

**SPECIAL MEETING OF WICKLOW COUNTY  
COUNCIL HELD VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS  
MEETING**

**ON**

**MONDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2022 AT 10:00am**

**MYCLEARTEXT LTD:**

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

**Jen Sinnamon**

**Andrew Howell**



2022-03-28

CATHAOIRLEACH: Morning all. Welcome to our meeting. I'm just going to hand you over to Helen first of all for a roll-call.

HELEN PURCELL: I'm going to try the roll-call in a different way today, and because we will have so many votes, and for the benefit of the people attending remotely, they can't hear the people in the chamber, so the roll is alphabetically, so, when you know it is coming to your turn, turn the microphone on, and answer using your microphone, please, and that way, the people will be able to hear you. We will do a trial run now. [Roll-call].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Moving on to votes of sympathy. Any votes of sympathy from the members? Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: Cathaoirleach, I would like to propose a vote of sympathy to Isla Vickers' family, a strong Fianna Fáil lady. I would like to pass on my sympathies to the Vickers' family and the death of Isla.

>> I think the seats are mixed up, Chair. The name tags are probably in the wrong place. Look, I wanted to be associated with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Walsh, yes.

>> Yes, I wanted to be associated. Sympathies to her and her extended family.

>> Mention to Hazel Clinton, one of our staff members here whose brother John O'Keefe was buried last Friday. The chap was only 41 years of age. A popular chap in the community, so our sympathy deepest sympathy to Hazel and the rest of the

family.

>> ... also, a very stalwart member of the community in the Greystones and the wider Greystones area, evidenced by the huge turnout of Isla's funeral on Saturday. We wish her family all the best at a very, very sad and difficult time for them. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Jerry O'Neill?

GERRY O'NEILL: I would like to mention our doctor here, he lived to a ripe old age. He looked after this area for many, many years, and at a time when it wasn't easy to get around West Wicklow, he never let anyone down. He got to every corner of the West Wicklow over the years in all sorts of weather and conditions, whatever. He died recently. I would like to offer condolences to his son and his grandchildren, who are also carrying on the tradition. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: Thank you. I wanted to offer my condolences to the family of Joe Duggan who passed away recently in Bray. Very, very significant member of the community who will be sadly missed, and to his extended family.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Glennon?

>> I would like to be associated with the comments of the doctor, a well-established member of the community, and helped many people over the years. His son continues the tradition of providing medical care in Blessington, and I understand his granddaughter is now also a doctor in

Blessington, but I would like to be associated with that. I noted for many years when I was the Sergeant in Blessington, he came to many difficult scenes and always there to lend a helping hand to anyone in difficulty.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Anne Ferris.

CLLR ANN FERRIS: I would like to be associated with the condolences to Jimmy Vickers on behalf of his beloved wife. It was very, very sad news when we heard it, and I would also like to be associated with the sympathies to the Duggan family in Bray on the passing of Joe. Joe had done tremendous work with charities all through his life in the Bray area, and in particular, he was - one of the founding members of Open Door, of which I'm a member, and I think some of the things that he did has gone unnoticed over the years, so I would like my sympathies to be included in that. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Pat Fitzgerald?

>> I wanted to extend my sympathy to the family of Mr Roy Dempsey who died last week in Arklow. Roy was a businessman who provided many people with jobs in Arklow over many, many years, and to his wife and extended family, I want to offer my condolences.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Just to the family of Pat Tomkins, former staff member at Wicklow County Council, and a long-standing community man in the area and to his family.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I will pass you back to Helen.

We're covered. Just stand for a moment's silence, please.

[Silence].

CATHAOIRLEACH: May the souls of all those faithfully departed rest in peace. Before we go on to item number 1, I wanted to take this opportunity to thank Cllr Annesley for filling in last Monday. Unfortunately I got the dreaded Covid, so I couldn't attend, so I want to thank Cllr Annesley as short notice for doing a great job. Moving on to item number 1: to consider report in accordance with section 179 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended), part 8 of the planning and development regulations 2001 (as amended), development of 106 residential units to include 70 numbered houses, 36 numbered duplex apartments and creche 200 square metres and associated site works at the site of Burgage Moor, Blessington. I'm going to hand you over to Helen first for an amendment, and a presentation from the housing team from Joe here. Helen, I would like to bring you in first.

HELEN PURCELL: It is a motion proposed by Cllr Gerry O'Neill, seconded by Patsy Glennon that the existing hedgerow should be retained on the L8858, and a new housing development would be situated behind the hedgerow, that access to the housing units in block 1 of the development be provided for by means to a separate access road.

>> To explain this from everybody, and to Cody Architects in the design team, they're going to give an overlay where we are coming from. We have re-looked at it, re-looked at the

redesigning, and it has an implication bigger than the four units the last time we are going to detail that, and detail the context of why the design is recommended the way we did with the chief executive's report. There is no attempt to that bar amendments of the Chief Executive's report as circulated.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Tomas, are you with us?

>> I think the presentation, that should be able to be shared on screen.

TOMAS SEXTON: Just checking if that presentation is available on screen there. Super. Thank you.

Great, So ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're still not ... should be getting ... ... we're getting that now. Go ahead, Tomas.

TOMAS SEXTON: Great, just giving a presentation here to deal with the specific aspects that were raised at the last two council meetings. Could you move on to the next slide, please.

Great. We gave the overview of a presentation the reason before last, and I listened in at the last meeting as well. To capture here is a presentation that deals specifically with the retention of the hedgerow, the trees, and the ditch along Burgage More, and just to touch on some of the key aspects which were raised at the meeting. And I will just bullet-point them here. Hopefully this is representing what was discussed, and certainly what I took away from the meetings, and first of all, it was retain the existing mound, hedgerow, and trees to Burgage More. Also, there was mention of clash of reversing

cars on to Burgage More, and keeping the new social housing development as its own distinct development with a singular entrance without a second entrance from - access from the Burgage More. Creche location generating traffic. But also those contrary views about whether the existing rural field boundary/ditch was appropriate for new housing development. That came from some of the councillors and the discussion points as well.

And also, the kind of changing character that the roadway would have in the area going from a rural to a more urban carriageway. They were the key aspects. I will deal with those as we go through the presentation.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I stop you for one second. Can you speak up a little louder, if you don't mind? We're finding it difficult to hear you.

TOMAS SEXTON: Great. I might go on to ... sorry, is that any better?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, that's it.

TOMAS SEXTON: Great. I took off the ear buds here. My apologies. I'm in a conference today, so I'm speaking from a hotel lobby, so hopefully there isn't much background noise.

Anyway, we will continue

I've about a ten-minute presentation, so I will try to get through this promptly. The next slide, please.

Okay, so, again, this is the site location, just for those who might be less familiar with Blessington. It's in the southern

fringe of the town, but, and it sits within what looks like a fairly rural setting at the moment. You can see the urban development coming, coming out towards it.

If you go to the next slide, please, and this is pretty much the same map but setting from the development plan. You can see the site there positioned highlighted in red, zone for residential. You can see the plan very much has a site surrounded by plans for future development, so very much the long-term long-term vision for this site and the surrounding lands is to be an urban area surrounded with more housing, more development area

The next slide shows that in a little more clearer context. That is an aerial image. The site highlighted in red there. But the site that is currently has planning, the a, as sent development there on the left-hand side, we've just Photoshopped in that layout, and that as you see from the last meeting, has now commenced on site.

To the north of the site is council-owned lands for community and employment which has been mentioned, it has a planning requirement for that. To the east is the green area which is active open space with wonderful views across the reservoir. Then to the south is zone for residential lands. Whilst the site feels rural in a sense, it is actually part of the greater kind of plans for further urban development in the Blessington area, so we need to look at what it is going to become as well as what it actually is at the moment.

Next slide, please. And that aspect, this is a photograph of just

the lands immediately to the east, looking towards the reservoir, and looking towards the hills in the distance. And, you know, it really is a wonderful site, and wonderful context. There are some really fantastic quality of trees in the rural rolling hills setting. That's why it has the appeal of green, the green area in the zone here.

Next slide, please.

And then stepping within the site, again, there are some wonderful field boundaries, really exceptional for kind of rural - agricultural field boundaries, really high-quality trees of mature and of a really good condition. That is a lined boundary to the south. You can see there is very high mature trees below, so we have lower-level hedgerow and hedging which really gives great enclosure, but also there is good visibility through. The earth mounds are low so you get good visibility through the mounds which are good for development on the other side as well, and having that connectivity.

Next again. Look to the east, again, that quality of tree boundary wraps around to the east as well. You can see again the hillscapes in the distance. On the left side of the screen are clusters of very fine trees as well which we've designated for attention.

Next slide, please. Then looking back at the Burgage More road, and looking at it its quality, the existing hedgerow has been narrowly removed to the north, to further west of the site by the adjoining development. This is one that has now been permitted

planning, and has been permitted ... as well. The sight is on the left-hand side of the screen here, just designated the left, and you can see even here the boundary is not the same kind of quality as what we've just seen. Next slide, please. Looking at the same road so to the southern end, this is the other end of the Burgage Road, looking back up towards the last photograph we saw, this site is on the right-hand side. The adjoining houses are on the right there. Whilst there are one or two nice trees in the foreground, as you can see, the existing field boundary that runs along the road, along the site frontage, actually stops at the edge of the site frontage, and housing to the southern part you can see the hedgerows on the left and right are actually new, almost suburban hedging in front of single-storey bungalow housing, where the verges have been changed, there are no longer the rumour traditional field boundaries, and there has been some clearing of verges to make unstructured foot paths there. They could be improved in time.

>> [Inaudible] the ditch.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead, Tomas.

TOMAS SEXTON: Okay, you can see the field boundary in front of the site is retaining as country boundary, but if there is any improvement to be won to that road and continues down to the south, it would not be possible holding on to the field boundary as it is, as has happened in developing individual houses to the south. Next slide, please.

