively support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Shay Cullen. Sorry. Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Yes, I'd like to support this proposal as well. I think especially the side of the road it is coming from Dublin. I think it is really important. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Gura mile maith agat, Cathaoirleach. Just to say I support this proposal, as somebody who has a lot of experience working in tourism and international education, I certainly believe these types of facilities are very positive when trying to promote people visiting and going through these areas. I think that this is very positive from that, but also can create local jobs, people who actually work in it. I think this is a tremendous opportunity. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Can we go for a vote please? We have a proposer and we have a seconder.

HELEN PURCELL: It is item V1-33, to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation, proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune.

[Vote taken]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can we go for a vote with a propose and a seconder. Can we go for a vote, Helen, please.

HELEN PURCELL: Item V133 rejecting the Chief Executive recommendation, proposed by Cllr O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 29 for, 42 against, 1 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen.

SORCHA WALSH: 34, page 41 of the document and page 53 of the Chief Executive's report. A row posed amendment in relation to green industry to have reference to the circular economy proposed by the Chief Executive at the last meeting, agreed by the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr O'Brien. A seconder? Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Thank you. All agreed? All agreed. No dose decent? No.

SORCHA WALSH: 35, object which regard to postal facilities to support the provision of postal fast facilities, recommended by the Chief Executive and agreed at the last meeting. Still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Tom Fortune proposed, and Cllr Stephen Stokes seconded. All agreed.

CLLR O'CONNOR: One small thing to add. One thing should be added I know in my constituency and in part of it in Kilmac, there is a loss of the postal service facilities there. If we can have something like "and the restoration of postal services" rather than "new" I know a lot of communities have lost their postal facilities, so if we can somehow do a small edit. It is not that big at all. if that can be done, that will be great.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will get Erika to come in.

SORCHA WALSH: It will be a further modification; not minor as we are adding new policy. Now we either make the amendments or not to make the amendment or do a minor modification. It is my opinion to add an extra clause with regards to retainment of former or closed facilities is a different policy. It is not what is in the wording at the moment. So, my advice that is a modification that is not open to you to make.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Happy with that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Rory O'Connor are you happy with that?

CLLR O'CONNOR: That is fine. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: 36. Page 42 of your amendment document and on page 64 of the Chief Executive's Report. A proposal that came president Chief Executive in the last stage to include a map of

aggregate potential in the county agreed in the last meeting and various bodies made submissions such as the GSI and the OPR in favour of inclusion of the map.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A proposer for that, please? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. A seconder? Cllr Shay Cullen. All in agreement. Thank you. No dissenters? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now on to tourism. A few amendments with the regards to the tourism chapter, the vast majority by one recommended by the Chief Executive and agreed at the last meeting so we may be able to get through them quickly. V1-37 of the tourism chapter to update data on tourists in Wicklow County Council. Proposed and seconded, still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy and Cllr John Snell, all agreed? Thank you. No dissents, thank you. A show of hands. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you Cathaoirleach 38 proposed amendment to the information of falter Ireland strategies to be provided with additional information about the strategies to include a development plan as factual information. Proposed by the Chief Executive and agreed at the last meeting and still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A proposer, please? Cllr Patsy Glennon and Cllr Corrigan.

SORCHA WALSH: 39 the tourism strategy to provide the amendments at the top of the page on page 45 to provide updated data on visitor numbers of the county and from the bottom of the page fall us of Ireland and tourism policies agreed from the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh and seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune. All agreed. No dissents? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 40 on page 46 of amendments document, objective 11.17, it is to support hostels and alternative accommodations on walking and hiking routes proposed by the Chief Executive, agreed the last time and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed by Cllr Dermot O'Brien and seconded by Paul O'Brien. Thank you. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you Cathaoirleach. 41 proposed objectives under tourism and recreation objectives in relation to holiday homes. Recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report, agreed at the last meeting and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do we have a proposer, please? You can, certainly.

CLLR BOURKE: [distortion of sound]

>> We cannot hear him, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can you repeat that?

CLLR BOURKE: How many developments can it potentially apply to across the county? If there are holiday homes with restriction, they must be used for holiday. Otherwise, they can be sold.

SORCHA WALSH: I don't have a number of holiday homes in the counterparty, unfortunately. If you had come beforehand, I could have gathered it. It this is relating to purpose-built holiday homes. Smaller type houses with smaller gardens, no community facilities, shared water and waste, usually in rural areas, usually not connected to footpaths, close to schools or towns, permitted on

occasional use, not permanent use the policy is to resist consent for changed use as there is the odd application that people seek to change the use for the developments to permanent occupation.

So, the proposal is that the position is to resist that unless they can show that the housing development meets a standard to be a permanent housing development like the normal ones we permit in the towns and villages, if they can prove it has the standards and the connections to town, it can be considered but to make it clear, unless they can prove all the services are in situ, we will not consider it prime permission to change it to permanent home. Usually, they are substandard due to document due to the services provisions.

CLLR BOURKE: On the numbers, I don't have the numbers for Wicklow but on a presentation represented to the region authority last Friday the figure of 55,127 [sic] homes is the figure, as per the regional development monitor as present at that meeting.

CLLR WINTERS: I would agree with the planners' view on this.

And don't believe that the houses should be considered for permanent occupancy unless they do meet all of the criteria that would be normal in a regular building. Most of the holiday homes I have been in, in multi-developments they are small, no storage without proper outdoor areas, they are communal. There will be a lot of modifications to be met to bring up to the level you expect. If we change the policy, if we don't do this, there will be a chance that people could possibly build with the view to knowing that in 10, 15 years' time we can turn them into a permanent residence, I think it should be avoided at all costs. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, Members, we go for a vote on this, if that is okay, then. No, sorry, we do not need a vote. Sorry.

Do we have a propose, please? Cllr Irene Winters. A seconder, Cllr John Snell. All agreed? All agreed. Thank you. No dissent? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now on V1-42 on page 46 of the document tourism and recreation objective to correct a name of Failte Ireland to Bord Failte, recommended by the Chief Executive. Agreed and still recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen and Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy all agreed. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 43 on page 47 proposed amendment to CPO 11.28 with additional text on to support the tourism and the visitor parking facilities at appropriate locations to facilitate the actions to upland areas as identified by the [inaudible] master plan and by direct committee of Wicklow tourism or agencies, to that objective, recommended by the CE the last time, agreed at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed by Cllr John Snell and seconded by councillor Melanie Corrigan. All agreed, no dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: 44. Objective CPO 11.29 to add additional towns into the list of towns to be supported with Falta Ireland with tourism development. Recommended by the Chief Executive at the last meeting and is still supported. It was agreed at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed? Cllr Gerry Walsh. Seconded by Councillor Anne Ferris. Thank you. All agreed? All agreed. No dissents? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 45. Just to add small additional clause to develop Wicklow [inaudible] and the designation by Failte Ireland as a designation town declaring Rathnew as a major tourism area, proposed by the Chief Executive and agreed.

Proposed by Cllr Gail Dunne. Seconded by Cllr Irene Winters. Thank you. All agreed. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 46, proposed objective to make reference to supporting the implementation of the visitor master plan for Glendalough. To give compare support the delivery of the plans. Recommended by the CE agreed at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Patsy Glennon and Cllr O'Brien seconded. All agreed. Thank you.

No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: 47 another objective so to support the development of Avondale House proposed and agreed by the CE, still supported by the CE.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr John Snell, seconded by Cllr Sylvester Bourke. Thank you. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 48 proposed amendments to objective 411.34 to support, instead of saying supported development of network of trails, to be specific on walking, cycling horse riding agreed by the members the last time and supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Seconded by Councillor Anne Ferris. Thank you, everyone in agreement? No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: 49 to enhance the existing policy 11.37 to make reference to horse riding routes and trails as well as all other routes and trails and to change the name of walking routes to trails to encompass more than walking routes. Recommended by the Chief Executive and agreed by the members the last time. Still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy and seconded by Cllr O'Brien. Thank you.

All agreed? All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 50. To make slight amendment to objective 11.47 to relate to managing tourism within the counterparty rather than saying the words "seek to manage impact" to "manage" so, advised, recommended by the Chief Executive on advice from the environmental consultants. To advise we must be clear that we will do all that we can in our power to protect the environment and impacts arising from the visitor development which happens oft no-one rural and sensitive areas, so rather than seek to manage, it is just to manage impacts. Recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Seconded by Cllr Rory O'Connor. Thank you.

All agreed? Thank you.

Show of hands.

And I know I forget to say that. Sorry. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: Tourism 51, proposal to zoned lands of tourism developments at Jack White's, a proposal made by Cllr Sylvester Bourke and there was a vote on that. The Chief Executive is not in support of this proposed amendment receiving submissions including from the office of the planning

regulator. And the Chief Executive is not in support of this proposed zoning for the reasons set out in the report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Sylvester Bourke?

CLLR BOURKE: I didn't expect the management to be supportive but to propose it again. The owner, Mr Kennedy is a progressive business man in the area to give lots of employment. Keeping the show on the road during COVID with open air bar and food provision. I know this during the summer it was a busy season there. At one stage about 500 or 600 bikers overnight for a couple of nights. At a biker's rally. The scope there and potential to enhance the tourist offering in the area. I believe he is the key man to do it. I feel we should be supportive of the proposal and to give him the scope to fulfil his dreams for improved tourist offering on the site. So, proposing it again.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Sylvester Bourke.

CLLR FORTUNE: For example, TII in the submission, I quote a small piece from it. Talking about the development plan and the absence of a plan in accordance with the DEOCELG in the planning and national road guidelines, to the development and the impact that the lands can have on the safety and the efficiency ... what in God's name does that mean in English? Do these people travel around all of the rest of the county. I think it is a good project. Wicklow, where it can have everything that Ireland can offer from a tourism perspective, I am passionate about this. It is a very worthwhile project and I strongly second what is proposed before us.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy? I.

CLLR KENNEDY: I support it. It is great to see the initiative coming before us. I am concerned about the wording and the submissions made. As a councillor from the south of the county we would be delighted for tourism to come to the south, we have been without it long enough. I will be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Miriam Murphy?

CLLR MURPHY: To echo what the previous councillors they have read my mind as Cllr Sylvester Bourke outlined and the premises is well established for many, many years. And the owners have put their heart and soul into the employment of the young people there.

And kept it going through COVID and I think it will be an ideal situation there for that to promote the south of tourism here and linking it again up with Avondale and the area. But also, people in Jack White's they support every community group around. They sponsor so many things. I really would like to consider the support for this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Peir Leonard?

CLLR LEONARD: Also, to support this. I think we need to move more towards provide providing facilities for holiday in Ireland and we have a shortage of tourism accommodation. So, it fills a gap and it will sustain the local economy and tourism in and around Arklow and Avondale and Glendalough, it will tie in perfectly.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Irene Winters, please.

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I am likewise concerned by the wording and submissions from the NTA: Concerned that a development of this nature at this location compromises significant commercial activity at the motorway interchange. Well, the motorway is open 5 or 6 years and nabbing at this time or plan has been submitted for the interchange so someone in private industry



is willing to do that to provide the services in the area, it is the link point down to the north and the south beach of the motorway. And if there is parking, I don't know what the owners have planned but any sort of facilities that will accommodate cars and do a park and ride, whatever down to the beach and leave relieve the traffic pressures, it will be fantastic. So good to them if they can do something to alleviate that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Brien?

CLLR O'BRIEN: I want to support it; Cllr Irene Winters could not put it better. The owners have put in effort. I know that lots of talk has been about Arklow but this supports Wicklow town and more importantly, to get a park and ride even better. But to look after the people coming to Wicklow and have respect for them as well. I fully support that. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. That is Okay. We are going to a vote. Are we all in agreement or are we going for a vote? Let's go for a vote. Thank you, Cllr Lourda Scott.

HELEN PURCELL: V151 to reject the Chief Executive report to make amendment proposed by [inaudible] seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune.

[Vote taken]

CLLR DOYLE: Against.

[vote taken] Cllr Pat Fitzgerald is not present.

[Cote taken]

CLLR NEARY: Against.

[Cote taken].

CLLR SCOTT: Against. [vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: 28 for, 3 against, 1 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen.

SORCHA WALSH: Now we are on to chapter 12, page 50 of the proposed amendment book let's and page 52, V152, relating to including data on the modal split, the split of different transport types in Wicklow at the moment. The purpose of that to have it on record to monitor how well we are doing in the future on modal split. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time around and the members agreed it and the Chief Executive is still recommending it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do we have a proposer, please? Cllr O'Brien. Second, Cllr Lourda Scott. Thank you. All agreed. A show of hands. No descents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you Cathaoirleach. 53 a proposal which is on sustainable mobility objectives to add additional information with regards to the local transport plans and where we want to see the NTA work with us on delivering local transport plans proposed by the Chief Executive in the last report, agreed by the members the last time, still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I get a propose. Cllr O'Brien. Seconder ... Cllr Gerry Walsh. All agreed. A show of hands, no dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. 54 to add additional text with regards to electric vehicle charging points in new developments to enhance the policy that was proposed by the Chief

Executive the last time, agreed by the members and the Chief Executive is still recommending this amendment be made.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, proposer, please. Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy, seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. Thank you. All agreed? A show of hands, please. Thank you. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 55, Cathaoirleach, it is page 51 of the amendment book let's to make a change to 12.20 to add in the word "questionable accessible" with regards to the transport system. The Chief Executive recommended it the last time. It was agreed and it is still recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Propose, Cllr John Mullen. Seconded by Cllr Grace McManus. Thank you. All agreed. All agreed.

Show of hands. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now on number 56. This is our objective with regards to the public transport and the number of proposed amendments to this in red important to. Adding Kilcoole on to a bullet point to add in provision in supporting public transport services in West Wicklow and to promote accessible transport services and infrastructure. This was partly recommended by the Chief Executive the last time. It was amended as we were going through the meeting last March. Particularly Cllr Edward Timmins had suggested on that. So, a combination of the Chief Executive and the Cllr Edward Timmins' proposals, agreed at laid out there however by the entire council the last time around and still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do I have a proposer, please? Cllr. Vincent Blake. Seconded by Cllr Edward Timmins. Thank you. Are we all in agreement? Agreed. Show of hands. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now on 57, amendment to objective 12.22 to add detail on the public transport facilities along the East Coast to support the delivery of the Dart Plus programme and to support the electrification of the Greystones recommended by the Chief Executive the last time and agreed by the members and supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Stephen Stokes. All agreed. Thank you. No dissents. No. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now on 58.

On page 53 of the book let. A proposed amendment to objective 12.23 relating to public transport facilities and coastal protection along the East Coast. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time, agreed by the members and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposed by Councillor Anne Ferris. Seconded by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. Thank you. All agreed. Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: 59. Deleting objective to support the undertaking of study to assess the feasibility of extending rail services to county Wicklow in conjunction with amendment passed, on page 57 on the previous page but unnecessary as we had included it no objective 12.22. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time, agreed by you all, still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposal, Cllr Tom Fortune. Seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. Thank you. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 60 on page 54 of the document. To on corrective 12.27. text to include bus priority, bus lanes, priority signalling and so on. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time, still recommended and agreed the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy, seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents. Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: This is to support measures to improve bus priority, including bus lanes, priority signalling and so on. Recommended by the Chief Executive this time. Still recommended and agreed the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. All agreed? Thank you. No dissent, okay.

SORCHA WALSH: So, we're now on to 61, page 54 of your booklet. This is an amendment to objective 12.36. It is to add additional text with regard to the N11/M11 can upgrade study. This was proposed by the Chief Executive the last time and agreed by the members. It is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Do I have a proposer here please? Cllr Paul O'Brien. Seconded by Cllr Gerry Walsh. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. No dissent.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 62. It is an amendment to objective 12.66 and it was including extra text with regard to the development of an amenity of active cycling and walking group from Bray to Dun Laoghaire. It is recommended by the Chief Executive and still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I have a proposer by Cllr Anne Ferris. Seconded by Cllr Melanie Corrigan. Thank you. All in agreement? Agreed.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. We're now on to chapter 14, flood risk management. Amendment 63, to add an extra sentence to continue to work with the OPW and other agencies to ensure that development proposals support and do not impede or prevent the progression of schemes, flood management schemes. This was proposed by the Chief Executive and agreed at the last time and still supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, have I got a proposer? Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Seconded by Cllr Irene Winters. Thank you. All agreed.