Moving further along the road, and going towards the

graveyard, we can make out the wall in the background there is the wall to the graveyard. And the trees to the left-hand side here have now subsequently been removed by the adjacent development. A lot of greenery we are seeing there is ivy on the trees. On the right-hand side, there are the trees fronting on to Burgage More, despite one or two very good trees at the southern end, the relevant of the trees are of very modest quality, and structurally, they're not of - some have been clipped with some of the overlines there, but they're nowhere near the quality of the trees we've seen on the southern eastern boundaries that I showed just early on. The road is very narrow, so any improvement to the roads would jeopardise, just wouldn't be possible by holding on to those trees. So next slide, please

So this existing site plan, what we've added this is the context of the adjacent development, so you can see the adjacent development how it sits. In that development, they've taken a similar approach to what we have in our development here. You can see the site, the main entrance is where the already existing site is at the top left-hand corner

On the Burgage More Road, there are five houses you can make out, some pink arrows facing towards those. That parking is - they are directly accessed from Burgage More. They're not accessed from within the site. The car parking in the front garden areas and reverse back out on on to Burgage More Road. It the same strategies we've employed in the schemes

submitted for planning at the moment.

I wanted to show on this slide is how we've, the objectives required for our developing this site. There is a red line at the outline of the site. The junction at the graveyard has safety issues, and they needed to be dealt with in developing the approach to the site. The purple line there is showing where the main access is being developed that would provide access to the land's furthest development, and the lands to the north, so we combined that in that sort of access, particularly for larger vehicles coming to develop these lands and for the community enterprise zonings for the lands to the north, and also potential access to the active open space lands to the east. So we really need to have a very good safe access point that can cater for the kind of traffic nature that would be for that.

We've looked at retaining as many of the trees as possible on the site. That has been our starting point for this development, and you can see the trees and all the pages there, the shading shows the canopies, but the dashed lines show the root-protection areas which extend far beyond the canopy of the trees because of the scale and height of the trees. The green dotted line show where the development area is possible. You can see the setback from the hedgerows, the setback from the trees, and, if we kept the trees on Burgage More Road, a setback there as well. It is a constrained site when you try to provide the kind of housing, the LAP 100-plus housing for the site.

The pink arrows there show in the developing this, we need to make sure that we've got appropriate frontage of lands to the north, it is a site that connects and has facing on to that, and needs to integrate with its surrounding neighbourhood as well. Burgage More Road is part of that. In current planning policy, it's critical that you have integrated developments, developments that tie in with their context and connect with their neighbourhoods, and that we don't have isolated segregated development which has been a blight in many instances over many decades that have led to a lot of redevelopment and regeneration projects across the country which has been enshrined in planning policy and urban design principles in plans over the last number of years. On the east and south, the Green Arrow area showing an indication that whilst there is no development to the east planned, because that's going to be open green space, we need to make sure we've got a strong relationship between the development and the open space there, good visibility through the trees, and likewise to the south where access can be provided for future, and good visibility to the trees as well. Those are really the key objectives that we feel need to be addressed in any development or design for this site which we've taken on board.

The next slide, please.

Again to summarise the proposed development. 76 are houses, 36 are apartments, a kind of 2:1 ratio. In the scheme, the trees have been retained on the eastern boundary. All the trees on the southern boundary, we have removed one or two trees in poor condition. That is where we have positioned the future access to the south, to avail of that space

when we take out those trees. We have held back the housing from the root protection area, it goes beyond the canopy itself. A number of the good quality trees to the northern boundary have been kept. In developing the road access and making sure we have appropriate sight lines it became and we challenge the traffic engineering on this process, it just became impossible to keep all the trees along Burgage More, because their quality is not of a high quality, it's very modest in scale, really the approach was better to have a well- developed road network and street network and good quality frontage and have good quality tree planting that would mature into the future.

That was discussed significantly with the arbores we had on the project. Their advice was that the trees on the Burgage More were of poor quality and that were less good than the others that have been kept, and that prioritisation should be for the eastern and southern boundaries with new tree planting to the Burgage More. That was the advice they gave to us. This again is summarising. I don't dwell on this.

I will come to the table that says other planning statistics. We are achieving just under 35 units to the hectare, which 35 is seen as the minimum for good urban sustainable use of lands. The public open space 16%, so it's just marginally over the development plan minimum requirement of 15%. So we provide good quality outdoor space, but to retain trees we would have to reduce that, or reduce the amount of parking. Again we have a good provision of parking, it's not excessive, or change the mix, where you have more apartments and less houses. Again, that is not the requirement for housing here. So that wouldn't be the right approach here. So next slide, please.

So we have looked at the Moran & Associates alternative. We have had worked at that during the submission period, by have looked at it more closely since it was referenced in the more recent meetings. The Moran proposal suggested moving the development five metres to the east. In doing that we knew we couldn't encroach on the boundary. Five metres is a little bit less than the plot for a terraced house. So that would take it from the blocks to the right- hand side. So there is four rows of houses, so with that five metres would take out one house per row. That is where our initial highlight to this, without doing a detailed assessment would be a loss of four houses. However, we have looked at that more closely and designed a scheme that would deal with the kind of principles and I will come to that in a few minutes, but the issues around this proposal, I

appreciate it was just a sketch idea from Moran & Associates, but just now we need to delve into it in more detail and see what were the implications if you were to go down that route.

I suppose the most striking thing is that there is a very long cul- de- sac wrapping around to avoid access to Burgage More Road. Cul- de- sacs is very much discouraged in more recent housing guidelines and all of the planning, the national guidelines, DMU RS which deals with the design for urban- rural streetscapes. Very much recommends avoidance of cul- de- sacs. They limit activity and linkage between housing and creates an isolations of housing developments. So cul- de- sacs we would always design as being very short and create more home zones. We have one or two here in the development, but they very limited in length. This cul- de- sac would be seen as too long. Certainly, I think those comments last week about if this came in front of the normal planning process as a private scheme, certainly if we came forward to any local authority, certainly Wicklow, with a scheme that a cul- de- sac as long as this, it would certainly be refused planning, in my view and certainly at pre- planning we would be told that we could not, that kind of design approach could not be entertained. So it's very much something that is discouraged through the normal planning process as well.

The roadway itself is positioned close to Burgage More Road. It crosses over a significant tree protection route areas, which cannot be done if you are going to retain trees. That roadway would have to be pushed further east. Not just the five metres that was indicated, but much further than that. It's not wide enough to provide a safe pedestrian pathway. It would have to be provided within the site and then access back out into Burgage More as I have shown the photographs earlier on, it's too narrowly divided in the site. So you would have to open up the hedgerow to achieve that. The site boundary becomes exposed within the scheme, because the road passes to the first block. It's not overlooked by the housing but that could be altered. Already you are trying back- to- back housing where there is already existing private garden spaces, to secure them and make sure they are not open to potential security issues. So next slide, please.

So we have relooked at the scheme, taking the principles of the Moran proposal and addressing some of the issues I have highlighted there to deal with them where possible. So again the principles are much the same. The access road comes in, as Moran had suggested. We have

wrapped it around in a cul- de- sac format to test it fully. In this case we have moved it back about 12 metres, not just the five metres they have suggested, about 12 metres it's moved back. What that is is block one, it gets modified because we now need to move the creche up as it is suggested would become the more appropriate location. But the block at the southern end, we have reformatted the housing there to address the frontage of the housing facing south to deal with some of the overlooking and passing issues that would otherwise have occurred. We have opened up a pedestrian link on to Burgage More Road that would be essential to make sure there is a safe pedestrian route down to that point and provide good linkage. It's not ideal, it's set well into the site, but that connectivity could be made. We still have a very long cul- de- sac, but again that would be poor design as such, but again we have shown it here reflective.

We have slightly encroached on the road protection to try and maximise the housing footprint, but that is as much as I would be comfortable with encroaching on a route protection area. What that means is the blocks on the right hand side have to be reduced to make sure we still maintain the open space. So in each of those block we lose three houses in the top right, four in the bottom right, because we take, we have to now take out two houses per street and we lose six houses because carrying the road down around the south and we also have to keep that out of the route protection area to the south. So in total we actually lose 13 houses. Much more of a significance than what was highlighted in the Moran study, because it hadn't really taken into account the tree protection areas. When you overlay that, it's much more of an effect on the lay out. So if you were to try and achieve the principles that Moran has set out, we believe it will need to lose 13 houses to achieve it. It will still need a pedestrian access out ton to the Burgage More Road. It would need the hedgerow to be modified and reduced to get good overlooking between the two roads and you would still have, an excessive cul- de- sac which would be considered poor housing design.

This is showing a section through the road to show how the growth and the hedgerow would need to be reduced to make sure you have good visibility from the road to the existing housing. And the site is a lower level, so it's really critical to be able to achieve that. So in adopting it, you would lose the house, you would still have to modify the hedge, you would still have to get connectivity, pedestrian connectivity to the Burgage More Road to make sure it is an integrated and connected scheme. You would still be less so than we have at the moment, but those minimum movements would have to happen. So it will not be a sterilised

scheme with a hedgerow untouched. That really isn't possible and would it be good practice to proceed. Next slide, please.

Just going to touch on a few things to follow up very quickly. I mentioned design guidelines. Some of you may be familiar with it, I am not sure. But DMURS would be the guide that guides transportation, road design, street designs and how to integrate pedestrian, vehicular and good quality design into our streets and rural villages and towns and cities. And this is a very pertinent page I have taken from it, where it talks about rural frames and town. We have talked about Burgage More Road being rural, I contend it's not actually rural, it's within the urban area of Blessington. It's not like it's out in the rural countryside, far beyond Blessington. It has some of the legacy hedgerows from its rural origins, but it's really rural fringe at the moment. It is going through a transition in itself and it is at a point of transitioning from increased urban development by the grave yard, in the associated lands further and it needs to transition and become a transition zone and be a very well- defined and designed transitional zone. These things happen within their tones and villages and they need to be designed and planned accordingly. Next slide, please.

Just to give you an example of that in a similar setting in a, probably not unlike a town in a sense, this is in Clonakilty in West Work. This is an approach road coming in to the town from the west side. It's within the urban development area, but it's, I suppose on the fringe of the town. It's got the same kind of issues we are talking about here, it's got a road that is going through its own transition, it's got an old rural field boundary and the housing in behind that frontage is planned for new housing. It's not one of our project, so I hope that makes that clear in the commentary here, but those very similar. I suppose some of the big differences here are the approach road is much wider, so it's got greater capacity to deal with foot path improvements without impacting on the hedgerow. Also, the trees are much greater quality and they have a much greater contribution to the approach to the town and they, this site is actually devoid of good quality trees for the rest of the site. So this was the only good area that had trees, so it made sense to put a lot of effort into retaining these trees, unlike Blessington where in actual fact, Burgage More Road has the poorest quality of trees of the whole site. This also needs to provide an access point to the site as well. Next slide, please. These are a couple of photographs of the merging development, it's not quite finished in these photographs. Apologies for the quality of the photographs, these were taken very dull street lights coming on. So it doesn't look as attractive, but you can see here a lot of trees have been

retained, the new foot path has been put along by narrowing the road itself. So it didn't have to impact on the trees. The photograph to the right is just as you pan across, that is where the new main entrance have been provided. As you can see all the trees in that part had to be removed to provide that entrance to allow the housing to come forward and its former presence and overlooking to the site. Next slide, please.