SORCHA WALSH: So, now we're on number 64 which is in relation to energy infrastructure. It is on page 57 of anterior booklet and then the Chief Executive's Report, his recommendation is on page 84. So, this objective relates to setting out Wicklow's objective with regard to renewable energy. No particular type of renewable energy but all renewable energy, whether that be solar, wind, whatever, any type of renewable energy on the land of Wicklow, not related to offshore wind or anything like that.

So, it is part of Government policy that each county set out how it is going to meet its share of the renewable energy target for the country. This was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last time around and was agreed by the members. The Chief Executive is now, however, recommending a modification to this amendment and that's on page 84 of your Chief Executive's Report. You will see the Chief Executive's proposals in purple font. The purpose for this -- the reason for this amendment is that the Government policy with regard to the target for renewable energy has increased in the meantime. It is in the Climate Action Plan 2021. We've gone from the Climate Action Plan 2019, the objective was to achieve a 70% of renewable electricity by 2030, now it is

Government policy to reach 80%. So, each county has to meet their share of the new target, so the new targets are set out for you there in the purple text and that's what the Chief Executive is recommending that you make the amendment with this modification.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I just think there's an error there at both paragraphs you referred to 285 gigawatts. That should be megawatts, I think.

SORCHA WALSH: That's correct. You're right there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Well spotted, Councillor.

CLLR TIMMINS: Another small thing, just a comment. Wicklow has given its pro rata based on the land mass of County Wicklow compared to the rest of the country, 3%. I just wonder should we be taking -- I won't make an amendment here today, but just a comment -- should we take account of the fact that Wicklow is a very upland county and, you know, wind farms are not as suitable I think in scenic upland counties like Wicklow which is the most scenic upland county in the country, compared to the flat lands of the rest of the country. Just a comment. I'm not sure Wicklow should be taken the same proportion given its landscape.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sorcha, anything to say to that?

SORCHA WALSH: No, I would just say this is not to do with wind energy. It is just renewable energy. It could be all forms of energy. It doesn't have to be uplands and the uplands doesn't have to be wind. There is biomass, geothermal, solar, so this doesn't relate specifically to wind.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Sylvester Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: What effect will this have on, say, previously refused permissions for wind energy or renewable energy projects in the county? Will it give them a second bite?

SORCHA WALSH: The development plan is not retrospective. It has no impact on previous decisions. These provisions commence in six weeks' time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do I have a proposer for this, please? Cllr Grace McManus. Seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Are we all agreed? Agreed. No dissent. Okay. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. So, now we're on number 65. This is a proposal to add another objective, a new objective to support and facilitate to the highest degree possible the development of alternative and renewable sources of energy generally. So, this was recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report, was agreed at the last meeting and is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have we got a proposer please? Cllr Anne Ferris. Seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen. Are we all agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Number 66 is a new objective to support and facilitate co-location of renewable energy developments and technologies. This was proposed by the Chief Executive the last time and agreed by the members the last time and is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Again, I just want to query this, really. The co-location for renewable energy developments to ensure the most efficient use of land -- does that suggest then where there are existing onshore wind farm developments that those land will be favourable towards additional onshore wind farm development because there's existing infrastructure there? I just want collar tie on that before I make up my mind. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Co-location generally refers to different types of energy generation co-existing at the same site. It is not just a wind farm that currently has four and plies for another four. It would be maybe if it was possible to use the land for solar at the same time as wind. That's my understanding of it. That objective wouldn't be pertinent to the assessment necessarily of that location. A wind farm application for either a new wind farm or additional turbines on existing wind farm would be subject to our normal wind energy policies that are in the plan already.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are you happy with that Cllr Mullen?

CLLR MULLEN: Sorcha did say that last time when we withdrew a motion on this that the winds energy policy was going to be reviewed and that was a commitment made at a previous meeting. We understood that to be the case.

SORCHA WALSH: When we get new guidelines, we will. We still haven't got them.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Can I have a proposer for that, please? Cllr Dermot O'Brien. seconder, Cllr Rory O'Connor. All agreed? All agreed. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. Number 67 is on page 58 of your booklet. A proposed new objective to support sustainable energy communities. This was recommended by the Chief Executive the last time and agreed by the members and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr Irene Winters. Seconded by Paul O'Brien. Thank you. All agreed. All agreed. Show of hands please. Okay. No dissent. Thanks a million.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 68 a proposed new objective to support the research and development into green hydrogen as an option for fuel generation in case we get any applications along those lines to support it, if we can. This was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last stage and agreed by the members and still recommended.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Grace McManus. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? Agreed. Show of hands. Thank you. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 69 is to add some extra text on to objective 16.9, which is to facilitate the provision of projects that convert biomass to gas or electricity. This was recommended by the Chief Executive the last time, to add a caveat on to are ensure that some projects don't have adverse impacts. It was agreed at the last meeting and is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposer please. Cllr Lourda Scott. Seconded by Cllr Melanie Corrigan. All agreed? Show of hands. Thank you. No dissent.

SORCHA WALSH: Finally, under this section we have amendment 70 on page 58 of your booklet. A proposed change to objective 16.26. It is to support the development of low emission vehicle types. It was recommended by the Chief Executive last time and agreed by the members last time, still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposer Cllr Anne Ferris and seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? Thank you. Show of hands. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay. Thank you Cathaoirleach. We're now on to chapter 17 of the plan. We're on page 59 of your booklet and on amendment 71. This amendment is to delete some text and add some text with regard to the role of biodiversity in managing climate change. This was recommended by the Chief Executive the last time and agreed by members and is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Dermot O'Brien is proposing this. Cllr Gail Dunne has seconded it. Are we all in favour? Show of hands. Thank you. No dissent.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, we're on number 72, on page 59. This related to a number of amendments to a batch of objectives that relate to woodlands, trees and hedgerows. We put them together as one objective when we were publishing it but there are five changes altogether. So, we have actually broken it up I suppose in the Chief Executive's Report, so the Chief Executive supports the amendments proposed to objectives 17.18, 17.20, 17.21 and 17.22. The Chief Executive does not support the amendment to 17.19. All the rest of it, the Chief Executive is in support of except 17.19. I believe this was proposed by Cllr Lourda Scott at the last meeting and there was a vote on 17.19, whereas the rest were agreed by the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Lourda Scott, would you like to come?

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. From my memory we had a good discussion on the CPO17.19 at the last meeting and there was good engagement from all of the councillors and it was subsequently voted through. I do note there were a few public submissions on this section and they were all in support of 17.19. I strongly disagree with the Chief Executive's summation on this one, where he says -- I have lost my place here -- but he states basically it is considered unwise to include 17.19 as it may create a facilities and knob realistic expectation amongst the public. Like, I just completely can't accept that as a good reason to reject this amendment. The expectations are very clearly there by the public already and that's been reflected in the public's submissions relating to protection of trees and biodiversity from the very start of this plan and throughout the plan and indeed from the submissions from the public have come in on this particular version that we're looking at right now. Not to mention the fact that, you know, Wicklow County Council has declared a biodiversity emergency back in 2019, you know, so they're setting the bar for themselves. So, I have to disagree with this and I hope for support from my fellow councillors as we all voted this through back a few months ago at the previous version of the plan. So, I would disagree with the Chief Executive's recommendation on 17.19. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I would like to agree with Cllr Scott that it be included and voted on and agreed by the members. The tree preservation order doesn't guarantee the protection of a trees, but it gives the trees a chance to be assessed. I think not to include this amendment is actually it is doing a great disservice to the environment. Trees are very, very important and we just can't dismiss them as being something that shouldn't be included in the development plan. I just hope that everybody supports it, as they did before. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Irene Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: I do agree with sentiment with it. However, if it is not legally possible to do emergency tree preservation orders, we would actually be giving the public false hope and a false expectation of what is achievable within the County Development Plan, if they read, and, in particular, where it appears they are in danger of being felled and people then come in looking for something that actually can't happen. whereas I don't want trees felled and I do think they should be

preserved. Maybe it is better to have a full listing, rather than just running in, you know, and giving people the impression that something can be done when it can't. I don't think that in the County Development Plan, no more than when they talked about the ten-year rule for planning earlier on, you can't say one thing in the plan and then actually have another thing in practice and this would be one of those as well. So unfortunately, I have to agree with the Chief Executive in relation to 17.19.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I agree with the sentiment. There could be unintentional consequences here. I agree with the Chief Executive. For example, there was a tree assessed in the local village here. It was told it was all right. One half a storm, it wasn't even a full storm, the tree was down. Luckily, no-one was killed. But if we go by this logic, that tree would have been preserved and nothing would have been done and this tree came down anyway. Thank God it didn't kill anyone.

Plus, the fact we have residents where they put up in the past their own trees, which are now a hindrance to the structures in the estates. I would agree with the sentiment but I can't agree with the practicalities of it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Pat Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. In fairness, I agree with the Chief Executive on this. As someone who has made their living out of trees nearly all of my life and I fully understand the sentiment of the proposal, but it is legally not possible to do what we're being asked to do here today. I mean, at the moment we're not cutting trees nearly between March and September anyway because of the nesting season and it is only right and proper we look after the nesting season but this is not possible. I don't see anybody going out and clear-felling trees willy nilly and there is probably no need for this. I understand the sentiment of it but it is not legally possible and not enforceable. I do agree with the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erika Doyle, please.

CLLR DOYLE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just a comment and a request for clarification. I don't think anybody has an issue in an urgent health and safety situation where a tree needs to come down and is on its way down, you know, has been damaged or storm damaged or whatever. I think there might be a perception that TPOs mean that no trees can be ever cut anywhere. Like, it doesn't mean that. It just offers probably the only way of protecting trees that should be sentiment protecting. Otherwise, they're gone and there's nothing you could do after that.

I wanted to get clarification. The Chief Executive in his response says that he does not support the proposed amendment as it is not legally possible to make emergency TPOs. Now, emergency is in inverted commas there. But it goes on to say that essentially the Local Authority really can't do any TPOs because there is no [inaudible] and to have no expectation of any TPOs. I'm just wondering, like, is the Chief Executive saying that we just can't do TPOs. Where is the emergency aspect coming from? I know it is implied in the amendment as in response to requests from local communities but that's the way an ordinary TPO would go anyway, it would need an assessment. If maybe I could get a bit of clarification. The point of disagreement, where is that coming from? Where's the emergency word coming from? And what does it mean by not legally possible? I don't understand that, emergency TPO and TPO, I presume they're the same thing apart from the time frame for response. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I just wanted to support this being kept in as well. I mean, the TPO in its very nature is a process where all parties involved, owners of the trees and, you know, everything is assessed and taken into account, so I can't see why it couldn't be left in. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Gura mile maith agat, Cathaoirleach. Yes, I want to support this. I certainly believe in the Greystones district, for example, tree preservation orders are very important and we're under intense pressure to keep trees that should be there and, you know, are a danger of being felled because of the intense development pressure. So, I would commend this, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Cllr Doyle asked my question in terms of emergency. It is used there as a tool to prevent this from passing, whereby it is not in the amendment at all. For me, the strength of this amendment suggests that when we take collective responsibility for trees, then there's a better opportunity for the right trees to stay with us and we all know how important that is. I support this amendment. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Pat Kennedy again.

CLLR KENNEDY: Sorry, I won't hold up the meeting. I would be afraid by adopting this objective, we will actually lose more trees because people will -- any tree that is within striking distance of a road where people have to take responsibility which they should anyway, you could see that we lose trees -- and in urban areas. I think we would lose trees by adopting this. We would save more trees by going with the Chief Executive on this. I am speaking from experience here. I think we would lose trees because of it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We've had a good debate here.

SORCHA WALSH: A question was raised there. There is a difference between doing a TPO and an emergency TPO because there's no such thing as an emergency TPO. We do do TPOs and you recently at the last meeting in March made a number of additional TPOs, the suggestion that we don't ever do them or can't do them is completely wrong. You adopted some new TPOs only a few months ago.

The process for doing a TPO is stage one, to establish that there is a tree or a group of trees that may be worthy of a TPO. Once we have established that using our own resources and expertise, we have to hire an arborist to properly assess the tree because it has to have scientific grounds for being protected.

We don't have an arborist on staff so we can procure an arborist which is what we did before. There's no reason we can't do that, it is just a matter of time. We need to go to market, give people time to bid for the project, assess the project and hire an arborist. If it is then concluded that the tree is worthy of protection, the next step is to publish the proposal as a draft and to inform the landowner and give the landowner and the public the right to say whether the tree should be protected or not. It is then brought back to you, the members. That's the legal process.

Logical is no provision that somebody could ring up the office saying there is a lovely tree being cut down, can you protect it? There's a process.



Now, if it is a development site, for example, a new housing development that is being built, and as part of that process the trees were assessed and there were conditions attached that certain tree had to be retained, of course the enforcement team can go straight out and see something that is not in compliance with the planning permission about to be done and engage with the landowner and company at the time. There is no power within the council to do anything all of a sudden on an emergency basis to stop that tree being cut down. And that's our key difficulty with this proposed objective because we genuinely feel if the objective in our development plan which is statement of policy to the public, that the public can ring up and say there's a tree at risk, you promised you would in objective 17.19, we will have to say we are not able to do it. It is clearly a false expectation and false hope. I think it is unfair on the council and the public to give them that expectation that something can be done on an emergency basis as in the next day someone can shoot out and stop the tree from being cut down. They would have no legal basis to do so.

Essentially what the Chief Executive is actually recommending, I did say to you at the beginning that most of these amendments came from the Chief Executive with an amendment from Cllr Scott. What the Chief Executive actually recommended last time was that the sentence marked in blue that says "where the peers are in danger of being felled" will be deleted from the plan. Cllr Scott has proposed to add in the red text. The Chief Executive is not in support of the red text and is in support of deleting the blue text. There's a bit of two elements in that. That leaves the policy intact that the Council will considering the making of tree preservation orders and we will continue to do that. People write to us all of the time about making new TPOs. We wait until we have a batch of them and go to the market and hire an arborist, which is what did the last time. At each development plan, we add more TPOs to the plan. There's no suggestion here by accepting the Chief Executive's advice that no TPO will never be done again. We will continue to do them as people bring them to our attention, as we do development plans and revise County Development Plans.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. Cllr Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: I wanted to come back in one more time. I mean, there is no suggestion in this amendment that, you know, the member of public will ring the council up and expect them to go out the next day and slap on a TPO. Again, if there is a communication, I would encourage that on the Wicklow County website for clarity and transparency. The reason this amendment came through from the public is that they recognise that TPOs are made by Wicklow County Council but they're only made at development plan stage, through that process, so ever five years. It is not often enough. The public are asking that it is done more often. Hence that phrase in response to questions from the local communities.

Even with the TPO process through this -- not this year's plan, but this new version of the plan that we're going through at the moment, a lot of people have contacted me and they've made that point to me. Again, this is why this amendment has come through, that it went under the radar. It wasn't, they didn't realise the TPOs were being done and it passed them by and they had to wait another five years before submitting another group of trees. This process, while we're doing it at the moment, while the council are making TPOs and they're committing to still considering make TPOs, it needs to be improved and it needs to be strengthened and it needs to be more often and frequent, not just at the five-year process. That's why this amendment was put through from the public and supported by the public's submissions and indeed was supported by the councillors here the last time as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

CLLR KAVANAGH: It doesn't state anywhere in this about trees that are about to fall or they can't be cut down. It is if you notice the -- the text says of high amenity value and that's all. I mean, there's not that many trees that people would look for a TPO on it. It has to have some very special reason to keep it, as Sorcha said. To be lumping all trees into this is just unfair. It is actually just trees of high amenity value. I think it should be kept in.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Sorcha, would you like to come back?