It gives an attractive frontage to it. However, as you can clearly see here, the housing has had to be kept quite a significant distance back from the trees. Again here they have maintained that root protection area. In fact in Blessington we would have to keep it further back again because they have managed to provide car parking around the sides of this and again because they haven't had tree constraints elsewhere they have managed to be able to do that in a much more efficient manner because we have had step off trees on other boundaries. But you can see the kind of difference you need to step back from trees in this setting. Again the trees are much better quality, the clearance under the crown is much better and they are raising the limbs and trimming those. The hedgerow is in the process of being altered and lowered. So it's a good mature tree with good trees and a very distinct setback. Then a last slide with this. So again coming back to the proposal, we still believe the current proposal is the optimum solution for this site. Balancing achieving the housing need that has been set out for the site. Retaining the most significant and best quality trees on the site and making sure that it is an integrated development, integrated with the new housing directly opposite, integrated with the surrounding streetscapes that are needing to be modified to serve this land and the wider lands and set a new edge in context, but also form that transition from this urban edge to the transitional fringe urban to the south, or fringe rural to the south, rather than it being purely rural. The adjustments that have been suggested to date, can easily be accommodated.

On the top left is layby parking for the grave yards. That can be achieved here because it's within the red line zone, but we are constrained within this application dealing with the red line zone. The tree planter, along Burgage More can be extended out to the kind of carriageway width to better define those and there can be surface treatment and drop kerb treatment to again better define the parking zone from the road carriageway. We believe that is by far the best solution for the site. I appreciate when we looked at the site at first, we wanted to keep all of the trees, but really when we worked it true it was impossible to have this level of housing provision of the kind of quality we are trying to achieve to

make sure we have a very good landscape, open space and really make sure that it is a sustained community and an integrated community into the long- term. So hopefully that addresses all the points I set out at the beginning. I am happy to take any questions.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Tomas. A very comprehensive presentation. I am going to bring in Cllr Gerry O'Neill first. Are you there?

CLLR O'NEILL: Yes. Thank you, can you hear me?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR O'NEILL: Thank you, Tomas, for your presentation. I am coming from, as an elected representative in the area for proper planning, I have seen mistakes in Blessington in the past. I note the likes of what happened in Glen Ding in the town square and my understanding of it is we need proper planning and to me it's a slight adjustment we are looking for here on this site. A slight adjustment. I am absolutely more anxious than anyone to get the housing in place. We need housing in Blessington, absolutely. We have 46 houses at the moment ready for occupation, except for the upgrading the sewerage, which we are told from Irish Water it could be at least another 12 months before the upgrade is in place. We have these houses and we urgently need houses and accommodation.

Other elected representatives in the area will tell you that the phone is ringing day in, day out, so listen, I want to move on with this and I want to ensure that these hundred odd houses are in place sooner rather than later. But in putting my argument forward, I am looking at Blessington as a, like any other part of the country, where we need, we need a consent, we need co- operation of local people, we need, we are talking about an area south of Blessington, which would be on a rural lane. It's mainly people who have been settled there, their forefathers were driven from the lake. It's a farming area. I absolutely don't, you know, if you look at our local area map it's clear, it's zoned residential south of this site that you talk about, but after that it's purely agricultural land. So from there to the Lakeside is agricultural lands. It's not fair to say it's urban, it never will be urban. In moving these houses, it's simple, it's to move it behind the hedgerow. That will put, place these 100 odd houses like any other part of the town, as a standalone estate. That is simply what they are asking for, a standalone estate. Might I add in talking to other people, who were hoping to get one of these houses in time to come, they too would prefer a standalone estate. They don't want hundreds of people walking by their front door every day of the week to the greenway. This is a very busy stretch of road from the graveyard area to the greenway.

There are... we have problems there every weekend here with traffic congestion and people trying to work their farms and this road, this little laneway is very busy. It would eliminate a lot of that, if we sit the housing behind the hedgerow, absolutely. Use the same entrance as you propose, there is no issue there. But I do note on slide 12 of 22 that you showed, that the red line would eliminate all car parking outside the graveyard. In fact it only leaves 7 spaces outside the grave yard, within your red line and I know you talk about the master plan for the other section, it's, it eliminates all parking. This is not acceptable to the people of the area where there is no car parking near, next or near the grave yard. It's proposed to put a foot path to the town out to the new estate. Now, I again will concede on that and I have been told that we will, that will be addressed and I am hoping for that. I am not going to hold up this Part 8 because of that. I trust that the authorities will immediately sort that issue out, because it's absolutely not acceptable. If you look at...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry O'Neill, you have made very good points but if you could...

CLLR O'NEILL: If I could finish. I am proposing the motion, and I understand it's a busy day. If I could point out, the trees, I haven't seen any tree report, it seems that some trees are going and some are bad and I am not quite sure where that comes from. We have no report. Three weeks ago we weren't losing any housing. In the manager's report last week we were only losing 4, now it's gone to 13, so I am not clear on that one. I think that 100 odd houses it's a huge boost to the area if it's planned properly. But I would please with fellow councillor, where I am coming from is we have to look after people in the area, the settled people of the area while we build new estates and accommodation. So I would urge, I won't hold you up, I know you are not giving me too much time here, Cathaoirleach, you are very quick with me, but I would urge the councillors here to consider the people of the area, we are not asking a big deal, we are just asking for a standalone estate to sit behind the hedgerow that is there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Other members, Cllr Glennon.

CLLR GLENNON: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, thank you, Cllr O'Neill. I seconded this motion at a time when we were told we would lose four houses. As Cllr O'Neill says it's gone up to 13 now. Obviously we all welcome local authority housing, it's badly needed in the Blessington area and hasn't been built there for years. In Tomas's report, he mentioned segregation. There is certainly no suggestion of segregation by any of the people who are concerned about this ditch. They are simply old families that live down that road and they don't like to see change. Some of those families are there for generations, Cllr O'Neill has said, farming down that

lane. So they see what was a minor country road, turned into a highway, it's also an access to the greenway.

So I don't think there is any, all the people who have spoken to me and Cllr O'Neill and Cllr Timmins and others up in that area have mentioned that they are in support of the housing but they were looking for this adjustment to it. They were trying to retain, I suppose as much of their old standing as they could in respect of the road. I am not going to go over everything that Cllr O'Neill has said. Again welcome housing in Blessington and going back to Cllr O'Neill's last point about parking at the give yard, we did speak to Lorraine last week and this is outside the parking issue that we are looking for is outside the scope of this Part 8. I fully accept that. But in the master plan for the area, we would like local councillors to have an input into the development of additional parking at the grave yard.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Can you hear me, chair?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR TIMMINS: Thank you for the presentation there. This is unsatisfactory because we were just told this morning that suddenly 13 houses would be lost if we proceed to retain the ditch. That is really like a gun being put to our head at the last minute. I am not happy about that. I don't want to vote against 13 houses being lost in the development in Blessington. So I can't, on the other hand I don't like being just told at a meeting here is the situation and we have no thorough presentation, but we have not had a chance to reflect on the implications of this. So I don't know what my two fellow members who have just spoken think, but I am not happy voting to either put this through as it is, or not put it through and lose 13 houses, given I have only been told that in the last hour. So I suggest, I don't suggest that we drag this out in the meeting, we have other very important stuff to get through today, so I suggest we shorten this discussion quickly and come to a quick decision. One suggestion is that we finalise this next week and we don't take a vote on it today and we thrash out the detail. I don't fully understand how the full 13 have been lost and I am not comfortable voting either way today, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, I am going to bring Joe in, followed by Cllr Behan. Joe.

JOE: When we got the original design, that was the design that was submitted to us, it was a sketch and we worked down through it. At the moment time took it at face value and we looked at units and took out

the four units that were affected. That is all we did with it, because it was a sketch submitted. So after the last week, as I said there has been extensive work undertaken by the local authority, just to clarify things regarding timing, the last email came in at 1.00am at night from Tomas. This is the amount of work being put into it. We were waiting for submissions from Cllr O'Neill on Friday, so that is the amount of work which has gone into this. When we are designing it we have to design the houses, the road, the lay out, it's got to go to DMURS. The bottom line is we couldn't move stuff down, because as Tomas detailed, they were to the south and the east of it, so we had to switch them up. That is the effect of this there.

The second one is if you built it the trees were going to die anyway. If you look at that one put up, there was no root protection for those trees. You can't just bring it to within two metres of trees like that and design up the road. So what Tomas did was he designed out and if you look at it, he designed out the road, giving the tree protection area, which is the next one there, sorry, the next one. Then, worked back down along the site, but in the position that we couldn't go on to the trees below, they also needed the tree protection area. So that is what Tomas's big emphasis on that. You were restricted on both sides. The second one is it's not good design. So when you go in there, there is no protection for the pedestrian protection, so you have to get pedestrians in. One way or another we are going to have to take lumps out of that ditch to get people in, keep them within the estate and get them back out again. So that is the implication of this, it's not as simple as that. So as we detailed, the plan, as submitted had no safety pedestrian path on Burgage More Lane at the moment. We didn't like the cul- de- sac and the site boundary, there is implications of bringing up to the trees there. So that is why we designed and then by creating that area then you then had to push everything down. That is where you lost units which was four below and three and six in the block.

But then, once you have that designed you come out of the... of the hedgerow. The hedge row that is there has to be reduced significantly. That is what that is there for.

Like we said, like Tomas said, it's now going from a rural lane to a fringe road or something like that. The good design and design as submitted is not a ditch and a standalone, it's an ordinary type road as we have there with houses facing on to the lane. So that is that one. It's not that we

create the units we had to go from a sketch to design, but there is implications for a lot of these things, they were in the original one.