SORCHA WALSH: I'd have to disagree with Cllr Scott that people weren't aware we consider TPOs. We have numerous submissions over the last number of years of people requesting TPOs. It was that list that people write in, email in, call in, that we distilled down into the list of about 15 or so that we actually proposed for TPOs. So, we get regular and ongoing correspondence from the public, whether or not we have issued and published an advert saying we consider that. They come to our heritage officer all of the time through different fora.

With regard to that, trees have to be of high amenity value. That's the condition of a TPO. I have to disagree with Cllr Mary Kavanagh that there aren't many of them. In the submissions we had in the draft plan, we had over 1,000, it was more like 2,000 trees were asked to be protected in Delgany alone. Not all of these could be of high amenity value and meet the TPO standard. It was a scattergun, protect every tree, what the request was. There was no differential between the different species. To assess every tree in Delgany would -- I said this at the last meeting in March -- given it costs us €25,000 to procure the assessment of 15 trees. To do 1,000 trees in one district, you would be calling for significant money. It is not an easy task and there is a lot of trees in Delgany and a lot of trees everywhere.

The people who are asking us to protect trees are not focusing on high amenity trees, they're focusing on all trees. I think we could be overwhelmed with requests for TPOs and would simply not be doable with the time frame and resources we have. That's why we feel that it's somewhat misleading to the public, this objective that suddenly they can write to us and go into a list to be assessed. We wouldn't be able to get through them in a six-year cycle, the amount we are being asked to protect within the time frame and the resources that we have. So, it is somewhat misleading to the public, that they can write and it goes into a list to be assessed. We would not get through a 6-year cycle. There are numerous policies on trees, particularly on the development. We do all we can to protect all trees. There is in the plan about stage one of the assessment in the development site, the natural features and the biodiversity which is a change in approach, perhaps and we are absolutely committed to doing that to protecting trees, whereas in the past it may not have been a top priority in the development of a site. So, we have concerns about the wording of the policy. We don't, we fully support the protection of trees and the making of further TPOs but feel that the policy as worded would mislead the public. What they are entitled to ask us to do and what we will do. Particularly where it says where they are in danger of being felled. That suggests it is imminent. So clearly the public in that situation are looking for it to happen imminent. So clearly a worrying phrase. If they are in danger of being felled so don't agree with that sentence being in the subjective.

CLLR FERRIS: Can you explain, or somebody, to explain, what is a tree of high amenity value? Maybe compare a tree of high amenity value against a tree that does not have high amenity value. I don't know what is the difference? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: There are clearly established in the assessment of TPOs. You read the TPO report circulated with the second Chief Executive's report. There is a standard protocol in terms of assessing but I don't have them off the top of the head, generally to do with landscape,

biodiversity. There are five criteria a tree fulfils. If you look at the last report they are clearly set out and how each tree is assessed in accordance so international protocols in assessing the value of a tree.

CLLR FERRIS: Okay. I didn't know that, thank you, Sorcha.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is everyone happy with all that has been answered? Are we clear on what we are voting on? Sorry, the Chief Executive.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: The key issue is the time frame we are talking about, as outlined in the response: In accordance with the statute, it takes a number of months to complete a TPO process. That is the reality. If someone rings up to ask for a TPO to be done ASAP, because a house or a tree is in danger of being cut down, it will take a number of months. There is no way around it. It is a part of the statutory process. There are a number of stages within the process, there is no way around that. That is the issue. It is the crux of the matter here. If that is put in it gives expectation that people will think you can request a TPO, call it an emergency or whatever you want to call it but not to be done within days or weeks. We are talking about months. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, I have asked to have this explained. I have another two speakers coming in. So, to save me asking the questions to ask Sorcha to explain the A and the B. So, Sorcha, can you explain?

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach we are talking about 17.19 with regards the objectives in the past they were agreed and the members may wish to agree this time. In 17.19 there may need to be a vote. I think there are two elements maybe two votes. The first element to take out the sentence where it appears "they are in danger of being felled", if you agree or disagree with that or wish it to stay in. The second vote is the text in red. Where it appears "in danger of being felled and response to request from local communities" so better to split 17.19 into two votes. The first relating to the part in blue, the second relating to the part in red.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is that anything to do with the question, Cllr Peir Leonard?

CLLR LEONARD: No. I wanted to highlight the wording in the 17.19. To consider the making of tree preservation orders, not to make but to consider it. Surely the timelines can be explained then to the public or the community groups if it is not eligible? But if it is, is there a possibility we can save three trees, so, that is all I wanted to highlight. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: The development plan could not have objective to make a tree preservation order unless it is a proposal of a tree you are making. All you can do is to consider making them, there is a considered process, whereby there is a proposal, a public review, the landowner ... then it is brought back to you to consider all the information. You have to do it in a thoughtful, considered way before making the decision. The plan can only state something definitive to make when you are making it there via the County Development Plan. So, this is to allow you to consider further tree preservation orders. There may be proposals brought by the members of trees to protect and you decide not to as there is somebody that says something to change your view. You need the wording like "consider the making of" as you have to give it the measure, to give it your consideration.

>>: I am for the word "considered" but the meaning of that word consider is that there is a process. That it should not delineate from anything being brought forward.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I have two more speakers to bring in. They are remote. Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: Yes, Cathaoirleach, I am a bit concern or confused. I don't know which I can call it.

I have two people have come to me over the last few weeks -- months actually -- regarding trees that were planted when the estates were being developed. At that time, I suppose, you know, there was no tree policies or whatever. Now the trees are certainly at a height of overgrown and planted between houses which are quite dangerous. I am concerned, is that is there a health and safety issue, then? I don't think that data public will understand tree policies if it is in a garden and they are looking out and finding that the tree is bent and they have to apply for the application for it to be cut down and there is a waiting list. I mean, is there a public health and safety? I mean, am I just getting it wrong? Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle?

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you, just a question felled. That in relation to the TPOs themselves. What is the Budget for TPOs? Do we have a Budget. Maybe I should know this. But do we have a Budget, what is it? How is it allocated or approved. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: With regards the Budget, no, there is no specific Budget for TPOs. The Budgetary decisions will be coming before you in the next few months. It comes from the County Development Plan but there is no specific money for it, no.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We are going to go for a vote. Sorcha, part A or B.

HELEN PURCELL: To clarify before that vote there are four other elements, 18.71, 17.21 and ... .. so 17.18, is Cllr Tom Fortune?

SORCHA WALSH: Can we do them all in one?

HELEN PURCELL: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Stephen Stokes is seconding that. All agreed. No dissents. No dissents. Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: 17.21?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Brien, Cllr Rory O'Connor. All agreed? No dissents. Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: 17.22.

CLLR DOYLE: Propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Melanie Corrigan and Cllr Lourda Scott. Agreed, no dissents. Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: 17.23.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh and Cllr Irene Winters is to second. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: Now to the complex bit. So, I have a proposal from Cllr Lourda Scott, seconded by Cllr Mary Kavanagh to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation of 17.9 to make amendments. Talking about two votes but I don't have a proposer or a seconder.

SORCHA WALSH: So, the proposer is to delete text in blue but keep the text in red, that was from Cllr Lourda Scott but the Chief Executive was to delete the text in blue.

[distortion of sound]

HELEN PURCELL: Clear on that? No.

SORCHA WALSH: Let's go through it again. So, the vote on Cllr Lourda Scott's proposal to delete text in blue to add text in red.

>>: If that passes it, it not to go to the Chief Executive.

HELEN PURCELL: Rejecting the Chief Executive recommendation on 17.19 to make recommendations proposed by Cllr Lourda Scott and seconded by Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

[Vote taken]

CLLR DOYLE: Sorry, Helen, I am back in but was booted out. What are we voting on?

HELEN PURCELL: V172, CB O17.19. Proposed by Cllr Lourda Scott, seconded by Cllr Mary Kavanagh to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation on 17.19 and to make amendments. Outlined in red.

CLLR DOYLE: To reject ... sorry! I'm having a double negative moment.

HELEN PURCELL: I will read the whole thing out. CPO 17.19 says, to consider the making of the tree preservation orders, TPOs to protect the trees and woodlands of high amenity. Then we are leaving out, value where it appears that they are in danger of being felled and adding in: Generally, and in particular, where it appears that they are in danger of being felled and in response to requests for local communities. So, the Chief Executive, that's the Chief Executive's recommendation. So, for or against, then, Cllr Lourda Scott and Cllr Mary Kavanagh or against the Chief Executive's recommendation.

CLLR DOYLE: Sorry, I wanted to make sure. Against. Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: Cllr Doyle, did you understand what I was saying to you?

CLLR DOYLE: I am for the proposal, against the Chief Executive's advice.

HELEN PURCELL: So, for.

CLLR DOYLE: Apologies.

HELEN PURCELL: You are for?

CLLR DOYLE: Yes.

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 13 for, 17 against, 2 absent.

SORCHA WALSH: So, to consider the making of tree preservation of trees of high amenity value. So, the only bit we are voting on now, is do you want it to say "value where it appears of being in danger of being felled"? The Chief Executive's wording ends in the word "value". Does someone want to propose that? Cllr Shay Cullen is. Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Flynn-Kennedy, do you want to come in or second it. Are you only proposing it, Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy? [distortion of sound]

HELEN PURCELL: Put your mic on, sorry.

CLLR KENNEDY: What we are voting on is to protect trees, woodlands of high value; is that right?

HELEN PURCELL: High amenity value. Where we keep in the words "amenity value" if you are voting for you want the sentence to end with the "amenity" word in there.

CLLR FERRIS: I am asking about that. If you take out where it appears that they are in danger of being felled, what the Chief Executive wanted. The next part in red where he put in amenity ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have voted on that.

CLLR FERRIS: Does he not want the words generally and particularly where they are in danger of being felled and in response to local communities?

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have voted on that one.

SORCHA WALSH: The inclusion of the sentence, generally and in particular where in danger of being felled has been rejected by the members by the vote you held. The proposal has two elements. The first half to end the sentence with the word "value", recommended by the Chief Executive at the meeting in March. So, this amendment was a hybrid of the Chief Executive's recommendation and Cllr Lourda Scott's recommendation. So, the proposal now is to end the sentence in the word "value" or "felled" in blue. So, the Chief Executive is recommending you end it at the word value to read: To consider the making of tree preservation orders to protect trees and woodlands of high amenity value. So, if you are in favour of that, vote for the next vote.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you, Sorcha. All very confusing.

>>: Are they proposing to accept the Chief Executive's recommendation?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes. All in agreement or to go for a vote?

CLLR FERRIS: Agreed.

SORCHA WALSH: Vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay to vote.

HELEN PURCELL: We are on V1-72. We are voting on whether or not to accept: To consider the making of tree preservation orders to protect trees and woodlands of high amenity value.

CLLR SCOTT: Sorry, I think I may need more coffee. So, if we reject that sentence, we then accept to consider the making of tree preservation orders to protect trees and woodlands of high value where it appears that they are in danger of being felled? Correct? If we reject it --

>>: If you vote for the motion you end up with the word "fell". If you are for, you end up with "value".

HELEN PURCELL: Okay, everybody clear?

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 18 for, 12 against. 2 not present. So, we finish at the word "value".

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on to 73, landscape category maps on page 60 of the amendment booklet and page 90 of the Chief Executive's Report. To change the landscape category of an area marked in red there. The Chief Executive had proposed this the last time. Agreed the last time. The Chief Executive is still recommending it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Shay Cullen proposed. Cllr O'Brien seconded. All agreed? All agreed. No dissents? No. Thank you very much.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on a few more to get through to finish Volume 1 of the plan, you are delighted to hear, that is only Volume 1 done.

So, page 61, amendment 74 to amend the chapter on green infrastructure to add an extra sentence, national policy objective from the County Development Plan there in red, on page 61.

Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time you agreed it and the Chief Executive is still recommending it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer, please. Cllr Patsy Glennon and seconded by Cllr Rory O'Connor.

All agreed? Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 75. Agreeing infrastructure objectives to include extra text to make reference to bridle ways and cycle ways and changing paths and walkways and cycleways to trails. So, all grouped together as different types of trails. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time agreed by the members. Still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer, please? Councillor Anne Ferris. Seconded by Cllr Melanie Corrigan. All agreed and no dissents

SORCHA WALSH: 76, partly recommended by the Chief Executive and then there was an amendment made by Cllr Erika Doyle so a vote the last time as there were two elements to it. The Chief Executive, you can see his report on page ... I've lost my way now. 91. 93?

CATHAOIRLEACH: It is like playing bingo.

SORCHA WALSH: The Chief Executive's recommendation is to make the plan with the amendment, as proposed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a proposal please? Cllr O'Brien. Cllr Shay Cullen. All agreed. Thank you. No dissents. Show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Finally in the section 77, new objective with regard to public rights of way. Recommended by the Chief Executive in the last report agreed by members and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A proposer please? Cllr Lourda Scott. Seconded, Cllr O'Brien. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: 78, on Marine spatial planning on page 63 of the document amendment 78, to add extra text and delete some text with regards to the Marine Area Planning Act to ensure it is up to date with the new Act. Recommended by the Chief Executive, agreed by the members and still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A proposer? Cllr Gerry Walsh. And seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents. No. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 79, amendments to Marine spatial planning chapter to add reference to national policy objective A to add an extra sentence. Recommended by the Chief Executive, still recommended and you agreed it the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Gail Dunne. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Amendment number 80, chapter 1. To add new text and delete text again to make reference to the new Marine Area Planning Act. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time, agreed by you the last time, still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposer, please? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Seconded by Councillor Anne Ferris. Thank you. All agreed? No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: So, now we are going on to Volume 2 of the plan. So, I don't know if there was a ... oh, do we want to go back to the ...

Cllr Mitchell and Cllr Fortune proposals, V15, it may be the best time to do it, do we want to go back to Cllr Tom Fortune and Cllr Derek Mitchell's proposals? V15. Page 6 and the Chief Executive report, you have to go to page 19. Thank you.

So, two documents circulated to you now. If they, are they up on the screen. The proposed amendments up on the screen? The proposal from Cllr Derek Mitchell, seconded by Cllr Stephen Stokes to add a line into the table in that section under the Level 3 settlements, Arklow, [inaudible] and Blessington to say: It is estimated that growth will exceed the target range before the end of planned period due to legacy housing developments under construction. So that is a proposal taken secondly.

And the Cllr Tom Fortune under the section of Kilcoole to use the same text but to replace the word Kilcoole. That estimated growth in Kilcoole will ... so two separate proposals, let's call them A5, 5B. They must be taken separately, Cathaoirleach. Does everyone have a hard copy in front of them?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is Cllr Derek Mitchell happy?

SORCHA WALSH: Let's take Cllr Mitchell first. And also, to make the decision on amendment 5 overall that you are accepting the Chief Executive's other recommended changes to 5 and then Cllr Derek Mitchell's and Cllr Tom Fortune's are in addition to that. So, not replacing anything from the Chief Executive's recommendation but in addition to it. Cllr Derek Mitchell first? To go through the proposal, to quickly go over it.

CLLR MITCHELL: Basically, the census this year has shown that Greystones population is on, it is 2028 target to be exceeded substantially, logically one would put it in the table but we are told that the table of numbers has come from the eastern and the midland region authority and at this stage it is not possible to amend it. So important to record here that this is likely to happen so that the service providers and all of that, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: Probably have a vote as it is a further modification.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you everyone know what we are voting on? Okay.

HELEN PURCELL: This is amendment, V15A as circulated proposed by Cllr Derek Mitchell. Seconded by Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: We need a vote on this because it is a further modification.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Does everyone understand what we're voting on now? Okay. Thank you.



HELEN PURCELL: Right, this is amendment, it is V1-5A, as circulated, proposed by Cllr Derek Mitchell, seconded by Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: 30 for, 2 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sorcha, we have another part of that?

SORCHA WALSH: Part B is Cllr Tom Fortune's proposal, circulated to you, which is to include the same sentence with respect to Kilcoole. We're a little bit more resistant on this and less supportive of the proposal, in that the planning permissions already granted and under way in Greystones, if fulfilled will likely result in the target being exceeded. We're not at that stage. In Kilcoole, there are no planning developments under way that would bring Kilcoole above its target at the moment. If the developments that are not yet granted were delivered, then yes, this would be factually correct, but it is not quite as correct as it was in Greystones. We've no huge difficulty with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Tom Fortune, do you want to come in?

CLLR FORTUNE: I slightly disagree with Sorcha on that, in that there are 140-odd houses going on in the Lot Lane area of Kilcoole bringing in a population of 400+ that wasn't in any numbers we talked about in recent times. The SHD shenanigans that went on in the main street is still there. It is ongoing battle. There are the guts of 350 houses plus there. It will bring us over the number by 2028. I think it is justified in doing the same thing for Kilcoole. We are basically a stone's throw from Delgany and Greystones. So, I propose that we would do this as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you, Cllr Fortune. Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I'm happy to support that as well and second it for Cllr Fortune.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. We will go for aet vote then.

HELEN PURCELL: We're on V1-5B, as circulated. Proposed by Cllr Tom Fortune, seconded by Cllr Peir Leonard.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: 31 for, and one not present. An opportune time to talk about our break at five o'clock.

SORCHA WALSH: We haven't had a vote on the actual V-15. This was two modifications to number five but we didn't vote on the substantive number 5. So, once we have done that, it is a great time to have a break!

HELEN PURCELL: It is just to talk about it. If someone wants to propose and second five, it can be agreed or voted on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Irene Winters and seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune. All agreed? Agreed.

HELEN PURCELL: Okay that's Volume 1 of the plan done.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Well done everyone.

HELEN PURCELL: We were talking about having a break at 5.00, if that's agreeable. How long would you like it for, Cathaoirleach? Half an hour.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, Cllr Joe Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Just to be helpful in helping people make their decision, I have talked to my colleagues and the Chief Executive, if he will confirm something with me, we'd be happy to rest the Section 140 until the first item at the October meeting so that members wouldn't have to wait to discuss the Section 140, even though we did want to discuss it. Given the fact that people's energy levels are certainly going to be drooping as we go on into the night. If the Chief Executive is willing to confirm that no further work will happen with regard to preparing a system of charges, we are happy to wait and have the Section 140 as the first item at the October meeting, Cathaoirleach.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Cllr Joe Behan, I don't agree with you too often. I'm only too delighted to agree with you on this occasion! Looking at the relieved and tired faces around me, they'd be delighted with that approach. I'm happy to take it as the first agenda item on the October meeting. No substantial works will be done in the meantime on that particular topic.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I just get clarification? I did not go back on my word. Thank you very much. That's okay. It is only the thing you have in your life, your word. Thank you.

Sorcha, have we agreed that we're going to stop at five o'clock for 25 minutes? We will stretch it to it half an hour.

CLLR MULLEN: Are we going to a finish? For how long?

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will try our best.

CLLR MULLEN: How long will this take? We obviously still have about 40 or 50 amendments left.

ADMINISTRATOR: At the moment, we are proposing to go just past five o'clock so we can revisit as we when we reconvene to see how you're going.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I have a problem with what you're proposing, I have to go at six o'clock. Now, I can probably get back for eight o'clock, if we're still in session! I would like to be able to vote on the plan as well. But I don't have any control over that due to circumstances outside of my control.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Fortune. Thank you for that. Cllr Avril Cronin.

CLLR CRONIN: I have to leave but I will log in remotely.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We will see if we can get another few done by five o'clock, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Right. We will start at number 80. We're on Volume 2. We're on page 66 of the Proposed Amendments Document. We're on volume 2 plans and on amendment V2-81. So, number 81 is in relation to the introduction to the Level 4 plans and the proposal is to include extra text in the plan under economic development setting out how much land is zoned for employment development in each of those towns. This was proposed by the Chief Executive last time and agreed by the members and is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I support this amendment. A brief comment on it. You will note at the end of the amendment it states that they will allow for 100% headroom in terms of zoning for employment. I have no issue with that at all. That's a sensible thing to do because lots of land gets zoned and landowners for various reasons are not interested in developing it and also there can be technical reasons why land doesn't get developed for employment. I just find it ironic that it is quite okay that we can put forward 100% headroom on employment zoning but we can't do it I think primarily because of the planning regulator, we can't do 100% headroom on residential zoning when we actually have a housing shortage. I just find it very ironic that this is allowed, which I support, but yet we're not allowed to have 100% headroom. Hence all of the dezoning that has been happening.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sorcha, have you anything to say about that?

SORCHA WALSH: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Has anyone else any questions on that? Okay. We will go for a vote now?

HELEN PURCELL: You can agree it, if people are happy.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do we all agree with that? Agreed. Proposer, please. Cllr Melanie Corrigan. Seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Number 821 the introduction to Level 4 plans and adding more text and policy with regard to flood risk assessment and how we will address flood risk assessment in the Level 4 plans. This was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last meeting and was agreed by all of you and is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposer, Cllr Tom Fortune. Seconded by Cllr Sylvester Bourke. All agreed? Agreed. No dissent, thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now, we're on number 83. This was actually a proposal from Cllr Edward Timmins at the time. It was to allow for the development of sports and community facilities on land. The Chief Executive is happy to support this. On the report, you will see he is recommending that the plan be made with that amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I'm happy to support it, but it is actually 85 is the one I was proposing, which we will come to in a minute.

SORCHA WALSH: There was a combination of modifications?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. You are proposing. Have we got a seconder? Thank you, Cllr Snell. All agreed? Agreed. No dissent, thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: We're on to number 84. The next batch relates to Baltinglass. Number 84 is to include a new objective in the plan to facilitate and support the development of a new supermarket on land zone town centre that will include the retail offer of Baltinglass and the surrounding area to support a healthy and vibrant town centre.

This is a completely separate objective to the debate we had about retail being located on the N81 on the far side of the town. It is a further objective further down the list. This got confused with number 86 at the last meeting. This is a simple straightforward objective to support of the

development of retail in the town centre. This was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last meeting and was agreed at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Have I got a proposer please? Cllr Patsy Glennon. Seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen. All agreed? Agreed. No dissent. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 85 is a proposal for a new objective to support and facilitate multi-sports campus in Baltinglass. This was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last meeting and all agreed at the last meeting. It is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen is proposing it. Seconded by Cllr Patsy Glennon. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. No dissent.

SORCHA WALSH: Take a deep breath. This is going to be hard to explain but I will try and do it slowly and carefully.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins, yes.

CLLR TIMMINS: This relates to land owned by a member of my family, so I have to declare that, like I did in the previous two meetings. I have to absent myself from the meeting. I'd ask that I be contacted when the debate is finished because, actually, I'm proposing the following amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You can go and put the kettle on, Edward. We will call you! Thank you for that, Cllr Timmins.

SORCHA WALSH: You will recall from the last meeting, the draft plan for land out on the west side of Baltinglass on the N81, the draft plan designated lands as an actionary, which means a block of land which might have a range of different zonings to be locked together in that the landowners and there might be more than one landowner, have to agree a masterplan and how they will share access and so on. Included in that area in the draft plan was a piece of land zoned for retail. It was zoned commercial with an objective for retail use. It was a proposal that I believe had come from Cllr O'Neill at the time. That is what was in the draft plan.

At the March meeting and the Chief Executive's Report that we were discussing, the Chief Executive recommended that the two elements, first that the action area be split into two smaller areas, because some of the landowners had come back and questioned the practicality of joining so many landowners together. The Chief Executive had supported that proposal.

The Chief Executive also recommended that the retail zone be omitted completely, so we had two votes. One was whether to split the actionary into two, which you the members passed, the second vote was whether or not to include the retail element. The members voted to include the retail element.

That retail zoning is essentially finished with, you decided to leave it in the plan and that's not what was the subject of the amendment. What went on display was splitting the actionary into two components, into two areas. However, in our transcription of the decision that was made at the meeting and in the preparing it for publication, there was one line got lost in translation and it was the one objective in text that said "and to provide for and to allow for a discount retailer on the land zoned for commercial". So, the commercial zoning is in. You've have passed that already, against our advice; that's fine. But this line was omitted in error, I'll be honest with you, because it was so confusing, the vote, the last day in March. Cllr Gerry O'Neill has identified this and asked us to rectify this error. We don't consider this a proposed modification. It is simply if you agree with Cllr O'Neill's proposal, you are simply passing some elements of the amendment and not passing other

elements. So, that's Cllr O'Neill's proposal, circulated to you on Friday last week. If you agree with Cllr O'Neill's proposal, you would be splitting the actionary into two blocks, allowing retail on one of them with an objective to allow for discount retailer. You'd also be accepting the Chief Executive's recommendations. He has proposed some wording about changing the objectives for park on that. That's all encompassed in that one document from Cllr O'Neill.

Look, you know our opinion. We are not supportive of retail on this land. The OPR has some concerns about that. Today, we are asking are you happy to accept Cllr O'Neill's proposal that it is clearly written in the text that the discount retailer will be facilitated and you're happy to include the Chief Executive's changes which are in purpose approximately, which are to do with the park objectives.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Patsy Glennon, please.

CLLR GLENNON: Sorry, just one quick question. Can we be that specific at this stage of the plan? I'm talking and referencing the reference to a discount food store. Can you define a discount food store per se? Is it too restrictive? I don't know.

SORCHA WALSH: It is defined in the planning guidelines. It is a particular type of retailing, generally of a particular type of size and a particular format. You are all familiar with the brands that do the discount retailing. They generally have a smaller footprint than the big supermarkets. Most of their goods are on the floor, rather than in storage. You know the format.

Yes, we would agree with the points you raised, that it is very precise that the proposal that is put forward that the land should be reserved for a discount retailer, it would preclude retailers that are not discount retailers, and other formats. But I believe that is what the intention of the members from the West was, there would be very specific zoning, very specifically for discount retailer because they felt that type of retail was genuinely needed in that town as opposed to standard types of retail. That was the clear goal, I understand, of the West Area members, was to designate this land for discount retailing and not for other forms of retailing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. Cllr Gerry O'Neill.

CLLR O'NEILL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just to answer the question there. It is to give the people of Baltinglass the same opportunity of low-cost shopping as any other part of the county, i.e., Wicklow Town or Greystones or wherever, you know. At the moment over the years, the people of Baltinglass have to travel many miles out of town, whether it to be to Tullow or Athy or Blessington or wherever for low-cost shopping. It is to give the people of Baltinglass that chance there. And, you know, at the moment, there are hundreds of people travelling from Baltinglass to other towns, as I say outside of the area every week. It is just to give those people the same chance as anyone. Gura mile maith agat.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Vincent Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: I second Cllr O'Neill's proposal. Yes, he is perfectly right there. We've been inundated with requests from people in Baltinglass. They have a committee up there canvassing for this type of a store in Baltinglass as such. I'd second Cllr O'Neill's proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Miriam Murphy. Sorry, you have withdrawn.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Murphy. Okay, we have a proposer and a seconder. Will it go to a vote then? We don't need to vote.

HELEN PURCELL: We do need to vote. This has been circulated to you, V2-86, contains both the Chief Executive and Cllr O'Neill's amendment. We're voting to accept both. If it falls, we will go back to the Chief Executive's recommendation. Is that clear?

CATHAOIRLEACH: That is clear, yes.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 34 for, 2 not present. If you give me a minute to call Cllr Edward Timmins back to the meeting.

SORCHA WALSH: We're on number 87, page 71 of the proposed booklet. For the Chief Executive's Report, you need to be on page 104. This proposed amendment is an amendment to change the zoning of land in Baltinglass. This came from Cllr Timmins back in March. There was a vote on it. A couple of submissions on it. The Chief Executive is recommending that this amendment not be made for the reasons set out in his report on page 104.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: The OPW, I think, are happy with the proposal, just to say that. This relates to some local businessman trying to develop a tourist facility in the middle of Baltinglass, i.e., glamping. He made an application two years ago but it was refused for various reasons. And we're just trying to address some of the reasons here, one of which was the zoning.

Earlier in the year, I worked with the planners. Sorcha was very helpful and worked with me in terms of coming up with a wording that might pass the environmental and SAC issues that the planning could potentially give. So, I see the OPW are actually happy with the wording that covers off those areas in terms of flood risk, et cetera, because some of the land is close to the River Slaney.

The zonings, I feel and the advice I've been given -- I'm no expert on it -- is that they do address those issues. And all I'm trying to do here is give the possibility, it will still obviously have to go through a lot of hoops, the landowner the opportunity of glamping in the town of Baltinglass, a town with not much employment, really. This is an opportunity to develop tourism in rural West Wicklow and in Baltinglass in particular. This amendment did go through by a substantial vote in our March meeting. I'd be happy to propose this here again. I very much look for support on this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Timmins. Cllr Erika Doyle wants to come in.

CLLR DOYLE: Thanks, Chair. I got booted out again, so I missed the beginning. Is this the glamping on the flood plain? Just for the Bray councillors, we have a situation where everybody is objecting to a bridge in Bray because it is proposed to build on the flood plains. I just wanted to point that out, that, you know, there is not really any difference in the flood plains. A flood plain is a flood plain and a development is a development. I'd like to point that out. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, do we go for a vote, Sorcha? Cllr Anne Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I was going to ask something in relation to the flood plain. Have those issues been resolved? Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: The land in question is partly located in Flood Zone A and partly located in Flood Zone B. There are some elements in Flood Zone C. The wording that Cllr Timmins has proposed is that in the development of the land, that A, only water compatible development as defined by the

flood risk guidelines may occur in areas defined in the plan SF4A and any site-specific assessment being in Flood Zone A.

Part B, he has put in there is only water compatible development or less vulnerable development that would be allowed in Flood Zone B. So, both of those, that's lifted directly from the guidelines. So, water compatible development is allowed in Flood Zone A and water compatible and less vulnerable development is allowable in Flood Zone B. That's what is set out in the guidelines and Cllr Timmins has written that explicitly in the proposed objective for the development of these lands. When it comes to dealing with the planning application, the applicant will have to show that they are in compliance with that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR FERRIS: Can I ask another question, please, Cathaoirleach?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead, Cllr Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you very much, Cathaoirleach. Thinking back to last March, weren't we told that a glamping development would happen there? Glamping is surely another word for camping. So, you know, I can't understand that kind of a project going on to lands, on to flood plain lands. I don't know how someone is going to make an application to do with glamping will be approved for something on a flood plain. I mean, it is not as if people are bringing boats across a piece of land and then getting into the river and that. You know, you're actually talking about glamping and people staying there in the glamping, whatever they are, I don't know what they're called, they are like huts. They're not exactly tents. I just can't see how that would work out.

>>: I am not the spokesperson here but the proposal from the Cllr Edward Timmins is on the part of the sites not in risk of flooding, flood zone C is where the development will occur and the other areas of development, if that is services or so on that go with the glamping will not be where people will stay if allowed in the flood risk areas. Part of the site is in flood zone C where development is allowed and certain types allowed in flood zone B, we retain concerns about the risk of flooding on the site. Why we are not supportive. I am not trying to put words in the Cllr Edward Timmins' mouth about there are parts of the block not at risk of flooding. I understand that the intention is that they are the locations for the development. But that is a matter teased out in a planning application. If Cllr Edward Timmins would like to come in. I don't like speaking for him.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins?

CLLR TIMMINS: When it comes from you, Sorcha, it has more valuing thank you!

SORCHA WALSH: No, it came from you, not me!

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Thank you. Chair. I noticed in the response putting aside objectives around the risk, considering the risk of adverse effects on the environment, on the footing zone it remains high, if you care to elaborate a little about that?