>> Despite what the director says it has the look of pulling a rabbit out of the hat at the last minute to scupper the Councillor's proposal. Particularly when they're only hearing about the implications just now, I don't think that's an acceptable way to do business. If any of us from other parts of the county were presented with that, I think we would feel the same. I think the councillors need more time to consider that. I want to take serious issue with one point that Tomas made in his presentation. I'm certainly not with the agreement with the idea that cul-de-sacs have to be abandoned for ever more, that there's something wrong with them. As a parent of young children, I can tell you that cul-de-sacs are the safest place for kids to be reared. He's suggesting that all estates will have to be through roads. I don't think that's good planning at all. Think it's nonsense; absolute nonsense. Cul-de-sacs would be a safer bet for the families who are going to be living there. I think if that is the level of argument that consultants and council officials are putting up against a development like this, it's very, very poor indeed, and I'm quite happy to go on the record and support Cllr O'Neill's amendment. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: There is no-one else indicating. Sorry, Cllr Fitzgerald?

>> Just, I wasn't at the last meeting there, the first meeting I

missed, but I just - I was filled in on the meeting, and my view was that there was going to be four houses taken off. 106 is the figure. And now, today, it's 13. Is that right, we're down 13 to the number that was to be there? I can't hear you.

>> We went from a sketch to a full design scheme. At the time, the ... was a sketch, but bearing in mind the feelings and issues brought up, we did a full design in the last week to try to do that. There are implications of you have can't unions the ditch as-is, you have to give space to the trees there, push everything down. Because we are indicating that specimen trees are the better trees down at the lower end, you have to squish up the development rather than pushing it down. That is the implication.

>> Surely we knew that before? It was a week to go, and I just checked from the lads here, and it was stated at the meeting it was four - is that quite right? - a reduction of four, and now because of this, that, and the other, it's a reduction of 13.

The other point I want to make when we have Part 8 in our area, we go to the meeting and decide on it and that is where it should be decided. I should not be coming to the council here to be honest about it. We have Part 8s, the latest one in Arklow.. what is happening here is I think it should have been left to the members in the municipal district to deal with that matter.

That's my view. Instead coming into it now, I didn't realise it was 13 until ten or 15 minutes ago. That's difficult.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mitchell?

>> This is the second or third time we've discussed this [inaudible] a tremendous discussion with a lot to do. But produce it by 13 houses is simply not acceptable, and also, as I said last week, that this - this is an urban area, when you build 100 houses, it becomes an urban area. Whether people would like it to remain rural or not, if you build 100 houses, it's urban, and I think with a ditch, and a hedge, which may not survive well in those sorts of circumstances, it is the wrong thing to do, and I think we should go ahead and build it as per the Part 8.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Leonard?

>> Yes, because I'm not from this local area, but looking at the plans first off, the first thing that struck me from the Part 8 was you put a lot of houses into a rural area, and I'm sure the demand is there, but for me, looking at the second plan, with the 13 houses, for me, what struck me was that although the reduction in houses - and it's been very suddenly given, and it should be definitely a decision made by the local councils and the local community in that area, but that the quality of life of those people in a less built-up area in a rural - I mean, surely it's the quality of life we want people going forward. I just think it's a much nicer layout, the creche where it is, and from a design aspect, even though it is less 13 houses, and maybe another few houses could be squeezed into that there, but I think the quality of life of those people and going forward to the next generations that would benefit to be there for them, you won't see that until the next generations, but the first plan to

me looked very, very built up. It looked for out of context in the rural setting when you're looking at the rural fields and stuff around it. But I do think that it is a decision that needs to be made by the local councillors in that area and community.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: Wasn't there something here a time back where if it was a number of units, it would come to the council, and if it was under 100 units, it came to the - if it was under 100 units, it was dealt with the municipal districts, over 100, dealt with by the council. I think this should be pulled today and go back to the municipal district - that's being quite honest about it.

>> I second that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, so we have a proposal to pull it. I'm going to bring in the Chief Executive.

>> Anything over 50 has to go to the full council. That's the policy. That's the situation. That's what was agreed. That's why it came here. Obviously, the ones that you mentioned that were dealt with at local level, at the district were under 50, so that is why it is here, so that is the same, regardless where it's coming from.

>> Just to clarify, some of the local councillors might help me here, but it has been up to pre-planning and a number of occasions at the municipal area, but once it goes over the 50, it comes here. That's the agreement we have. That's the way we agreed it two years ago. So, like I said, I'm recommending it.

The proper planning and development mentioned was dealt with

in the report, and a lot of the issues raised were dealt with on the Chief Executive's reported. The only thing that is new we went from taking the sketch as submitted in its face value and saying, "Right, if you did that, you're losing four", and now if I had to design it and accept this, therefore, I don't have the privilege - those trees, if you want to protect them, you have to move back to protect the root bore. That's why I'm recommending that we don't go ahead with the design as submitted. There are implications, and the major implications are that you lose 13 dwellings. And one of the issue is because pedestrian safety, you have to get them off that lane and bring them in, and therefore that has an implication on the design. And subsequent land units, because I don't [inaudible] boundary impact on the better trees there, therefore I have to squish everything up. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy, do you want to finish your point?

CLLR KENNEDY: I still propose this go back to the municipal district and be discussed by municipal members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: And come back with when it is agreed by the district. Is that what you're suggesting?

CLLR KENNEDY: [Inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: Is there a timeline on this proposal that we have to have it done by a certain timeline? That's one question with regards to it. The other thing is there has been a lot of criticism

of the district members in terms of not dealing with this. My understanding is, over the last 18 months, we have dealt extensively with it, we have plenty of presentations from the housing section of the council and the planning department, and so forth, and I would have been of the opinion that we have dealt with it. We had numerous meetings - our own chair organised meetings outside of the actual council meeting as well to try and push the thing on, to try in finalise this for houses for people who badly need them in West Wicklow. From a council point of view, I reject the criticism made in regards to the fact that we haven't dealt with it. We have dealt with it.. in my understanding, it has been completed in that regard.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks. That's a view to continue with it.

Okay. At this point, Joe, can you just clarify the time frame on this?

JOE: The Part 8 time frame, it is six weeks when that report was issued. But, on top of that, we have gone back. We went back even to Friday after the first meeting which was again was - it was in March, went back and explained it, and the only difference is we, bearing in mind what happened last break, we redesigned the scheme, if you keep the hedge, and you can't keep all of it anyhow, this is the implication. It is as submitted there. We are saying this has less of a chance of working, because the implications are once you start taking out those houses you push down the site, and your loss is 13 houses. So, I'm still recommending, I'm comfortable with what we submitted

there.

Like I said the last day, I'm committed to the seven parallel parking at the graveyard - committed to that. The order of modifications there, I'm comfortable with the development.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I want to agree with with a lot of what has been said, and in particular with Cllr Vincent Blake in regards to I genuinely feel that there is no criticism of the West Wicklow Councillors.

They're perfectly entitled to debate this. It's been given a good airing here again today on probably one of the busiest days of the year we are going to have. Last week, it had a good debate, and I did talk to the officials after the meeting last week, and based on the drawings they've been given - and I want to thank Tomas - this is what they've come up with. I try to be fair in everything that I do, and looking at what has been presented, I genuinely feel that, you know, the loss of 13 units shouldn't be overplayed or underplayed. And it is a misfortune that members are only learning about that today, but that's due to the time constraints, that's due to the evidence-based sketches that have been presented, and the design team having to look at it in a short period of time. The reality is that, you know, those amendments coming before this council later on, and I know there are members in the chambers here who have such amendments to try and retain hedgerow, trees, and the like, and I'm sure will be supported. So the members are not out of

order in asking for what they're looking for. But the reality in anything I've seen there presented this morning, I think the quality trees that is to the south and the east, are being retained. To move the whole development sideways, you still have to protect the roots of the trees, and anything I see on the laneway unfortunately is of very poor quality. Pedestrian safety will be paramount to me as well. Also - and I do concur with what each and every one of them do support housing, and each and every one of them want to maximise the potential for the amount of houses on the development. But also to be mindful of the people who live on the lane, but I do believe, and Cllr Blake has probably touched on it, that if it is kicked back a week, that I don't think there's going to be consensus, because the one thing through the housing SPC we always look for, and has always been delivered on, is engagement at municipal district level, and there has been a lot of engagement from the director and his officials now in the municipal district. Unfortunately at times, there won't be a consensus, there won't be an agreement. And we all have to step up to the plate, based on what we know about it, we mightn't have the intimate knowledge that the people or the councillors within that district that, but what is presented in front of you, you make your own informed decision. Unfortunately, I will be disagreeing with some of the councillors that I have an awful lot of time for, but a personal - I will leave personal friendship to one side, because the reality what is being presented to me is the best option, and

I will, supporting this Part 8.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Snell. I will bring in the Chief Executive for the final word.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: If I could, Cathaoirleach. Just in relation to I suppose the proposed look - the proposal has been pointed out by Cllr Blake, this has been discussed at district level. I don't think it's going to change anything if it goes back as Cllr Snell mentioned. Even if it did go back to the district, it still has to come here again tonight full council because it's over 50 houses, so it doesn't really make sense to push it back, and obviously we have the statutory [inaudible] in relation to Part 8, so I don't believe we have the time to do that. So, because of that, I've asked Cllr Kennedy if he would withdraw that proposal? Thank you very much, Councillor.

CLLR KENNEDY: I was suggesting that it will give the other councillors in the west the time for ...

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I know where you're coming from.

CLLR KENNEDY: I withdraw that. It's fine.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Look, we've aired this very well.

>> Cathaoirleach, can I make a point and the proposer of this motion. If I could by ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: One minute to sum up, and that's it.

>> I was told here at 25 past nine this morning that we would lose 13 how much. I don't think it's fair, or fair of any Councillor the other side of the county to agree with that. That is a hatchet job. I think that is dreadful. I mean, we are quite entitled as

elected reps, we are as good as any Councillor in the county. And I absolutely - I find it absolutely insulting that be told at 25-past nine that we're down to another 13 houses. However - however, if I was told 12 months ago that we were getting 93 houses in Burgage More, I would have been delighted, and we would be accommodating the people of the area as well. As I outlined earlier on, the issue of the parking, the route of the greenway, the inconvenience it causes every weekend with traffic, all that can be involved and would be involved. I think maybe if the councillors who are opposed to my suggestion here would maybe travel out here and have a look at it, instead of making up their mind from behind a desk at Wicklow County Council.

CATHAOIRLEACH: This is the third time it's come to the chamber. I think everybody's got a very good airing of their views on this. I'm going to go for a vote, so we are going to be voting on the amendment put forward by Cllr O'Neill and Cllr Glennon. If you are voting for this, you're supporting a reduction of 13 houses.