SORCHA WALSH: We believe that zoning land in flood zone A and B is not appropriate and should be avoided. This proposal entails zoning land in A and B although there are caveats to endeavour to eliminate the risks but we retain the concern we don't believe land is zoned in A and B when it does not pass various justification tests so we retain concerns about the development on the lands. But we explain the concerns at the last stage and explain them again today, up to you, the members, knowing the information and having read the flood risk assessment, to make a decision if you

believe that the risk is too high, you do not wish to zone the land or believe the wording that this mitigates against the risk from flooding. So, it is really up to you, to the members to make the decision. We believe there is still a residual risk remaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Briefly, to note as well that the OPW welcomes the plan. So, the OPW are in strong agreement with this. And the flood risk C is actually quite a low risk of flooding. So, it needs to be clarified. Sometimes people think that flood risk C is a flood risk. But it is a low flood risk, is that correct?

SORCHA WALSH: No known risk.

CLLR MULLEN: So, we have to put it in context. Thank you, Cllr Edward Timmins for the work.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. We are bog for a vote. Are we all in agreement? No, we are not.

SORCHA WALSH: We have to have a vote. It is rejecting the Chief Executive's recommendation.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I am still learning this and almost three-quarters of the way through.

HELEN PURCELL: V287 rejecting the Chief Executive report to make amendments as proposed by Cllr Edward Timmins and seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR DOYLE: Can I get clarity on the way we are voting, please, if you don't mind.

HELEN PURCELL: Voting for the amendment, voting for the wording there in red but the Chief Executive is not recommending that. Is that clear?

SORCHA WALSH: Always voting on the amendment that is put to the floor, either for or against.

CLLR FERRIS: That is not clear, are we voting for the Chief Executive's recommendation or not?

HELEN PURCELL: Voting against the Chief Executive recommendation, the Chief Executive is not recommending this amendment. You are voting to reject; you are voting for the amendment to reject the Chief Executive's recommendation.

CLLR FERRIS: So, agreeing with the Chief Executive we are voting yes ... against ... we are voting, no?

HELEN PURCELL: Yes.

>>: The proposals in red are what we are voting on.

CLLR FERRIS: If we agree with the Chief Executive, Cathaoirleach, are we voting yes or no.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If you agree with Cllr Edward Timmins voting for. If you agree with the Chief Executive, you are voting against.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you. Cathaoirleach, that is very clear now.

HELEN PURCELL: Right.

So, it is V2-87. To make the amendment. Which rejects the Chief Executive's report as proposed by Cllr Edward Timmins, seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 24, the 9 against, 3 not present.



CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, members. We will adjourn now to get a cup of tea. Back in half an hour. Thank you.

[A short adjournment]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, members, we will get the roll call now, if everyone is ready to go again. Thank you, Helen.

[Roll call taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha, I will hand over to you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. We are on number V-288. Page 72 of your booklet.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins?

CLLR TIMMINS: Chairman, a couple of my family live on that road, so I wanted to declare that and make myself absent from the meeting and any discussion or vote on it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Mullen?

CLLR MULLEN: I will wait.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Erika.

SORCHA WALSH: V-288 a proposed amendment to the Baltinglass map on page 72 of the amendment document and the proposal is to extend the town boundary of Baltinglass to include the lands and to zone the lands as RE or existing residential. Proposed by Cllr John Mullen at the last meeting with a vote. Set out in page 105 of the Chief Executive's report, the Chief Executive does not support the proposal for the reasons set out in the report. Recommending to make the plan without the proposed amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Again, to remind colleagues we voted this through the last meeting. Again, it is a difference the interpretation most people regard, and looking at the map and see the amount of existing houses on the road it is a part of the town. Everyone regards this road as part of the town. In fact, the existing lands that are, that could be regarded and could be regarded as infill are serviced and could provide local homes for people in the next few years subject to getting through planning permission, so the explanation was [distortion of sound] passed by us at the last meeting. Nothing changed for it not to pass on this meeting. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr John Mullen.

We will move on to vote, sorry, do we have a seconder? Thank you, Cllr Shay Cullen.

HELEN PURCELL: V-288 to make the amendment and elect the Chief Executive report.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 22 for, 6 against, 4 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, thank you. Do you want to ask Edward to come back in again, please.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach on 89, page 73 Newtownkennedy. The amendment to change the land use map to include, to zone a piece of land shown in draft plan as open space to

zone CE which is community and education to add a specific local objective to, as you can see in the red, outlined there to zone the land for a nursing home type development. Recommended by the Chief Executive in his last report and it was agreed by the members and the Chief Executive is still supportive of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, thank you. A proposer? Cllr Shay Cullen. Seconding, Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Are we all in agreement? No dissents? Thank you. A show of hands. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 90, Newtownkennedy in proposal to change land active open space in the draft plan to change to RN new residential. The site has planning permission and is under construction. At the last stage we opposed, the Chief Executive opposed the zoning on the basis of it exceeding the targets for Newtownkennedy but in light of zoning, the Chief Executive is now planning to make it with the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha, do you yes, a proposer please. Thank you, Cllr Patsy Glennon. Seconded by Cllr Tom Fortune. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. 91. This is a proposal to change the land in RN new residential in the draft plan to change to strategic land bank. This, number 91, this was recommended by the Chief Executive at the last time around, agreed by the members and the Chief Executive still supports the change of zoning from RN to strategic land bank on 110 of the Chief Executive Report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien is proposing. A seconder? Cllr Lourda Scott. Thank you, all in agreement. Sorry, Cllr Shay Cullen?

CLLR CULLEN: A question for Sorcha, is this the land recently granted planning permission through the SHD process or is that the next amendment?

SORCHA WALSH: The Western Parts of the lands are part of that SHG [sic] so, part of the lands is part of the SHG, yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All in agreement? No dissents? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 91, a proposal to extend the boundary of Newtown Kennedy and plan and to zone the extended area for strategic land bank. This was proposed by Cllr Shay Cullen at the last meeting, agreed by the members, the Chief Executive did not support it and the Chief Executive continues to not support the proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Do I have a proposer for this? Cllr Shay Cullen, Okay. A seconder? Sorry, Cllr Shay Cullen?

CLLR CULLEN: On the basis that the last vote was supporting strategic land bank, I'm happy to proceed with that again. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

A seconder for that? Cllr John Snell.

CLLR SNELL: If I can say, Cathaoirleach, I would second this proposal. The couple in the Municipal Districts spent a lot of time to look at the Newtownkennedy area in particular. We agreed it should be a strategic land bank and that is what was passed and voted on. Unfortunately, as we know, some people did get a strategic housing development passed against the wishes of the councillors but I think we are staying steadfast to what was passed, the strategic land bank, so that is why I support retaining that for usage beyond the lifeline of the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. We have a proposer and a seconder, are we all in agreement?

HELEN PURCELL: It will need a vote as rejecting the Chief Executive advice.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, we go for a vote. Is everybody in agreement? We are all agreed, Sorcha?

SORCHA WALSH: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, no, Cllr Lourda Scott is not in agreement and Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: No, not in agreement, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We will have to go for a vote then, please, Helen.

HELEN PURCELL: V-292.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 25 for, 4 against, 3 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, we are now moving on to Wrath drone on page 93. Section 4.9 at the time the Chief Executive did not support the proposal and continues not for the reasons set out on page 112 of the Chief Executive Report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Patrick Kennedy, did you want to come in?

CLLR KENNEDY: As members remember, the last time I spoke passionately about this, east of Main Street in Rathdrum where we look to build in New Street and support that, to thank Sorcha and the team for the work but we don't support the fact where the new street ends is fine, we have no problem with the new street but what is proposed is that a line comes from the Memoir Park, so the road comes out to the park in Rathdrum that we do not agree. We have to thank the Rathdrum development association to look at it in depth to offer an alternative exit on to the main road. We are sticking with that. We cannot, under no circumstances allow the only recreational park in the town to be turned into a road. So, rejecting what the Chief Executive is suggesting here, and asking the members to vote with me again to stick with the wording that we have inserted here. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Does anyone else want to come in there on that? Cllr Sylvester Bourke?

CLLR BOURKE: To Cllr Patrick Flynn-Kennedy's proposal it is important to preserve the whole aspect of the Memorial Park and putting road through the centre of it is detrimental to the community. So, I am seconding this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

Okay. We will go for a vote. We have a proposer and a seconder. So can we go for a vote.

HELEN PURCELL: V293 proposed by Cllr Patrick Flynn-Kennedy, seconded by Cllr Sylvester Bourke to make amendment and to reject the Chief Executive recommendation.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: That is 28 for and 4 and no absenters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, we are on 94. Relating to the zoning of lands at Knock... [sic] in Rathdrum to zone 6 hectares for active open space and 6.5 for N R and including objective for the land in March the Chief Executive proposed the proposal with the amount of land zones in Rathdrum Vis-a-vis the growth of the town with guidelines and the fact that permission is granted on part of the site, and I think there is a second or 2 granted and we recommend that the plan is recommended with the proposed amendment as displayed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Anyone like to speak on this, all in agreement. A proposer and seconder? Cllr Patrick Kennedy and Cllr Sylvester Bourke. All in agreement. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. 95 relating to Rathdrum and the proposal to extend the planned boundary by 2 acres to include objective in the plan allow for development of 4 units of the lands. The Chief Executive did not support the proposal in the meeting in March. Put to a vote and I think it was Cllr Sylvester Bourke proposing it and the Chief Executive still does not recommend the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Sylvester Bourke?

CLLR BOURKE: I would like to propose this for a family for four units for four sons to build houses for their local needs. It is probably the least attractive part of the overall site. As well. It is low down. So, I believe that we should be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

Cllr Patrick Kennedy, seconding that. Okay. All in agreement to this? We are not. Okay. We will go for a vote, please, Helen.

HELEN PURCELL: It is V2-95. To support the amendment, proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke, seconded by Cllr Patrick Kennedy.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 22 for, 7 against. 3 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 969 final proposals for change to Rathdrum. To change passive open space shown on the map on 81 to change to employment. The Chief Executive does not support the making of the amendment for the reasons set out on page 117 of his report. Proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke at the last meeting.

CLLR KENNEDY: I will let in Cllr Sylvester Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: As I was proposing we would be using the top end of the field running down to the river as expansion for the wool insulation business for Mr Pierce an acre and-a-half of development. Logical to extend into the field as the existing business is beside it so a growing business and I believe will again rate employment in the town and enhance the economic area there, so I'm prepared to propose it again. To stick with it and to help this business to grow.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Patrick Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: I fully propose this. It is in a cul-de-sac, so it is, the Piers will have been involved in wool business in Rathdrum going back 250 years, it is a unique business to Rathdrum going back to

probably the [inaudible] time but creating jobs, probably not a huge amount of jobs but it is creating jobs. I believe in plans when we make plans and change plans and the last time this was zoned commercial, the last time and we changed the zoning to open space. This time we are looking to revert back the top acre of the land which is the right thing to do and Rathdrum needs jobs and we ask people to support it this time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have a proposer, Cllr Sylvester Bourke and seconder, Cllr Patrick Kennedy. Do we agree or go for a vote. All agreed. Thank you. No dissents. No? A show of hands please. Okay. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, we are now on to the first amendment 97 on page 82 of the document and page 118 of the Chief Executive Report to add extra text in the part of the plans to regards to flood risk and how flood risk is fully addressed with the planning applications in the towns. Recommended by the Chief Executive at the last meeting and agreed and the Chief Executive is still recommending the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do we have a propose. Thank you, Cllr John Snell, seconder, Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 98 to do with the Ashford plan.

So, 98 is proposal to amend turn actionary 1 into a specific local objective area, less complex in terms of preparing master plans and to change the extent of the zoning in the area. So, on page 83 and 84 is the change of the map to change it from and to change it to. Recommended by the Chief Executive the last time around and greed by you the members the last time and the Chief Executive is still recommending this change.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Irene Winters? And Cllr Paul O'Brien seconded. Are we all in favour. Agreement. Okay. No dissents? A show of hands, please.

Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 99 also Ashford. A proposal to extend the boundary of the Ashford plan at Balliny and to zone the land for partial open space and residential space. Proposed by Cllr Gail Dunne at the last meeting with a few submissions and the Chief Executive is not recommending the amendment but recommending that the plan be made without the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Gail Dunne, can you come in?

CLLR DUNNE: Thank you to the Council for the support the last time. We are looking for support again. It is a good proposal and asking for the council to support me. Thank you.

Secunder? Cllr Paul O'Brien thank you. No dissents? Okay, we are all agreed. Thank you.

Show of hands, please. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: To clarify what you agreed is to reject the Chief Executive's advice in that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes. I am saying yes, is that right, Cllr Gail Dunne? Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay. So, now on to 100. Relating to Inchnappa on page 86 of the document, the map on 87 to extend the planned boundary to zone the land for speaks pick local objective, 19 hectares, and to zone the land, 11NR minimum 2.3 hectares for maximum open space and in red on page 86 the development criteria proposed by the members for the development of the land. Proposed by Cllr Gail Dunne and agreed by the members. The Chief Executive's advice at this stage is

to make the plan with the proposed modification but to be modified asset out in the Chief Executive Report on page 126. Recommendation is essentially to zone the land but zone it strategic land bank rather than zone it for rest dental and open space use.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gail Dunne?

CLLR DUNNE: I am looking for it to keep it in. There has been a lot of work done with the councillors in the Municipal District. In fairness to meet up. There is a loft community gain and everybody would be happy when the lands are built on. We have built a lot in Ashford with no community gain. I think there was a planning application last Friday. So, we are looking for the couple to support me on this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien?

CLLR P O'BRIEN: To second Cllr Gail Dunne's proposal. It is all about the community gain. We have seen mistakes made with Newtown with absolutely no community gain. This is the reverse. It is where we will see plenty of community gain in Ashford. As I say with councillor, we should not turn off the tap in the middle of a drought when it comes to housing to acknowledge there is a housing crisis, there is the infrastructure for the houses, that is why I support it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen?

CLLR CULLEN: We have done a lot of work on this in terms of our district. I want to support this zoning. But particularly on the fact that is a huge community gain for the people of Ashford. Going through two SHD processes where there was nothing in terms of community gain, this hopefully to alleviate that and you can see the responses from the public and community that they are very much engaged in this. It has my full support. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Again, just to say that the Municipal District councillors, the 6 of us have met on many occasions with regards to Ashford. Taking the role seriously. There were 7 applications not supported and put into this plan because they were on zoned lands. To such a degree that we could have had an extra 2,200 housing units in Ashford. We went against that. Over 61 hectares of land we didn't submit to put into this. This is close to village centre. It is lands prime location for development, and as previous speakers said in regards to the community gain, Ashford is playing catch-up, like Newtown Kennedy and many areas including Wicklow Town and Rathnew when it comes to their local plan. We want to get it right. The community are with us, always engaged which is why there are so many submissions of support for the community gain.

CATHAOIRLEACH: No dissents? No. All in favour. A show of hands. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: We finish with Ashford moving on to Okay ram on page 88 of the document on page 128 of the Chief Executive report a proposal to extend the planned boundary 0.8 hectares for NR proposed by yourself, chairman at the last meeting. I have it agreed at the last meeting. The Chief Executive does not support the amendment set out in page 128 to recommend to make the plan without amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: This is for a gentleman with family in the area, looking for a couple of houses on it. Which is why I proposed. I got a seconder at the last meeting. Looking for a seconder again. Thank you, Cllr Sylvester Bourke. Are we all agreed? No dissents? No. Sorry?

HELEN PURCELL: Chair, we are not all agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, Cllr Erika Doyle. Let's go for a vote.

HELEN PURCELL: V2-101 to make amendment as proposed by Cllr Tommy Ansley seconded by Cllr Sylvester Bourke.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 21 for, 7 against, 4 not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha, please.