>> I think Cllr Timmins has his hand up.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I didn't notice that. Go ahead.

EDWARD TIMMINS: My hasn't never went through the 13 houses. There is no mention of 13 houses in my amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins, first of all.

EDWARD TIMMINS: I had my hand up, but when you said you were going for have to a vote ... I just said, if we're going

round in circles, and I agree with moving it forward, closing this discussion, because lots of stuff has been constantly repeated by people. I still suggest it, and we didn't get an answer, when the six weeks is up, the six weeks could extend until next Monday [inaudible] we wait until next Monday, finalise, reflect on it and figure out is there any other way. To come up with this late last night to lose 13 is - another 100% - with all due respect to the consultants that there is not another way of solving this. So therefore I say do we meet as locals with the officials over the next few days, and we finalise it next Monday? That is a more sensible approach if we're still within the six weeks. That's absolutely what I propose along the lines of what Cllr Kennedy proposed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going for a vote on this. Cllr Kennedy has withdrawn his proposal. We've given it a good hearing. I'm going to ask Helen to read out the amendment.

HELEN PURCELL: Okay, the Motion proposed by Cllr Gerry O'Neill, seconded by Cllr Patsy Glennon that the existing hedgerow should be retained on the L8858, and the new housing development would be situated behind the hedgerow. Access to the housing units ... be provided for by means to a separate access road. [Vote taken].

Eight for, 21 against, three not present. So the motion is not passed. As a result, we will now have another vote. Another vote as per the Chief Executive's Report as circulated with clarifications as given by the Director of Service. Okay. [Votes

taken].

24 for, five against, and three not present. It's passed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you.

Okay, moving on to item number 2, to consider ...

>> Cathaoirleach, can I ask for clarification there, did we need a proposer for the Part 8?

HELEN PURCELL: Sorry, we did. We needed a proposer and a seconder.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by? Seconded by Cllr Ferris, is it?

CLLR ANN FERRIS: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you for being so attentive there, Cllr Ferris. Item number 2: to consider the second Chief Executive's report and submissions to the Draft County Development Plan issued under Section 12.4 of the Planning & Development Act (as amended) on 14th December 2021 and consider adopting or making amendments to the Draft County Development Plan 2022. I'm going to bring in Helen first of all to read some etiquette.

HELEN PURCELL: Just to remind the members that you received two lots of correspondence last week in relation to lobbying, and also in relation to ethics. You're reminded the requirements under the ethics legislation that where 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

truly from the meeting until the matter is concluded. You must inform the council's ethics registrar in writing, to disclose an absence from the meeting will be reported in the minutes, and, when the item is completed, the member will be advised by phone and can rejoin the meeting unless they're present, in which case they can rejoin then. Then in relation to voting, can I also just detail how it's going to work: I would ask the members to keep their microphones and cameras on anybody who is attending remotely during the voting process.

Once an amendment is proposed and seconded, the Cathaoirleach will clearly indicate to vote verbally and by show each hands on the 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 ask the elected members 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.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, just before we go on to the item, I just wanted to firstly complement and thank the members in playing such an active role in putting forward their amendments to this plan, and indeed the expert and efficient way that the planning team have gone about their business and how they've interacted with councillors over the last few weeks. I suppose I want to make the point before we start that ... has

said on many occasions this is our plan. I think it's fair to say that we have had a lot of mixed messages from various different departments over the last number of weeks in terms of service land, zoning land, and so on, and so on.

Quite frankly, I feel that one department isn't talking to the other, and there is total confusion, and that's my opinion, by the way, but that seems the way from what I can see what is going on. On the one hand would be we're asked to dezone land, and, on the other, asked to continue to provide service zone land, so it is something to be mindful of.

Again, I want to bring to the members' attention this is our plan. Let's not be concerned about outside influences, whether that is EMRA, the OPR, the Planning Regulator, or, indeed, the Minister. In my view, I'm doing this plan, like all of you, for the people of Wicklow. If there are parties outside this room who take exception to what we are doing, or what we are doing for the people of Wicklow, let them deal with it at a later stage. Let's not be concerned about, in my view, outside parties being involved and telling us how we should develop our county development plan. Over the next day, or how long it will take, we are working off two documents: the draft plan which contains the Chief Executive's amendments, which is the bigger of the folders that we have, and obviously the smaller booklet which contains the elected members' 70 amendments. Now, it's my intention to start at chapter 2 and work our way through the chapters, and I will try and just outline it as we go along in

terms of keeping everybody abreast of how this is going to work. And in particular, we will be taking where applicable, we will be taking the members of proposed amendments first and going back to the Chief Executive's recommendations on each chapter, so it will be amendments first from the members first of all. We will explain as we go along. Hopefully, it will be easy enough to follow. There is a lot of information here but we will move forward and keep going.

First of all, if you have a look at your amendment book, all of the content is on the inside, so we're going to go to chapter 2 which Development Planned Strategy, the first one our Chief Executive's recommendation, because there is nothing in from the Councillor amendments, so, item number 1 on the Chief Executive's recommendations is to omit a phrase on page 9 of your draft plan book, so, I don't intend to read these. They are there for everyone to read. Is that agreeable with members?

That, if you have an issue, that you raise it?

So are we agreeing with item number 1 of the omit the phrase on page number 9?

Is that agreeable by members? Cllr Snell.

The first one is number one on the page. It's page number 9 on the draft development plan.

CLLR SNELL: Can I just ask a question before we get into this? A lot of members would have been informed that there was a meeting held between the Minister For Housing and all Chief Executives within the

State. It was mentioned that the meeting that zoned land, that is currently zoned, that is serviceable by water and effluent treatment was not to be dezoned. Depending on who you are talking to, I am sure that has been relayed to 32 councillors, yet I haven't read or heard anything to say that did take place. I don't want to put the acting Chief Executive under pressure, but I think it's important information if it did happen. I don't know if you personally would have been at that meeting, or maybe your predecessor, Frank Curran. But would it be possible to shine light on that, Cathaoirleach, if that information is available to the members before we get into this process today?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in the Chief Executive on that.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: There was a housing summit, there was a preparation, it was mentioned, suggested that if land was serviced it wouldn't be dezoned, but there is nothing in writing, there is nothing in writing and obviously it's been the context of the targets that we have as well. That has to be taken into consideration. So the view of the OPR would be it has to obviously, any decision would have to fit within the overall structure and targets that are set for Wicklow, but obviously the meaning I took from it was where possible that would be done. Unfortunately, it's a grey area, it's not black and white, people have looked for written clarification on that, that hasn't been forthcoming. We obviously have the draft guidelines at the moment, there is nothing in that to suggest that. So, I am not sure whether that helps, or causes more confusion, councillor, but I suppose it's a frustration for ourselves as well that there is a bit of lack of clarity in that regard.

CATHAOIRLEACH: One second, go ahead, Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Could I thank the Chief Executive for his reply and his honesty as best he could in answering that. I understand that it's still as clear as muddy water to the whole lot of us, but thank you for trying to explain where we stand.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Maybe staying with that for a second and with your own opening comments as well when you introduced this item on the agenda. There seems to be a contradiction in terms going on here that I am uncomfortable with in that the various bodies that have fed into this process to date and predicted, it's coming to the executive to do things in the way they have to do it, it seems to contradict, in my view, the housing for all plan, that the minister continues to talk about in the media and I mean they are talking in terms of getting back to levels of the Celtic Tiger and when it wasn't uncommon for 50,000- 90,000 houses to be built. If we are to take the theory behind the document we are presented

with, that we are being asked and it's being recommended that we dezone existing loaned lands quite extensively, to me that doesn't make sense because, I mean as public reps and certainly for myself, the calls you get now are people in desperation looking for a home, looking to get two houses put on maybe some land they have got so they can house the family because they can't afford to go other different directions. So to me, while I acknowledge and understand the Chief Executive and his team will have to do what they are basically being asked to do, I think we as members in my view have a serious responsibility here today. I do think, as I said at the outset of my comments, there is a total contradiction in terms with what we are reading and looking at and what is being said by the minister for housing in particular and the fallout from that. So to me, it's confusing and I think we need to be careful and we do owe a duty to the people of Wicklow to do this properly from that perspective.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy did you? No. Okay. We are moving on then. As I said, it's item number one to omit the phrase, are we all agreed with that? I don't think there is anything... I know, okay, can I have a proposer and seconder? Propose by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy, seconded by? Cllr Snell. Okay. Item number two... sorry, are we all agreed? I didn't hear any dissenting voices. All agreed? Yeah, okay. Item number two, it's effectively two words to be included. Again could I have a proposer and seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Fortune, seconded by Cllr Walsh. All agreed?

CLLR FERRIS: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. Thank you. We are on to chapter number 3. We are going to the elected member's proposed amendments.

So item number one is from Cllr Vincent Blake. I am going to take number one and two. Number two is the same thing effectively. So I am withdrawing that amendment for myself. So Cllr Blake, I might bring you in on this?

CLLR BLAKE: A quick comment on what you said at the outset of one department not talking to another department. It's just in relation to an amendment I have at the end of it, in regard to Shillelagh and in regards zoning of land that I have proposed that has been zoned for quite some time but the council planners here want to withdraw it. At the same time we have the housing sections talking to the landowners and saying if you give us access to your land this will, at the end of the day, actually end up that your own land will be serviced here as well in that. I am disappointed that the comments that have been made by the planning department here to the landowners in context of the future development of those particular areas of land and providing houses for people there. I have

heard the comments that came back to me, very disappointed in what was said and obviously a reference to myself in that regard.

Look it, in proposing this particular amend. As one of those councillors here for quite some time, we spend a lot of time talking about planning in the past. I am going back 20 years ago when we talk about the rural clusters and this particular thing came up at that point in time, to try and accommodate people who had rural connections and to allow them to be able to build houses in the rural areas. We came up with the cluster as a solution to that problem at the time. It worked very well in some areas, it didn't work in other areas. We have had suggestions in the past about taking some of those clusters out of it and maybe it could in the future take some of them out of it. But, as it stands at the moment, they have worked in particular areas, so look it, I am proposing that this particular amendment to reinstate the clusters, as per what we agreed, back a number of years ago, but it was changed in 2010 to restricted, basically to almost nobody in the rural areas could get a house in any of the clusters. So I am proposing that we reinstate the clusters as was back a number of years ago.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: I would like to second that proposal by Cllr Blake. I won't repeat what he said. He is a long- serving councillor, he knows that rural clusters are valuable in the context of the post Covid world we are living in. Again I would like to say that a lot of the framework for this plan, which was deeply flawed was written and passed pre- Covid. Covid has taught us that working from home is a real possibility, that rural Wicklow deserved housing development just as much as urban Wicklow and these rural clusters will play a significant part in sustainable development there, so I second that motion, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, we have a proposer in Vincent Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen. Are we all in agreement?

CLLR FERRIS: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. Thank you. Number two is deleted. Item number 3 is proposed by Cllr Edward Timmins, seconded by Cllr Vincent Blake. Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Just to say as an introduction all of the proposals here were already voted through by councillors in May or whenever we had the last vote. We won and lost some votes and all of them are now back before us again, so I would like to say that almost all my proposals were already voted on and I don't propose to go into long arguments about

why I am doing it again, because it was already agreed by the members, it was always argued for. I think it's unsatisfactory that we have to go through them all again, but here we are. This one covers what Vincent Blake just did, but it also covers leaving the existing hierarchy we had in the draft plan. The management are proposing to change it, propose to change the number of headline figures for categories for towns and villages. I am saying that the ten categories we have, which includes the rural clusters which are being excluded by the management that we retain it, that is also some of my further proposals are linked to that, because it has further implications down the line.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Nobody else indicated, so it's proposed by Cllr Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake, are we all in agreement? Yeah. All in agreement on the screen. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Item number 4, again Cllr Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake. Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: That is again the implication of what I have just said, if you retain all the existing categories that then has implications for stuff that the management changed as a consequence of their proposal. This is really just to follow through, I know some of these may be unnecessary, but if that one, the one that previously is agreed, which it has been, that has implications for other amendments that the management were proposing. So here is one like that, so it's really just a follow on from that, the implications of that decision we just made, how it effects further things in the development plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Blake, I am going to bring Sorcha in on this.

SORCHA: Just in relation to this, you will see in the report that the Chief Executive has indicated that should the members accept this proposal from Cllr Timmins, it relates to a table which he is proposing be deleted, but he has discussed this and he is happy that the table be modified rather than deleted. That is in the green text. The deleting of the table would, we feel wouldn't serve the plan well, because it's a good table in that it gives good explanatory information. Cllr Timmins's key problem with it is the designation of the different levels in the hierarchy. So our suggestion is that returning to the original levels in the hierarchy which is 1- 10 instead of 1- 5, but retaining the useful text that went with that. I understand from Cllr Timmins he is happy enough with that modification, but he might want to confirm that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are you happy with Sorcha's explanation?

CLLR TIMMINS: That is fine, retain the table so it's there for everyone to see.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed on amendment number 4? All agreed. Proposed by Cllr Edward Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake.

Amendment number 5, Cllr Timmins again, I will bring you in again.

CLLR TIMMINS: There is a slight change here. First of all the main part of this where the lettering is changed by the management, this is to do with the management proposals, because it had changed the designation of the hierarchy, so the number changed. One slight change I made was include Level 5. That is kind of what are called... Level 5 towns. I am saying that include that because to restrict what they are looking to do here is saying we restrict all growth to town centre for Levels 1- 4 as it would be in the new hierarchy. I am saying extend that to five, to towns like Dunlavin and that area. You will see Level 5 on the previous page. The reason I am saying that is if we restrict growth to the town centres that lessens the development outside the town centres. Like say a town like Dunlavin has a brand new sewage plant and all the town has been rezoned and all the yellow parts of the town were dezoned. So I want us to retain the flexibility that we can have housing outside the town centres up to Level 5. The management are suggesting up to Level 4 I am looking to put it to Level 5.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Timmins and seconded by Cllr Blake, are we all in agreement? Yeah, okay, thank you. Moving on to amendment number 6. Sorry, Cllr Blake?

CLLR BLAKE: Just in relation to, there was an awful lot in changes to the markings of these towns and villages, this could have implications for a lot the towns in terms of where the maps have been redrawn as well. Just a comment on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, do you want to come in on that?

SORCHA: I understand from Cllr Timmins that the proposal is related to his main proposal which is to revert it back to 1- 10 instead of the proposal from the Chief Executive which was to make it 1- 5. That is the key reason for the change. The second reason is that the paragraph that is in the draft plan indicates that the primary focus of development in Levels 1- 3 or Levels 1- 4 is in the town centre. He wants that change toed 1- 5 and there be no qualitative restriction on units that could be built within the town centres of Levels 1- 5 rather than 3- 4. I don't think there is a huge change, because there is no land to be provided outside of the centres of the Level 5s. So I am not sure it has a huge implication, but a lot of this can be teased, when these get published, what we will have to do is make sure when we publish them. These will be published as amendments for the public to comment on.

After this meeting we can go through each one and if something past here has a consequent change that hasn't been spotted at this meeting, that

can be identified in that report and clarified that that amendment will need to come with a change in a different location, but that will be flagged for the public to see that and that will all be decided at the final meeting. So there will be changes, consequent from each of these amendments and as many of you will know, at the end of meetings we will have a final vote which is to accept the Chief Executive's recommendations, to accept the member's recommendations as past, plus any changes consequent. So there can be knock on- effects but it's impossible to pick them out right here at the meeting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think that is well explained. So I think we are all agreed on Cllr Timmins's and Cllr Blake's amendment number five. Moving on to number 6 proposed by Cllr Mullen and seconded by Cllr Blake.

CLLR MULLEN: Thank you, this is where we are getting into the flexibility we were trying to bring forward into the plan and where Cllr Snell's contribution to the start of the meeting whereby he was trying to get the clarity as to what happened between the minister and the Chief Executives. At this stage as well I would like to acknowledge and thank on my behalf, Senator Pat Casey who has been trying to liaise with the officials on this matter. The key to the proposal is to ensure that the County Development Plan has the flexibility within it to deliver the housing targets within the lifetime of the plan.

The figures as given by and I won't rehash, we have been through this before, are unsustainable and undeliverable, particularly in the town of Bray, where there is housing growth figure that can't be achieved within the lifetime of the plan. Those housing figures are being taken away from the other areas of Wicklow, where housing can be delivered within the lifetime of the plan. That is ultimately, we are all on the same page here at this point, that we want to deliver the maximum amount of homes on sustainable level on appropriately zoned sites within the lifetime of the plan. This allows a tiered sequencing of land, which again I withdrew this motion before under severe pressure from the previous manager and some colleagues, but at the same time I think it's being brought back now because we have proven and in fact the draft guidelines that are sometimes quoted at us, do give, in my view, sufficient space for us to do that.

So on page 54 of the new draft plan guidelines for planning authorities, should it be the case that there is a surplus of well- located zoned and fully serviced land to meet population and housing supply targets already

zoned for develop. In any local authority area when reviewing the development plan, it is recommended that a phased approach be taken to prioritise and rank the preferred... exactly what we have been trying to put forward since the start, which is we should be flexible in our approach, we should not be dezoning appropriately zoned sites unless there is a particular reason to do so. It is absolutely daft to do so. Some of the housing growth targets in certain areas, like I said, are unachievable. To take away sites in other parts of the county, like I said is just counterproductive.

I think while there has been a degree of muddying the waters, there is an attempt to try and clarify this and even the draft guidelines that are being quoted back to us, now give us that space. As you said, chairman, earlier, at the very start, if this is to be our plan, we shouldn't be afraid of putting in the measures that we believe should be put in. If external factors at a higher level want to take that out, so be it and the pressure will be put upon them. I can guarantee you, we have been doing it at our level with our minister and it will continue. But today it's about us representing the people of Wicklow and the county- wide crisis that exists in housing.

So I think we should pass this today and see what happens.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, I am going to bring Sorcha in on this.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. There is a number of issues raised there and I just need to give some factual clarification in relation to them before the members decide on this. There is no provision in the national planning framework, the road map and any of the ministerial guidelines with a population allocated to Bray to be reallocated around the county. We were given a county housing allocation, that we had to allocate around the county and then an extra allocation for Bray. That cannot be taken off Bray, it's explained it in the NPF and the regional plan. It cannot be taken out of Bray and divvied out to everywhere else. The reality is that the amount of growth that has been allocated to the county pot to Bray is very small and the majority of the growth allocated to the county has been allocated out around the county towns other than Bray.

There is no provision in guidelines or the NPF for us to take an allocation out of Bray and relocate it elsewhere. It's in black and white in those guidelines. So if anyone has been told otherwise, it's not been put in writing, it's not in writing we can't advice you any first than that. With regard to the idea of flexibility, the sections of the guidelines quoted talk

about flexibility and sequencing and phasing of sites within towns, not about sequencing and phasing between towns. You have to set out your growth strategy for each town in your hierarchy and then tally the amount of land zoned for each of those towns to that target. It cannot be the case that you can move the target around at any time during the six year life span of the plan. That if one town isn't growing, all of a sudden the target that is built into the County Development Plan for a different town can suddenly change.

That is not provided for in the Act or the guidelines either. You have to set out your growth target for each town in your settlement hierarchy and then decide how much land needs to be zoned within that town to meet that target. Yes, you certainly have flexibility with respect to what land you zone within that town to meet that target and you can zone land for phase 1 development, let's say immediate development, if it's serviced and ready to go. You can have land bank land, so land that is possibly within the built envelope of the town, but not needed this time around, or maybe not serviced.

So there are options for zoning within each town, but it's clear that those guidelines don't set out that there is flexibility between towns, it's between sites in an individual town. As Cllr Mullen read out, it mentioned sites rather than between towns.