SORCHA WALSH: 102 Carnew and 129 of the Chief Executive Report. Proposal to zoned land for mix of residential and community use in the draft plan it is zoned active open spaces changed from active open to residential and community use, set out in red above the map. Proposed by Cllr John Mullen and agreed by the members. The Chief Executive's response set out on page 130, while the Chief Executive opposed this at the last stage, with the new ministerial guidelines the Chief Executive recommending that the amendment made as proposed with the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Proposer, Cllr John Mullen and Cllr. Vincent Blake to second. All agreed. No dissents. A show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you, we are on 103 page 90 of your document and page 131 of the Chief Executive Report proposed from car knew to extend the planned boundary to zone the land part new and part open space the Chief Executive does not support the making for the reasons set out in page 132 of the support proposed by Cllr. Vincent Blake at the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Vincent Blake, would you like to come in? Do we have a seconder? Cllr John Mullen to second.

CLLR MULLEN: Yes, seconding.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Do we have no dissents? We are all in favour? A show of hands please. Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: To confirm you agreed to reject the CE's advice to make the amendment as published.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes. 104 is also in car knew. A proposal to extend planned boundary in zoned lands measuring hectares for NR, the map shown on page 90, proposed by Cllr. Vincent Blake, you held a vote at the time the Chief Executive advice is on page 133, recommending that the plan made with the proposed amendment but modified so the that the land is zoned strategic land bank rather than NR, the reasons set out on page 133. Cllr. Vincent Blake?

CLLR BLAKE: This is adjacent to the town centre in Carnew. It was in the zoned residential at the moment. We are told time and time again we should not be taking out residential land. It is a development in Carnew, so we want to leave it in as proposed on previous occasions.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do we have a seconder? Cllr John Mullen, thank you. All in agreement. Agreed. Okay. A show of hands, please. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. We are on 105 page 91 of your document and page 134 of the Chief Executive. A similar proposal to extend the planned boundary of Carnew to approximately 3 hectares for use to the Chief Executive suggesting that the plan be made with modifications, the reasons set out on page 134.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Vincent Blake?

CLLR BLAKE: As said before. This land has been serviced and the developer there has put a lot of money into developing the land adjacent to it over a number of years. We do need more housing in Carnew in all fairness. So, to consider this [inaudible]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Seconder. Cllr John Mullen.

All agreed? All agreed. No dissents. A show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: So, finished with Carnew to move on to Dunlavon. Page 92. To extend the boundary in zone for 3.6 hectares for NR proposed by Cllr Edward Timmins. The Chief Executive's comment on that proposal is on 135 of the report. Recommending that you make the proposed modification but modify such that the land is zoned strategic land bank rather than RN.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins?

CLLR TIMMINS: It is like the previous two with Carnew. The land is zoned residential. And this is unusual. They have a brand-new sewage and waste water treatment plant 10 years ago. In the plan almost all of the land around Dunlavon and the rest dental is dezoned. Cronin put in a small part to be zoned. This is another piece to be put in. Close to the main street. As I say, previously zoned so I would look for this to be continued to be taken as a residential zoning. Bear in mind that a lot of Dunlavon has been dezoned.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Patsy Glennon?

CLLR GLENNON: Seconding the motion with the residential use. As outlined by Cllr. Vincent Blake and Cllr Edward Timmins before.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Cronin?

CLLR CRONIN: [distortion of sound] we have to allow for ... we need private development to allow people to stay in the area where they have been born and reared so I want to support the amendment too.

HELEN PURCELL: Supporting, councillor Cronin?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR CRONIN: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is will objection? All in favour? A show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on to 107 on page 93, Tinahely. A proposal to correct wording on the architectural conveys area, recommended by the Chief Executive, agreed by the members, still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All in agreement? A show of hands, please. Thank you. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: 108, page 94 a proposal in Tinahely to extend a planned boundary to zone the land bank. The Chief Executive is happy to support the making of the proposed amendment objecting to it the last time around but happy to support it being zoned for strategic land bank as proposed by Cllr. Vincent Blake.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr. Vincent Blake? Happy to propose. Seconded, Cllr John Mullen? All in agreement? Agreed. A show of hands please, no dissents.



SORCHA WALSH: 109 is similar in Tinahely to zone the land strategic land bank proposed by Cllr John Mullen and the Chief Executive is happy to support the zoning of the land for strategic land bank.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen? Thank you. Seconded by Cllr. Vincent Blake all agreed? No dissents? A show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: The final in Tinahely page 9 R5 of your document with the CE report on page 141 to extend the boundary and zone the lands special, special residential to include an objective in the Tinahely plan to allow for 4 units. And the Chief Executive is happy to support this amendment. Page 141 of the guidelines. Proposed by Cllr John Mullen.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen and seconded by Cllr. Vincent Blake. All agreed. A show of hands.

SORCHA WALSH: 96 amendment 111, an additional objective in regard to addressing flood risk in Avoca. Proposed by the Chief Executive, agreed by the members and the Chief Executive still is supporting it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A proposal, please. Cllr Sylvester Bourke. Secunder? I will second that all in agreement? Thank you very much.

A show of hands, sorry? No dissents? Okay.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on to 112, page 97, Newcastle. The proposal to change the land map. Proposed by the Chief Executive and agreed by the members. A correction to reflect existing boundary of a planning permission already granted so the Chief Executive is recommending to make the amendment as displayed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposal, please? Cllr Derek Mitchell? And Cllr Gerry Walsh seconded. All in agreement? Agreed. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Amendment V2-112. We're on to Newcastle now. So, the proposal is to change the land use map, as you can see there, on page 97. This was proposed by the Chief Executive originally and was agreed by the members the last time. It is just a minor correction to reflect existing boundary of a planning permission already granted so the Chief Executive's recommending that you make the amendment as displayed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Derek Mitchell proposed, Cllr Gerry Walsh seconded. All we all agreed? Agreed. Show of hands, thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Moving on to Roundwood on page 98. We're on amendment 113, in Roundwood. Number 113 relates to land down at objective RD4 at Water's Bridge, where the objective was to zone the land for tertiary zone and for tourism use and with two family dwellings as well. The Chief Executive has evaluated this proposed amendment, a submission was received. It is on page 144 and is recommending that the plan be made without this proposed amendment. It had been proposed by Cllr Shay Cullen.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. We have already passed this in terms of a vote in the last meeting. I want to continue with that. As Sorcha has quite rightly said, it is to try and develop maybe a tourism offering on that land, with family dwellings for two sites, so it is fairly straightforward. I'd appreciate the support on it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I'd like to second Cllr Cullen's proposal there. He's 100% correct, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all in agreement with this? Agreed. No dissents. Show of hands please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay. Number 114 is also in Roundwood. This is a proposal to extend the planned boundary to include the land hatched on the map and to zone the land secondary zone. The Chief Executive's evaluation of that proposal is on page 145 of his report. Having regard to the new ministerial guidelines, the Chief Executive is now recommending the plan be made with that amendment. He had previously opposed it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR CULLEN: I would add, Chairman, the planning permission has already been granted on this piece of land. I note that the Chief Executive has changed his view in terms of the zoning, so I'm looking to retain the zoning that is on it as was voted on in the last meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you, Cllr John Snell will second that. Cllr Paul O'Brien, do you want to come in? You're happy enough? Are we all in agreement? Agreed. Show of hands, thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 115, page 99. A proposal to extend the planned boundary to include the land shown there on the map and to zone it, secondary zone, within objective there in red. This was proposed by Cllr Shay Cullen the last time. The Chief Executive, his recommendations are on page 146. The Chief Executive's recommending that you make the proposed amendment but you modify it by making the land strategic land bank rather than secondary zone.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: The final one for Roundwood, yes. This was voted and passed on in the last meeting. This is in the current plan is zoned residential and we're looking to retain the zoning as is. As you can see from the map on page 99, it is right adjacent to the town centre and has the attributes for development. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed. All agreed. No dissents. Show of hands please.

SORCHA WALSH: We're now on page 100, amendment number 116, it relates to Laragh, Glendalough. The proposed amendment is to include a new objective which addresses flooding in more detail. This was recommended by the CE originally and agreed by the members. The Chief Executive still recommends it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Have I got a proposer please? Cllr Paul O'Brien. Seconded by Cllr Gail Dunne. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. No dissents. Show of hands please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Right. You're delighted to know we're finished Volume 2. Now, it is Volume 3.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Well done.

SORCHA WALSH: Volume 3 of our appendix. We have a number of changes to get through there. So, amendment V3-117 relate to our development and design standards. It is on page 101 of your budget. On the Chief Executive's Report, you should be on page 149. It relates to including a

list of extra documents that we'll have regard to when assessing planning applications, the three bullet points there on 101. It is proposed by the Chief Executive and recommended and agreed by the members the last time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do I have a proposer please? Thank you, Cllr Gail Dunne. Seconded by Cllr Gerry Walsh. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents. Show of hands please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 118 there is to enhance and change some of the wording on section 1.3 about protecting nature and biodiversity in the assessment of planning applications. It was recommended by the Chief Executive and agreed the last time and still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Mary Kavanagh and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. Show of hands please. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 119 is to add an additional sentence on to our objective with regard to noise pollution to provide more information about the guidelines that we'll refer to in the assessment of planning applications. This was proposed by the Chief Executive at the last meeting. It is still supported by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr John Snell, seconded by Cllr Lourda Scott. Everyone in agreement? Thank you. Show of hands. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, number 120. You're on page 102 now is to add additional information on light pollution and standards that will be utilised in the assessment of applications in relation to light pollution. It was recommended by the Chief Executive and is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien. Seconded by Cllr Anne Ferris. All agreed? Thank you very much. Show of hands. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now, we're on number 121. This is to do with our standards for construction management and dealing with environmental aspects of that. It was originally proposed by the Chief Executive and amended by Cllr Lourda Scott at the last meeting. The Chief Executive is recommending that the plan be made with that proposed amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Proposed by Cllr Lourda Scott. Seconded by Cllr Gail Dunne. All in agreement? Agreed. Show of hands please. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: We're on 122. Page 103 of your amendment report. The proposed amendment is to change the standard --

[Problem with sound]

SORCHA WALSH: Amendment number 123 is on page 103 of your document. The proposal is to add additional text with regard to enclosures. It is recommended by the Chief Executive at the last stage and agreed by the members and is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Anne Ferris, proposed. Cllr Rory O'Connor seconded. All in agreement? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, proposed amendment 124 is to include a new map in the plan showing that the danger zone and the Department of Defence's training area on a map in the plan and the map isn't actually in this document but it was in your previous document. It is online also am. It was

recommended by the Chief Executive. Essentially it is marking the area that the military use up in the glen so people are aware of it in the assessment of planning applications or the making of planning applications. It is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: I propose it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Who seconds it? Cllr Edward Timmins. Okay. Thank you. All in agreement? Show of hands please? Thank you. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 125 is to do with density. This is appendix a proposal to take out, delete a section of the plan, delete a section of this section of the plan with regards to density in neighbourhood centres. At the time we didn't recommend it as it didn't really fit with the density guidelines. It was recommended by the Chief Executive. You, the members, agreed with it. The Chief Executive is still supporting it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Have I got a proposer please? Cllr Melanie Corrigan. Seconded by Cllr Anne Ferris. All in agreement? Agreed. Show of hands please. No dissents. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number 126. You're on page 104 of your document. This is to do with the open space standards for duplex units. At the moment, duplexes are treated as dwellings and the private open space requirements are 60 to 75 square metres which has been proven very difficult to achieve for duplexes. The proposed amendment was to reduce that requirement to ten square metres per bedroom. We got a number of submissions in relation to that. We have reconsidered that and sketched up and looked at a number of duplex-type developments. We do believe that a three bedroomed duplex would be quite difficult to deliver given it is on a balcony. We are recommending that the plan be made with the amendment with a modification, page 153 of your Chief Executive's Report, the modification is that a one-bedroom duplex has 10 square metres and thereafter it is ten square metres per additional bedroom. A three bedroom would require 20 square metres rather than 30 square metres. In some cases, we believe it is an appropriate amount of open space for duplexes which are very much like dwellings and are being utilised by families. We believe the application of a lower rate such as you would find for apartments would potentially be too low for a typical duplex. This is our recommendation in terms of the modification we are proposing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Are you happy that it can be achieved, 20 square metres can be achieved by the duplex, especially one that doesn't have, if it is up steps and doesn't have direct access to outside open space, outside private open space? Do you think it is achievable, 20 square metres?

SORCHA WALSH: It can be achievable and the developer will design in 20 square metres. It is perfectly achievable but it has to be designed into the proposal. The private open space should be a by-product of other elements of the design, that whatever is left open can be the open space. If our standard is 20 square metres then the designers will have to design that into the proposal. Going down to 20 is quite a significant reduction and we think it is completely achievable. Designers have to design it into their proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do I have a proposer for this, please? Cllr Irene Winters. Seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen. All agreed? All agreed.

SORCHA WALSH: Can I confirm you are agreeing to accept the Chief Executive's modification? The Chief Executive's advice?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry. Cllr Anne Ferris wants to come in.

CLLR FERRIS: If we vote against it, it remains at the larger open space?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Would that be right, Sorcha?

SORCHA WALSH: Your options are to reject this amendment altogether and the requirement for duplexes will be 65 to 70 square metres as is in the County Development Plan. The option one is to go with the proposed amendment as published which was ten square metres per bedroom. Option three is to go with the Chief Executive's proposed modification which is ten square metres for the first bedroom and five square metres for every bedroom thereafter. You do have three options.

CLLR FERRIS: Cathaoirleach, I think I would prefer it to remain as it was because to reduce to that amount, it really doesn't give people of space.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I'm probably missing something here so maybe somebody could let me know. If we're suggesting now to reduce it, I'm just wondering why the developers are against the suggestion to reduce it. If this doesn't come through, it will stay at the larger amount. Why would they not support this? I'm probably missing something really obvious here. I'm not sure. I would imagine it is in their interest to reduce -- is it that there's currently no minimum at all? I'm wondering why they would be against it. Thank you, Chair.

SORCHA WALSH: Duplexes should be treated like apartments and an even lower provision of private open space should be provided for duplex than we're currently recommending to you. They should be treated like apartments where you can have a much lower rate of private open space. We're trying to come in through the middle and something that is achievable. This is at the first-floor level, remember, on a depend lucks. There is an apartment at the ground floor and either a two-storey unit above and the private open space is essentially the space on top of the bedroom -- on top of the apartment on the ground floor. So, it is almost impossible to achieve the 60 to 75 square metres anyway, and in a number of cases, the developers have been able to make the case, particularly to An Bord Pleanála, that the 60 to 65 metres is unreasonable. Sometimes the An Bord Pleanála have accepted that argument. We don't necessarily agree with that but we do agree that the 60 to 75 metres is not achievable on that balcony plinth on the ground floor apartment. We think something between 20 to 30 square metres is achievable and more reasonable for a duplex unit, as it is more of a house than an apartment. The 60 to 75 square metres, we don't think it is achievable, so I'm recommending that you amended it to a more achievable amount of private open space. It can be the ten metres per bedroom as proposed, or the proposed modification which is ten square metres for the first bedroom and five square metres thereafter.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Yes, thanks Cathaoirleach. I think I'm missing something here again. I understand Sorcha your explanation about the three-plus bedroom and I probably accept that. But then are we voting to reduce the minimum private space for, say, a one bedroom or two bedrooms from 50 square metres to 10 square metres, that seems quite a drop. Is that 50 square metres not practically possible? Could you just go through that piece a bit.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I bring in Cllr Irene Winters as well in case we're repeating questions?

CLLR WINTERS: Can I just say my understanding of what I have proposed is that currently, when apartments and duplexes have been built, the developers are using the apartment guidelines which is basically absolutely minimal outdoor spaces. We currently, for houses, suggest 50 square metres for one and two bedroomed houses and 60 to 75 square metres for three bedrooms plus houses. They are suggesting that a duplex is not a house, that it's an apartment. So, this is why I'm proposing it. I understand what this will do is guarantee the duplexes and apartments will have a minimum amount of outdoor space guaranteed to them, which they currently don't have. Now, if that's not what's, actually -- that's what I think I'm proposing and I just want Sorcha to confirm that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sorcha, can you?