Again, as the chairman said, it's your plan, if you want to have text like this in the plan, you can propose this and we will see what happens to it. I don't see how it would be implementable in any way, if say growth didn't happen in Bray, it couldn't suddenly happen in Tinahely, if the land wasn't zoned already in Tinahely and serviced. So there is no instant flexibility that is possible to achieve through the six- year life of the plan. One would have to start varying the plan at various stages, application by application, year by year in order to deliver the type of flexibility that is suggested. So I don't think it's a practical reality that something like this could delivered, even if it becomes a policy of the development plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Sorcha. Cllr Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Unfortunately I am going to have to vote against Cllr Mullen's proposal on this, just as a member of the Bray Municipal District, I don't want to lose anything that we have, that has been designated to us. I think Sorcha's specialist knowledge there and her expertise, it say, it may not be utilised immediately, that land could be brought and set aside

for further use, so just as a member of Bray I don't want to jeopardise our opportunities.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Joe Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, I would have to agree with Cllr Ferris and disagree with Cllr Mullen on this occasion. From my recollection and maybe Sorcha can correct me if I am wrong, there was a huge battle fought at the regional authority level by the previous Cathaoirleach and a number of other councillors who were members of the authority and the then Chief Executive, to try and ensure there was some realistic level of additional population growth provided for North Wicklow and in particular Bray. I think Bray became a Metropolitan Growth Status Town, which is unique within the county. The pressure was to have the population and the development. Basically in County Dublin. I think a lot of work went in to convincing other members around the Leinster area and the planners and so on to include Bray. I get completely what Cllr Mullen is saying that we don't want any artificial situation being created where because a figure is given to Bray that nothing else can happen within the county. I would also ask members to bear in mind, I think in the next two years we are going to have a new Bray area plan ourselves, Bray Municipal District plan. I would certainly be hopeful that the population figures that we have that are included at the moment would be carried forward to that plan and that we would be able to realise those figures. However, I do agree that we need to be as flexible as possible throughout the rest of the county and ensuring that everywhere we can provide additional development that we do so. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Just two quick points on Sorcha's point on the Bray figures. She is correct, as a member of EMRI, I would query that at the adoption stage. Quite rightly the figures allocated the most figures, that is a proportion of the Bray target. That cannot be redistributed across the county. I know that Dun Laoghaire and Rathdown are looking at those figures closely because they would like to get them for themselves. The Minister's guidelines issued back in August referred to additional provision of land or sites in suitably located or serviced sites.

In other words to, again as Cllr Mullen said earlier, to ensure the flexibility around the overall core strategy. In effect, if we are too restrictive in terms of the allocation of zoned land, sites aren't delivered, developed rather in the term of the six- year plan of the plan, does it mean we don't have an additional provision to cover that. I think that is part of the ministerial guidelines in issued in August 21.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Just briefly in fairness to Cllr Mullen's proposal, I don't think Bray would lose out in terms of having houses being allocated to them, because those houses wouldn't be built anyway because the infrastructure isn't there. He is only talking about the case where Bray does not have sufficient infrastructure, where planning would be refused and wouldn't be allowed anywhere. My understanding is it wouldn't be a loss to Bray.

Thank you, Cathaoirleach. On the mention of the additional provision, the additional provision is described in the draft guidelines as we used to describe head room which worked out how many how much land you needed to stone in a particular land to meet your target, that you zoned a certain percentage more to ensure there was no inflexibility in the town, if there was a land owner who was not interested in developing their land, who didn't achieve the density that you had envisaged. For all of the towns that are within the County Development Plan, other than the LAP towns, there is additional provision built into this plan which you adopted last May. I will give you an example. If you take a town like Tinahely, the growth rate envisaged by the County Development Plan is about 20 to 25% growth in that town would be 87 to 109 houses. The Draft County Development Plan has capacity for 175 houses easily and potentially more capacity than that, so there is additional provision built into every town, more than - in fact, it's more than the 25% suggested by the guidelines which came out after we had adopted the draft plan, so there is flexibility built into each and every town already from the outset. So, we are

confident that, given the target for each of those towns, that there is enough land zoned in the draft plan as of last June to reach those targets subject to that land being serviced, obviously, with land to spare, and I could give you examples of other towns across the county if you wish where we can show that the extra provision, the additional provision, the flexibility, so more land zoned than needed to meet the target is already built into the plan that you adopted last May, last June.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Sorcha. Final word to Cllr Mullen, and then we're going for a vote.

CLLR MULLEN: I will be brief. I would like to thank Cllr Timmins. I'm using Bray as an example. I'm suggesting flexibility here. I think this motion gives us flexibility in ensuring sufficient provision of housing, lands, and sites, and it says lands that while there is flexibility in the plan that's been brought to us, I don't think at this stage, and I would like to reiterate my opposition to every stage of this plan I've co-operated with it, but I did say that I passed previous stages. This is not true. And I think several of us have said that time and time again. That is important for the public to understand. That the current housing strategy as played out in this plan is not acceptable to the majority of councillors here. So I do think we need to have a vote on this. I use Bray as an example but it could be from anywhere else. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, Amendment number 6 proposed by Cllr Mullen, seconded by Cllr Blake. In favour for or

against. Going for a vote. [Votes taken].

HELEN PURCELL: 15 for, 13 against, and four not present

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 7 in the name of Cllr Edward Timmins proposed, seconded by Cllr Vincent Blake. Cllr Timmins?

EDWARD TIMMINS: Just very briefly, it's kind of like what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. There are lots of obstacles put to justify zoning, and correctly so, but there is no - there is very little obstacles or justifications for dezoning.

Dezoning seems to be done with the stroke of a pen, so all I was doing was adding in there and agreeing that some kind of justification be done for dezoning, and I know the CE's response and the proposal, but I wouldn't agree with that because that is actually adding more requirements for current land that is zoned at the moment, so that's my proposal anyway, that in other words, if land is to be dezoned, there should be some justification for it, rather than it being dezoned for very simple reasons without any full explanations. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We all agreed with amendment 7?

Proposed by Cllr Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake? Agreed? Yes. All agreed.

Members on screen, is it? Members on screen, if you can just indicate. I know it's ... yes, okay. All agreed. Thank you.

Amendment number 8 proposed by Cllr Timmins seconded by Cllr Blake. Cllr Timmins?

EDWARD TIMMINS: This is where we were inserted into our

County Development Plan an excerpt from the National Planning Framework which puts huge restrictions on rural planning, and while we have to recognise National Planning Framework, it's an anathema to see this ... plans granted by Wicklow. I don't like this section at all of objective 19 in the National Planning Framework. It's very anti-rural plan, classifies every part of County Wicklow as being under urban pressure, apart from the tiny little towns. It even includes areas like ... in rural south-west Wicklow, areas that are in the depopulation area. They're classified as under rural pressure, sorry, under urban pressure. I mean, to say that that places them under urban pressure makes no sense at all, and that to me exposes how incorrect criteria is. It says a 15% of the population work in an area in a town more than 10,000 people, then the areas under urban pressure, so every inch of County Wicklow, apart from one tiny town, is considered under urban pressure. I know that is not the case, and certainly not the case where it's been depopulated. So I object to this national document, it's incorrect, it's wrong, it's flawed, and I don't like to see it being brought into our County Development Plan. I I am fees OUR County Development Plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring Sorcha in on this one.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Unfortunately, it's a requirement of the Planning Act rather than the National Planning Framework that the development planning include a map, an assessment, and a map of the areas within the county with respect the rural

housing policies will apply. That set out in the report for you there on page V114. The OPR correctly pointed out adopted by - the plan is not compliant with the Act in including a section of ix there, 1.9 of that section of the planning act. We recommended when we drew up a proposed draft plan last March, a one-page section that would be in chapter 3 of the Development Plan outlining, fulfilling that section of the Planning Act. At the plan draft and adoption meeting in May, it was agreed by the members to take that out of the plan, so it didn't get published in the draft plan. The OPR has correctly pointed out that the plan is non-compliant with the Act by omitting that section in the plan. I would just have a concern that this would be the type of thing that at the end of the process, if this does not appear in the plan, might make the plan subject to a ministerial direction. It's not simply a case of you not having regard to the National Planning Framework, or disagrees with something in the National Planning Framework, it's a requirement of the Planning Act. We had a debate about it last May, and I suppose it is the same debate again. We are advising you to include it in the plan as required by the Act, and the same text was proposed, as proposed to you, as this time last year for inclusion in the draft plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, do you agree with Cllr Edward Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake?

>> No, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going to vote.

>> It is Anne Ferris.

CLLR ANN FERRIS: Just on the advice there from Sorcha, and I think I said this back last year as well, that whatever capability we have in supporting motions here, this is clearly our duty not to go against the Planning Act, something contained in that. It is not a recommendation to accept the ACE's recommendation from another body. This is actually planning legislation that is set out here, and certainly as Sorcha said there about the ministerial act, we don't want to end up with that in the end. If something is against the planning ability, I don't think it can be supported.

CLLR MITCHELL: I would agree with Cllr Ferris, if it is against the Act, we shouldn't be putting it through. There are many issues of interpretation. More widely than that, I would say that I'm not in favour of making it easier to build one-off houses in the countryside. I think that if we do, I think we have the potential to wreck the county, North Wicklow, where there will be tremendous demand to do this. I don't know if this would enable that to happen nor, but I would be in favour of it on those two grounds. Thank you.

CLLR BLAKE: Just in terms of what Cllr Mitchell said there about rural housing. My understanding that Wicklow as a county has one of the lowest percentage of rural houses of any county in Ireland. I think Dublin - County Dublin which is a totally different aspect all together, might be the only one that actually has a lower percentage of rural houses, so we have protected

the countryside. As somebody from a rural area, we have protected the countryside in a big, big way. And just as the map shows there, there is only one area that is in red, right on the Carlow border. It's hard to depopulate an area where you don't have many houses anyway. Cllr Timmins said there, using this thing on the urban pressure all over County Wicklow. We know we're not under urban pressure. How can you put that part of County Wicklow and say it's under urban pressure from Dublin city? It's not, so it's not. Time and time again, and the planners are using it as an excuse to refuse planning permission for genuine people in the rural areas. So that is the reason why Cllr Timmins and myself are concerned about what exists there at the moment which is meaning used as an impediment to disenfranchise people, who are perfectly entitled to live in the rural areas and are not being allowed to do so.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring the Chief Executive in.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I understand the points being made by the councils, but I would obviously support the comments made by Cllr Ferris, Cllr Mitchell and who Sorcha outlined there. It does contradict legislation, it's not guidelines, and will invariably lead to a ministerial order. I will say to the council today that it is advisable maybe to pick your battles, and I don't think this is a battle we can win, so I suppose as you say, it's against the actual Act and the legislation. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, we are going for a vote.

Amendment number 8 proposed by Cllr Timmins, seconded by Cllr Blake, for or against? [Votes taken].

HELEN PURCELL: 15 for been 13 against, and four not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, that concludes the proposed amendments from the elected members on chapter 3. We're going to Chief Executive's recommendations for chapter 3, and the first one is on page 798 of your Draft Development Plan.