SORCHA WALSH: I think Cllr Irene Winters has hit a good point on the head there. If we have a standard that a duplex has to have 60 to 75 square metres of private open space and this is on a balcony terrace-type feature, it is not achievable on a typical duplex, because the ground floor unit, say, even if it is a large enough apartment on the ground floor, say it is 80 square metres, that would mean that the space above that, the duplex unit above that, say that has two floors of 40 square metres and 40 square metres, there isn't enough room on top of the ground floor apartment to meet our standards. So, Cllr Lourda Scott asked is the 50 square metres achievable for the one to two bedrooms, probably not. If we have a standard that's clearly unachievable and excessive, it gives an extra argument to developers to reject or to ask An Bord Pleanála to consider those standards unreasonable and to reject them completely and, therefore, use the apartment standards which are much, much lower. We believe if we come down somewhere in the middle and somewhere more reasonable, there's more likelihood of it being accepted by both designers and developers and An Bord Pleanála, rather than it just defaulting completely to the lowest standard which is the apartment. I think this is taking me a reasoned and measured approach to say we came up with a solution that is a midpoint between the two and, therefore, should be achievable and we should insist on it. If we have a standard that is clearly way too high and non-achievable but nothing else to offer, then the An Bord Pleanála or others might feel that the apartment standards should be bedrooms utilised.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Anne Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Cathaoirleach, I appreciate that explanation and I'm happy with Sorcha's reasoning on it. So, I've no ox to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. It was proposed by Cllr Irene Winters. It was seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen. Are we all in agreement? Sorry, Cllr John Snell wants to come in.

CLLR SNELL: There was another option being offered to the members, which was 10 square metres per bedroom rather than the second bedroom being reduced to five square metres. I'd like to propose that, if I could. That it be 10 square metres per bedroom in duplexes. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. So, now what happens, we have to go back again, Sorcha?

HELEN PURCELL: We haven't voted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

HELEN PURCELL: We hadn't actually voted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Right, okay.

HELEN PURCELL: This is an amendment from the floor. We were accepting the Chief Executive's recommendation with modifications from the report whereas now you're putting forward an amendment, Cllr John Snell, that it is ten square metres per bedroom.

CLLR SNELL: There are three options. As was said from the top table there, we could go with ten square metres per bedroom and that's the option I'd like to go with rather than reducing. Like previous speakers, like Cllr Anne Ferris, had a concern in regards to reducing too much, I feel it is a step too far. I'd like the option of proposing that we go for ten square metres per bedroom.

ADMINISTRATOR: What is in front of you is the Chief Executive's recommendations. You are for or against. What you're saying is to eliminate the option about the bedrooms, so it is ten square metres per bedroom?

SORCHA WALSH: It is on page 104, to revert to the amendment as published. So, it is to make the amendment as published without the Chief Executive's recommended modification.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: I disagree with Cllr John Snell's proposal. The management already suggested that we go with the ten square metres for the first and subsequent bedrooms, five square metres and that would leave a 20 square metre balcony. Under Cllr John Snell's proposal that would go up to 30. I'm not sure it is achievable. I think it puts an extra strain on that design. I think the proposal by the manager for ten and subsequent fives is a more reasonable proposal. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR TIMMINS: As proposed by Cllr Irene Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mary Kavanagh.

CLLR KAVANAGH: I was just querying if we were rejecting the Chief Executive's recommendation, then we would be voting for duplexes shall, generally, be provided with private open space at a minimum rate of ten, that's what would have been voting on until Cllr Snell proposed his amendment, which I think is the same thing, ten square metres per bedroom. I guess the point that Cllr Edward Timmins is making about 30, but I think 15 for a two bedroom is very small. Could we have a minimum of 20 and then 25 for a third bedroom? A minimum of 20 for two beds?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Snell wants to come back in.

CLLR SNELL: My light was on there, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry.

CLLR SNELL: My light was on there but you hadn't turned it off.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: If I was viewing that apartment and I was in the lift, would the rooms be accessible for a wheelchair user as a purchaser or whatever? I mean, it has to be considered in this. It really has. Reducing rooms to a shoebox is not accessible.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Now Sorcha, what is your advice on this one?

SORCHA WALSH: With respect to Cllr Miriam Murphy's point, this is not about the internal dimensions of the indoor space. This is about private open space.

The members can vote to make the amendment with the Chief Executive's modifications, which means the 10 square metres and then five-five. If they do not pass that, then it reverts to -- sorry, they'd have to do a vote then to make the amendment as published. They'd have to have two votes, I think.

ADMINISTRATOR: Which is one?

SORCHA WALSH: To accept or reject the risk's recommendation, with the modification. If that is then rejected, we can go to Cllr John Snell for his proposal to make the plan with the amendment as published.

CLLR FERRIS: Sorry, Cathaoirleach. What was the published amendment?

SORCHA WALSH: You're either for or against the amendment?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, I have a question from Cllr Anne Ferris. She wants to know what the amendment is?

CLLR FERRIS: What was the published amendment, was it ten square metres per bedroom?

SORCHA WALSH: Okay, the amendment that was published was ten square metres per bedroom. The Chief Executive is now recommending a modification to that, so it is ten square metres for the first bedroom and five square metres for any bedroom thereafter. I believe there is going to be a vote on that proposal to make the amendment with the Chief Executive's modification first. If you vote for that, you're voting for the standard which is ten square metres, plus five, plus five.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Derek Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: I support the Chief Executive's recommendation on this and would like a vote. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. We will go to a vote, then. Is everyone clear what they're voting on?

If this one fails, we will go to Cllr John Snell's.

HELEN PURCELL: It is V3-126, to agree the amendment with the Chief Executive's modifications, proposed by Cllr Irene Winters, seconded by Cllr Shay Cullen.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 19 for, ten against, two not present, one abstaining. So that motion is carried.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, members. Sorcha, please.

SORCHA WALSH: We are on number 127 now, it's on page 105 of your published amendments. This relates to the intensity of development, mainly entails omitting text which relates to minimum density standards on employment and industrial standards. This was recommended by the Chief Executive last time and the Chief Executive is still recommending it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, members. Cllr Paul O'Brien. You are proposing, thank you. Secunder? Cllr R O'Connor. Thank you. Are we all in agreement, or is anyone dissenting? Agreed. Can we just show hands, please. Thank you. Thank you, Sorcha.



SORCHA WALSH: Number 128 is on page 105 of your booklet. But the amendment is on page 106. This relates to an amendment were in larger housing developments, that consideration should be given to dedicating part of the open space to community garden use. This was recommended by the Chief Executive last time and agreed by the members and is still recommended by the Chief Executive.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, can I have a proposer, please? Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Seconded by Cllr John Snell. All agreed? Show of hands, please. Thank you. No dissent. Thank you, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: Thank you. So, number 129 is in relation to the housing strategy. So, you will recall that due to the changes that were made and have now been agreed at this meeting, to the core strategy, there is knock on effects to the housing strategy as the same data and tables needs to be replicated in the housing strategy. So, there is numerous tables throughout this, but they are basically reflective of decisions you have already made with respect to the core strategy tables. It was pointed out in one submission that there was a typo in this, so on page 156 of the Chief Executive's report, reference is made to, you can see the red and purple text there, that 2021 was written instead of 2020. This mistake isn't replicated anywhere else in the plan, it isn't in the core strategy, it was just a typo in the housing strategy. So, the Chief Executive is recommending that you make the amendments to the housing strategy, which are like changes consequent on your decisions to the core strategy, but with that modification that you do that correction of that typo. So that is his advice on page 156.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That is straightforward, I think. Cllr John Snell and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you. All in agreement? Thank you. Show of hands. Lovely. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now we are going on to our Record of Protected Structures. So, you need to flick on to page 185 of your proposed amendments document. You should be on page 157 of the Chief Executive's Report. So, we have a number of structures, or items that were proposed to be added to the Record of Protected Structures the last time around and you were, the Chief Executive recommended that these be added to the Record of Protected Structures but that the description of a number of them be changed. So, they are not new structures being added, it's not a completely new site, it's just a description. So maybe this was, do we need to go through them one by one? I think it would probably be the best thing to do quickly. So, we are on V3, 130A, that is the change of description of the Octagon viewing tower in Glen of The Downs. the Chief Executive is recommending you agree with all these. So can we have a proposer and seconder.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer, Cllr R O'Connor, seconder, Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. All in agreement? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: B is the Water's Bridge at the Vartry Reservoir and again it's to change the description.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer, please. Shay Cullen wants to come in, sorry.

CLLR S CULLEN: Just briefly. I want to clarify really, Sorcha, Water's Bridge there is funding secured for a foot path along that bridge. Would that have an impact on what we are voting on?

SORCHA WALSH: The description change wouldn't have an impact, the adding of this to the Record of Protected Structures would be a new consideration potentially. So, you have to make the final decision now on whether you are adding this to the Record of Protected Structures at all.

CLLR S CULLEN: My point is if we agree to add it to the record, by putting a foot path along that bridge will that hinder or make any difference to what we are voting on?

SORCHA WALSH: I can't say that, because that is a design matter for the designers of the foot path on whether, it being on the Record of Protected Structures, whether installing a foot path has any adverse impact on the bridge itself. I can't say that without knowing details of the project and without a project-specific assessment being undertaken. Foot paths were built on protected structures or near protected structures regularly and amendments can be made to protected structures as long as they don't damage the integrity of the structure. It's not evidence from this discussion what impact a foot path could have on that bridge. I can't say.

CLLR S CULLEN: On the basis of that I will be voting against this, I know funding has been secured and a foot path is to be constructed in the coming months. So, I would ask members to vote against this on the basis that that foot path links the Vartry Trails and is an integral part of the whole loop when it comes to the Vartry Trails so I don't think it's worth the risk of putting this forward at this moment in time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Anyone else want to come in? Cllr Pat Kennedy.

CLLR P KENNEDY: I will second Cllr Cullen's proposal there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. So, we are going to go for a vote on this.

SORCHA WALSH: So, the proposal is not to add this to the Record of Protected Structures at all.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

HELEN PURCELL: So V3130B. Proposed by Shay Cullen and seconded by Cllr Pat Kennedy. Not to include the Water's Bridge.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell wants to come in here.

CLLR SNELL: Just on a point of clarification, because this fundamentally different to what went out on public display and from a heritage point of view, the importance of the bridge. I share concerns of Cllr Cullen as well that it would impact. There is no doubt it would impact in regard to any works to go along the side of that bridge. I think that fundamentally what you are doing is you are now proposing to take it completely out of the plan and I don't think that is what was indicated here. It was only a word change. I think the public haven't had an opportunity to see are you taking this completely out of the plan, because today all we were doing was changing the wording on it and I don't think it's as clear-cut as just saying now we are going to vote to take this completely out of it. There is a lot of historians and a lot of people in the Heritage Forum, for example, who take particular interest in this and I have them in mind when I say that here today and it's not to be controversial or hold up the meeting, but the reality is that I do want us to follow proper procedures and get a little bit of guidance on this. So, if it means bypassing this and coming back to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to ask Sorcha to come back in.

SORCHA WALSH: I don't think you need to bypass anything; this is your day that you are making your final decision on whether to add any of these new structures to the Record of Protected Structures. So, the structure was put in the draft plan as a proposed addition, at the last meeting what was agreed was to propose to modify the description and that came from submissions. The submission came to us saying that the description wasn't accurate. You weren't making the final decision on whether to add this to the Record of Protected Structures or not. Today is the day you make the final decision whether to add it or not. So, all you agreed last time was to change the description of it and now you are making your final decision, so you are entitled to add it to the Record of Protected Structures or not and to add it with this wording or with, if you do decide to add it with this wording

or the original wording. So, I believe in terms of process you are entitled to not add this to the Record of Protected Structures, if you see fit. This is your final decision day.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr M Kavanagh.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I would share concerns as well that if we take this out, it isn't part of the protected structures, so effectively it has no protection. As Cllr Snell said, there are historians and local people who would probably be very upset if they wanted this in, recorded as a protected structure and we didn't go ahead. I just think there is not enough information as to how it could maybe be compromised by leaving it in and if there was then building around it or whatever, foot paths. I just, I am just concerned about, if it loses its protected structure, can it potentially be damaged basically?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Snell, do you want to come back in again?

CLLR SNELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. It was just to get clarification around it. Personally, I don't want it to impact on anything that is going to happen positively in the area. But I am making the point in regards to the public and that is what we are, public representatives, and while we have the power to take this out of the plan, I fully understand that and concur with what Sorcha has said, but the reality is that I don't think the public would have envisaged we were coming here today to take that out of the plan, when it was only a word change. I am happy enough either way, based on what Sorcha has said, I don't necessarily agree with it, but look it, it can go back to the public. It will be done and dusted here today and they can have their say in six years' time, but unfortunately, I don't think that is what historians and people who have heritage at heart would have thought would have happened here today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dermot O'Brien, please.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: [ On mute]

CATHAOIRLEACH: You are on mute, Cllr O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Apologies. I think it's a huge decision to remove something on a whim that is being proposed to be protected. But working from what Sorcha said, I imagine, this won't be the first time a path will be included in a protected structure, so I would have maybe a little bit of faith that those who are proposing to build that know what they are doing and that if we retain this as a protected structure, then whatever is done supplementary will be done correctly and will honour the protected status of this. So, I would be very keen to keep it in, thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cullen you want to come back in.

CLLR S CULLEN: Firstly, I want to say this is a historic bridge and, like all of the structures around the Vartry, I want to see it protected. But I have to let members understand here, there is a major safety issue on this bridge and the community have been calling for a foot path on this particular bridge for years and it has only been funded in the last couple of months by the Council. I can't emphasise that enough. Safety is paramount here. Historic bridge, that is absolutely fine and I support that, but safety is paramount and for that reason, I have to insist that the foot path goes ahead. Now, if we want to put a caveat in that we protect the bridge, but it won't impede a foot path going in, I am very supportive of that, but as I say and I am saying it for the last time, I have to take the health and safety of the community, who use the Vartry Trails and walk along a public road, a very busy public road. I have to take that into account. For that reason, that is why the foot path is absolutely necessary on this stretch of road. It's about 140 metres long, that is what we are looking at here and it has been funded and ready to go.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I don't know what the, I mean I understand that it's been funded for a foot path. My understanding from anything else I have ever seen if it's funded once you put in a protected structure, usually most of the funding gets eaten up in reports, rather than actual delivery of the project. So, I would imagine and would trust that the planners will sensitively allow a foot path to be erected that won't impact the integrity of the bridge, but by making it a protected structure, I think that we may impact the suitability of the structure for a walkway and where as I had initially said I would propose to have it included in the protected structures, I now wouldn't until the foot path is in place and it can be added after that. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Look I am an advocate of anything historical. I wouldn't like to see any historical building or structure damaged. At the same time as Shay Cullen pointed out, it's safety first, I don't want it on my conscience to vote against losing the foot path and something happens. Plus, it boils down to common sense at times. Cllr Cullen represents there; he is living up there. Sometimes we have to take the word of our fellow councillors and go with a bit of common sense here. So, I fully support Cllr Cullen on this one.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I am just looking for some clarification. If we vote this in as a protected structure, will it affect, if the funding has already been got and the plans are already in place, surely this comes after that? Will it impact the funding if we vote it in as a protected structure by the time the plan is endorsed?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Go raibh maith agat, Cathaoirleach. Yes, there has been a lot of discussions about historians, so, as a history graduate, I would love to just say that I certainly would support safety measures for this. That can be part of the future history of this bridge. That we can look then, once it's been put in place, that we can, if needs be, or if possible, re- add it in the future to becoming a protected structure again. So, I would actually agree with what Cllr O'Brien said we have to take the word of the local councillors in the area that have been working on this issue, so I would agree.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. Sorcha, there is a couple of questions there for you, if you wouldn't mind, or the Chief Executive...

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I will mention about the funding. It is announced recently the rural funding scheme, whereby I suppose certain areas around the county were, I suppose compensated for want of a better description, that didn't get funding under the active travel scheme, where it was more focussed on the urban areas. So, a number of areas and there were two projects in Roundwood that were funded. So that is the project we are talking about, it's Wicklow County Council own funding through development levies we are talking about. I am not sure that answers your question? What was the specific question about the funding?

CLLR LEONARD: It wasn't about... [INAUDIBLE]... I was asking will funding, will the funding, like I mean the funding has obviously been acknowledged for the bridge before we are voting on it being a protected structure, so would that not still be in place if we vote as a protected structure, it's come after the funding and like do we need to go for planning for the foot path or?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Depending on the works, it would be the Part 8 process. It would be required.

CLLR LEONARD: That is not in place.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: No, it's just the allocation that could be made.

CLLR LEONARD: So, could impact.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: It's a rough draft, so it would have to go through the normal Part 8 process.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Will there be any opportunity to add this to the protected structure list after this process? When these works are complete sometime in the future, outside of the development plan process?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Grace McManus.

CLLR McMANUS: I know this has been asked before but I am not clear. If the funding has already been committed to by council officials and it's going to go to a part 8, why would including this as a protected structure stop any of this process? I am not clear on why it wouldn't, if the funding has been committed to and the local councillors will make the decision via part 8 then why? I don't understand, if someone could clarify, please.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, do you want to clarify that, or the Chief Executive?

>>: Can I say one thing, if you make a protected structure, the whole criteria of the assessment will fall under that remit and that is what will dictate it. It could, I could perceive a situation as that the cost to put in a foot path, given that it's a protected structure and all the elements that is needed within that criteria could add significantly to the cost. That, let's say, under the current situation, may not need to be there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we all clear on this now? Right, we are going to go for a vote then. Sorry, Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Quickly, Cllr Walsh asked a question that wasn't answered, could this be added at a later date? If so, then obviously Cllr Cullen could move this here today and can be supported by all members and it could be added some time down the line, if we have had clarification on that. Obviously after a foot path is put in. No one wants to hold up the works that has already been planned.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cullen.

CLLR S CULLEN: A final point, I am very much of that view that Cllr winters and Snell have made, I am quite happy for this to be put in at a later stage, once the foot path and the safety measures have been put in place and I am committed to having it as part of the protected structures at a later stage. Whether that is one year, two years' time, as soon as the work is completed on the safety measures are in place, absolutely no problem.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, can you answer that?

SORCHA WALSH: The next time we are undertaking a review of the Record of Protected Structures we can certainly look at adding it if the members don't add it today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That is great. Very simple in the end, really. How do we go for a vote on that one, Sorcha? We vote against the Chief Executive's decision to add this in?

SORCHA WALSH: No, you are voting to not add this to the Record of Protected Structures.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So, we don't really have to have a vote.

SORCHA WALSH: We do.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead Helena.

HELEN PURCELL: It's V3, 130B. Proposed by Cllr Cullen and seconded by Cllr Pat Kennedy not to include.

>>: [INAUDIBLE]... Helen Purcell.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So, voting not to include it you vote for.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: 25 for, three against, two not present and two abstaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: So, we are going on to number C here. 130C, we amend this to include this structure in the Record of Protected Structures and change its description to overflow, spillway, weir at the Vartry Reservoir.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have I got a proposal for this? Thank you. Shay Cullen. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Are we all in agreement? Agreed. No dissents. Show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Number D. That is on page 186 and that is just to clarify that that is an existing entry on the Record of Protected Structures to make it clear towards Enniskerry Bridge at Monastery Road. So just changing the wording on the RPS at the moment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Melanie Corrigan.

CLLR CORRIGAN: I didn't realise it was just a change of the wording. I wanted to clarify something on that. We haven't got an application in yet, but we have been talking about putting a bridge, a walkway on the other side of that bridge to make it safer for walking, but obviously that is too late now, if it's already in, it's just a clarification of the name. Is that right?

SORCHA WALSH: This yes, this is an entry already on the Record of Protected Structures. That bridge is already protected. Someone pointed out that the record says Enniskerry, Monastery Road.

CLLR CORRIGAN: What I was seeking clarification on isn't relevant.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Second it, Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. Thank you, all agreed. Show of hands. Thank you. Thank you, Sorcha.

SORCHA WALSH: So, we are now on E, which is also this is to change the description of an existing entry on the Record of Protected Structures to clarify the correct townlands. It's the only change in this proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Snell and seconded by? Have I got a seconder. Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard. Thank you. All agreed? Lovely, thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: The next one is Derrybawn Bridge and it's a protected structure and it's to change the description.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Snell. Second by? Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy. All agreed? Thank you. No dissents.

SORCHA WALSH: G is also to amend the description of Derrybawn House which is already a protected structure.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr M Kavanagh. Seconded by Cllr Ferris. All agreed? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: H is to amend a description there as well of the Glendalough Mines.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by John Snell and seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. All agreed? Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Now we are on amendment number 131. This is to do with the strategic flood risk assessment. So, the strategic flood risk assessment is an ongoing process that occurs throughout the development plan. When you adopted that it underwent a strategic flood risk assessment and you were aware of the data on that. As you made proposed amendments, addendums are created to add to that report to assess anything new that has come up. So, the proposed amendment is simply to accept this addendum to the flood risk assessment which is adding extra assessment of any of the amendments that were proposed and to include that in the final flood risk assessment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do I have a proposer please? Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Seconded by Melanie Corrigan. All agreed? Agreed, thank you. Show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: We need to move forward slightly in the document now. So now you are on page 235 of the proposed amendments document. This is amendment number 132. This is a similar thing, we had to do an informal assessment as part of the draft plan and we are proposing some changes to the wording of that infrastructure assessment based on additional or updated information we received through the plan-making process. So, if you for example were to go to page 244 of the document you would see additional information provided with regard to sewerage network in Bray. If you go to page 245, again more information on waste water network in Wicklow, Rathnew, so these are all updates that have come to our attention throughout the plan. So, it's just to update that informal assessment. This was recommended by the Chief Executive the last time and he is still recommending these updates to the infrastructural assessment report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have I got a proposer? Sylvester Bourke and Cllr Ferris. Thank you. All in agreement? All in agreement, thank you. Show of hands, please. Thank you.

SORCHA WALSH: Then the last amendment. This isn't the last vote, there is a couple of more, so don't go running out once this is finished. This is page, number 133, on page 266 of the proposed amendments document. This relates to a proposed change to zoning in Enniskerry. This was proposed by Cllr Behan at the last meeting and there was a vote on it. The Chief Executive's assessment of this proposed amendment is set out on page 161 and 162 of the Chief Executive's report and for the reasons set out by the Chief Executive he is not recommending this amendment be made, he is recommending the plan be made without this amendment. That is on page 162 of his report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Joe Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. You might recall this also was discussed at the end of the last meeting in March and it was one of the few occasions where we had a completely unanimous vote of support which was to effectively rectify injustice which had been done to a working family farm, where it had been changed in a previous plan from agricultural use to open space with a lot of the attendant difficulties that would cause for a working farm if that continued to be the case.

Rather than dragging out the discussion, I have reams of paper that I could read out but no-one wants to hear them. The planning regulator didn't have an opinion which I was surprised to see. I would like to propose that that amendment remains in the plan and that appendix. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Joe Behan. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I said at the last one and will say it this time, I commend Cllr Joe Behan for bringing this to our notice and bringing this submission.

Again, I will just repeat what I said very quickly the last time. We get very little powers as councillor, but if I can give this family peace of mind, I'm happy to support this. I commend Cllr Behan for bringing it forward.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Yes, I would like to support Cllr Behan in this as well. This family has been hard done by. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Melanie Corrigan.

CLLR CORRIGAN: I'd like to support this as well. It is a local farming family on their family lands that have been there farming it for a long time. I 100% support this and ask that everybody else does also.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Rory O'Connor.

CLLR O'CONNOR: I don't think anything else could have been said. I want to say I fully support this. It would mean a lot to the family and, you know, I got contacted by the family afterwards and our full unity on this issue would mean a lot to them.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Rory O'Connor. Has everyone spoken now? Okay. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. If it hasn't been formally seconded, I'm happy to second Cllr Behan's proposal. This family aren't asking for any special treatment, anything extra, they're just asking for an injustice to be overturned. I fully support this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Joe Behan, can I go for a vote now?

HELEN PURCELL: We can agree it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Is there any dissent on this? We're all agreed. Agreed. Okay. Thank you very much. I'm in agreement as well. All agreed.

SORCHA WALSH: Cathaoirleach, there are two more steps we have to go through. The first relates to appropriate assessment wishing is one of your environmental assessments. The last step is to do a final vote on the plan, to adopt the plan. I'm just going to tell you a little bit about the situation with appropriate assessment. Appropriate assessment is the assessment that you would have carried out throughout the plan making process of any potential impacts that might have arisen from any provision of the plan on a mature site. You will have seen the documents in your assessment. At each stage, the contents of the plan or the amendments as the case may be would have had to have been screened initially to see if they were likely or there was a possibility of an



impact on the European site. If any proposals had the potential to give rise to impacts, they went through a fuller assessment, a second stage of appropriate assessment. Follow that second stage, at each stage along the way, we have advised you that subject to the mitigation measures that are integrated into the plan being applied and being fully applied, that we didn't predict that adverse impacts would arise on the Natura 2,000 sites as a result of the plan. It is contained in the reports we have given you to date.

Including in the proposed amendment, say, for example, that we got today, we gave you a comment on whether we thought any issues arose with appropriate assessment.

Section 177 of the Planning Act requires that before you make the decision to adopt the plan, a determination is made by the competent authority, that the plan you are about to adopt is not likely to give rise to adverse impacts or infect the integrity of the European sites. So, the executive is happy at this point to advise you that we're happy to make that declaration or that determination, that having incorporated the mitigation measures, the plan is not fore seen to give rise to any effect on the integrity of any European site alone or in combination with other plans or projects and this evaluation is made in light of the conservation objectives of the habitat or species for the sites that have been so designated.

This is just a moment of protocol and explains compliance with the statute that we're advising you that the executive is happy to make that determination that at this point so you can now go ahead and adopt the plan with that determination having been made. You don't have to do anything but it is just to let you know that that determination has been made.

The final step then is to adopt the plan and Helen Purcell will read out the full text of what you're now adopting. Give her a bit of time just to read through it. It is quite long. I think you have a copy of it in front of you. But it is setting out that you have considered everything that you are supposed to have considered and that you're now making the plan, having considered all of the correct documentation.

HELEN PURCELL: Having considered the Draft Plan, the Proposed Material Amendments, the Chief Executive's Reports on Consultations on the Draft Plan and the Proposed Material Amendments and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) environmental report for the Draft Plan and the Proposed Material Amendments; the Appropriate Assessment (AA), Natura Impact Report for the Draft Plan, and the Proposed Material Amendments; the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Draft Plan and the Proposed Material Amendments; written submissions relating to SEA, AA and SFRA made during the plan preparation process; ongoing advice on SAE, AA and SFRA from the Council's agents; the final consolidated Natura Impact Report and the final AA determination, in accordance with the provision of Section 12 (10) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the members agree, by resolution, to make the County Development Plan 2022 to 2028, with those proposed amendments that have been agreed today, with those proposed amendment that have been agreed to make with minor modifications today, without those proposed amendments that were not agreed today, for the reasons set out at today's meetings and previous meetings of the 28th and 29th March 2022, and any changes consequent required as, as a result, of the agreed amendments and with any minor data or document updates that have arisen during adoption of this plan, and to proceed in accordance with section 12 (12) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) to publish notice of the making of the plan.

I need a proposer please.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Shay Cullen proposed. Seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn-Kennedy.

HELEN PURCELL: Now, we will take a vote.

[Vote taken]

HELEN PURCELL: Vote: 31 for and 1 not present. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Edward Timmins want to come in.

CLLR TIMMINS: Really briefly, as Chairman of the SPC, I'd like to thank Sorcha and her team for all of the work they did over the last couple of years and I'd also like to thank you advice Chairman and the previous two Chairmen who held it together to make this development plan possible. Thanks. Thanks to everyone.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Pat Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: I want to be associated with the remarks of Cllr Edward Timmins and thank you, Chairman, for the way you conducted the day. Thanks to Sorcha and her team and Bernie and Breege and all of the team for their help they gave to us during the whole process. It is not an easy process. Thank you to the whole management team for the hand holding that went on during the last couple of years to bring this together.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I want to bring in Lorraine, please.

LORRAINE GALLAGHER: Cathaoirleach, I'd like to thank the planning team for all of their support and effort as well. I'd also like to thank the corporate team who work very closely with the planning team. Helen purr cell and Caroline for her support today. I'd also like to thank Teresa as well and our captioners who are there online to produce the transcript. Thanks, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Director.

BREDA MCCARTHY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Congratulations on our now adopted County Development Plan 2022 to 2028. As I said at the beginning, this is one of the most important policy documents that you, as elected members, will have put through in your time.st just to say to you no, just to reiterate, this adopted plan will come into effect in six weeks' time, unless a draft ministerial direction is received in relation to any aspect. With regard to those aspect, it will put those aspects on hold but the rest of the adopted plan will come into effect.

Congratulations and go home now and get some food and rest.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I've two more speakers to come in. Cllr Stephen Stokes.

CLLR STOKES: Gura mile maith agat, Cathaoirleach. I just want to commend everybody that was involved in this, including yourself, Sorcha, Helen, all of the staff and the planning team and all of the councillors for their contributions. I think that that the hand of history is upon us and to paraphrase Bill Clinton I certainly believe that this plan is helping us to build a bridge to the 22nd century.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much, Stephen. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thanks a million, Cathaoirleach. I'm sitting here wondering can I put this on my CV now this level of achievement! But genuinely, when you consider the scope of what for me personally, and I my colleague catch grace, the learning that has been infused in this whole process, and you come in with so much humility, and when I hear of officials that give their time and attention to us, they are generous with the silly questions. This really has been a journey so I really appreciate that we have got to this point and I'm honoured to be part of it. Thanks very much.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: Yes, I would like to echo what the other councillors said. Two things, fair dues to you, Cathaoirleach, you sailed through it there. But also, the nub members don't realise what the older members used to have to suffer, a big row with ever motion and sitting here until three o'clock and 12 o'clock and the rows were very good. We're missing the good rows.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Miriam Murphy. If you had asked me at 10.50 this morning if we would get this development plan finished, I would have thought unlikely. Even at lunch time, I thought we would be here until 11 o'clock at night, maybe even longer. I want to thank the team.

[Background noise]

Interrupting my final address! I would like to thank this young lady beside me who has been patient of me, Caroline. I wouldn't have got through this without you. It means a lot, to Helen, Teresa and Lorraine.

Also, members, I'd like to thank you for your patience with me in getting through this process. Thanks a million. Chief Executive, thank you.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I'll be very, very quick. I know everybody wants to go home. I would like to put on record my appreciation and thanks to a few people. First and foremost, Breege and her team, and, in particular, Sorcha she really is the oracle of forward planning and she kept us on the straight and narrow today, a stellar performance from her. I want to mention as well our ICT team who saved us this morning, you know, from coming back another day so fair play to them for sorting us out and saving the day.

Other Cathaoirleach, Cllr Tommy Annesley, he did a fantastic job. We were looking dodgy this morning but he pulled it through in the afternoon and did a fantastic job. He should be very proud of his display today.

Just to finish off, just you, the members, to thank you very much for your patience and stamina today and your informed input, not just today but in the whole process at all of the different stages. I have to say that the debate and arguments were extremely reasoned and measured and I think you can be very proud of your work here today. There's a massive achieve. Well done to everyone involved in today. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Chief Executive. Thank you.

**[The Special Meeting concluded at 7.45 pm]**