[Inaudible] for housing ... I will just bring in Sorcha to explain this.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Chapter 3, which is in the back of your large booklet, you will recall that there were three chapters of the development plan that needed so many sort of small changes throughout the chapters, that it was easier to present the amendments as the entire chapter with the amendments marked in red, and any deleted text shown in blue strike - through. Essentially, rather than go to each line one by one, and passing each one, what we tried to do is break it into what are the fundamental changes, because one change could perhaps appear three or four times in the one chapter, and you will see on the table of contents there on the newer document, under Chief Executive's recommendations, you will see letters "CSA, CSB" - I hope you can all see that - and those are the key topics that all of the changes in chapter 3 fall under. If you look at amendment CSB, that is regarding the Settlement Strategy, so that has already been dealt with by way of the councillors' amendments earlier on in this meeting. All of those changes

related to the change of settlement strategy from ten layers to five, and now it's been decided to keep it at ten. The other items, CSF, the item we dealt with there, the new section on rural housing, so all the remaining items still have to be approved or rejected by the members, and they're essentially broken into the new population targets, setting the LAP priority, new core strategy table, and enhanced objectives regarding international connectivity. Those are the - a lot of them will have one line on one page, another line two pages later because it relates to the same thing. So, Cath can the, we're in your hands how you want to go through it. Do you want to go through it page by page or topic by topic? It is challenging. If the members would like to do it by topic, I can lead them through it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we're on page 798, so at housing 3.2. If 3.2, 3.4, and 3.5, should we take them together? What is your preference on this?

>> So, if we start at page 798 - the page 798, and then following on to page 799, and then a table on page 805 all relate to the population targets. So all of those changes are the one item, so if ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, are we happy to take those together? Yes.

>> Essentially these changes are the minister issued new population targets for Wicklow and for every county in December 2020, and we endeavoured to integrate them into the development plan as it was adopted last June, last May, and the

OPR and others have come back and said they would like more clarity on how those new figures were implemented into the plan, and given us more direction on that. Essentially, the amendments to each of those tables relates to more clarity, more detail on how the ministers' housing targets are going to be implemented in the Development Plan. One of the fundamental changes that the OPR in line about the ministers's figures would like to see the population target stated as the exact target for you the for the county up to the day that the development plan is adopted and lasts for six years, so it is a target for Q2 2028.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So 69,658. That is on page 805 for anyone unsure about that.

>> Essentially, the draft development plan passed last May, we set out the targets as a 2031 target, so a longer-range target, and the OPR has asked us to come back and present that as the 2028 target laws the lifetime of the plan will be 20 2 to 2028. It's been presented as the half-way through 2028 figure, so there is no fundamental change for the growth targets for any town, its rate or percentage of growth, its allocation from the county pot, it's just been presented as the 2028 figure, essentially.

The other significant change is the OPR has asked us in light again with the ministerial guidelines - and you will see this on page 808 - is to show clearly for each town its target again, show how many houses have been built to date, how many

houses are likely to have been finished last year and this year up to the day that we adopt the plan, and what the remainder then is thereafter. That is on page 808. So all of those changes are all tied together, essentially, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Apologies for me coughing! Okay. Cllr Timmins.

EDWARD TIMMINS: Cathaoirleach, just to say that as Sorcha pointed out, CSB has already been dealt with, so we can skip that. CSD has also been dealt with, and so has CSF. We just dealt with it there a minute ago. So we don't need to go through them. I've gone through the other four. No real issue at the minute. If you want to go through them one by one?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we happy with CSA that Sorcha has covered? A proposer and a seconder, please?

>> I propose, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 898 to 805? So propose ...

>> This relates to the core strategy, so every table in the core strategy will include Arklow thereon.

>> Looking for Arklow ... T-is the third settlement there from the top. Bray, Wicklow, Rathnew, Arklow.

>> I can talk about 805 because there are figures there. 13,226 in 2015, 15,419 in 2028. That wouldn't be, with a waste treatment plant coming online, we are obviously above 13,22 at this stage, more likely at about 14,500, right? Pop ration. Where are we going from there, 900 people extra, up to 2028? That is at a standstill.

>> ... page 808. Page 808 gives you more clarity on that. The housing stock in Arklow in 2016, is 5,406, 500 completions up to the end of 2020 and the estimated completions is another 100 on top of that. Therefore the growth target for the lifetime of the plan is 800 units, and then between 2028 and 2031, another 166. So the total housing growth targeted for Arklow is 1,221. So during the lifetime of the plan, 790 houses, so that is nearly 800 houses over six years, between 100 150 per annum, 120 houses. I looked at the Chief Executive for his numbers brain! 120 houses per annum which would be achievable given the target date for the sewage treatment plant, because 120 would probably come later. They would probably be back-loaded in the second half of the plan rather than front-loaded, so more than 120 grand once the waste water treatment plant is commissioned.

>> It is only on table 41, I don't have a problem of the total number of houses allocated in it. I'm conscious of the fact that ... has granted a huge planning application. It is a concern watching the rest of the towns or villages in that section, that the growth rate ... will have an impact on it. Thanks, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Burke?

CLLR BURKE: In Arklow, the projected number of houses is 790 until 2028 and. What happens if those get exceeded before that time? Will the council actually start refusing applicants because it's possible that we might get, say, one or two very large applications which would gobble up a huge percentage of what is

available, and we may end up in a position where one or two people control control virtual all of the housing projected growth for the entire district of the town. So, what safeguards can you give us that it will be balanced? And that it will be fair, and that people will still have places to live? In other words, is it possible that you might end up refusing planning applications for people if those numbers are exceeded?; thank you, Cathaoirleach. The way to address this is in your next local area plan for Arklow. When you adopt your next local plan, it will tally with these figures. You think you can assure through adopting the plan that there are a variety of sites, that you don't allocate all of the growth to one site, you split it around the town in accordance with good spatial planning principles, servicing, access, and so on, and that is how you ensure that not all the 70 houses are not housed in one spot.

CLLR BURKE: For example, there are a couple of places where Irish Water are going to upgrade the sewage infrastructure in the villages. That will probably - Avoca will vet an improved facility. That will bring more pressure on. More can be given if the pressure is there? From local people who want to build?

>> It is through the plan you adopt for Avoca which is part of this county plan will dictate where housing can be built. So, if you zone land and it is serviced through this plan, then it has potential to be developed for housing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Sorcha. Cllr Walsh?

CLLR WALSH: Something similar to Cllr Burke's theory, the

growth up to Q3 of this year and Q2 of 28. Have you factored in, for example, in not permissions but developments in the pipeline, such as the convent land subject to judicial review at the moment? There is another HSD going very soon from another developer for a significant number of houses, 300 houses, I beg your pardon. Those figures, have they been included in the growth target figure there? If we succeeded between Q2 in 2028, what happens next?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha again?

>> Thank you. Sites without planning permission where development hasn't commenced aren't factored into that. You can see the table says "estimated completions", so that is developments under way, and then user housing growth target for the period of the plan is set out there. So the only things that are taken as given are the things that have been completed or under construction, because the permission being granted is no guarantee that it will be built, or commenced. When you come to do your Greystones local area plan, you will have to address those figures in your new local area plan, and it is very possible that some figures might be exceeded in some places. It doesn't happen very often. My knowledge of 20 years here in the council, we've rarely seen any town reach its target in any development plan, but we will see what happens. Greystones and Ashford are two examples where at the moment the level of growth seems to be heading towards exceeding targets, but it hasn't quite yet. I think the fundamental is really going to be

how much land is zoned in each town, and if the land is serviced, and then making decisions on the applications. We wouldn't like to see, and I think the director and Chief Executive would agree with me on this, we wouldn't like to see a situation where there's land there's been zoned democratically in the table, and figures used a few years previously perhaps would be used to refuse a good permission, and we will deal with each one on a case-by-case basis and whether it is a good planning for that particular town, whether there is demand for housing is serviced.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think that is a clear answer, Sorcha.

CLLR FORTUNE: The concern I was having was similar to what Sylvester Bourke originally rose there. If you look at the estimated completion figures and then look at the projections, just where I live myself, I am aware of a couple of things that would whack that number, but I think you have said that if an application comes forward that adds value to the area, it will get looked at in the proper way. It won't just be shot out, because it exceeds the number, is that correct?

CATHAOIRLEACH: That is clearly what Sorcha has stated. Cllr Kennedy. CLLR KENNEDY: It's very disappointing, these figures are being given to us. 1013 units with probably 265 of those already built, which means over the next nine years we are going to get 900 units to take a pay load of 36 persons in a pay load of 36,000 population and now we are only going to get

1200 housing units over ten years? That is not going to meet the need of the Arklow people. It's just not going to meet the need. I have to say it's very worrying. I don't know how, Cllr Fitzgerald has referenced it, it is not going to work.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will say, Cllr Kennedy, these are not new figures. They have been in the draft plan.

>>: Cllr Kennedy: It's not coming as a surprise and I am not surprised with the figure, make no mistake about that, but what I am saying is that it whether not work for the people of Wicklow. We are going to get 956 over the next nine years.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry O'Neill.

CLLR O'NEILL: Just looking at the estimated completions for Blessington for the second quarter of 22 at 40. At the moment, by the second quarter of 2022, there will be 98 houses completed here. I wanted to ask Sorcha, is she taking into consideration also housing that would be built in the county of Kildare with an address in Blessington, which is at the moment, how it states, which are in Kildare, but in the village of Blessington. It would be important to include that for infrastructure, schools, etc. So are those figures based on the housing estates in Kildare over the border, just with part of the town?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I wanted to ask Sorcha, do the units allocated, like say the 1200 for Arklow, are they, do they include renovations of old buildings that are sitting there that could be

renovated and turned into apartments? Do those figures include those?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to bring Sorcha in to answer those few questions.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. With regard to Blessington, units in Kildare are not counted, they form part of Kildare's strategy, in terms of delivery agency, they do look at as one unit in terms of schools, roads, waste water and so on. With regard to renovations, no, this relates to new unit completions.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, Cllr Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: If I could clarify the issue raised by Cllr Kennedy. I remember raising this before at an early stage of the discussions a couple of years ago and I was assured there would be a midterm review, I think after two years a review of the figures if growth was growing exponentially in Arklow and you could foresee you were going to run out of figures, that it could be reviewed and figures could be expanded midterm. Could you clarify, is that still the case or is that off the table?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I am going to bring Breege in, the director.

Breege: I think Sorcha outlined that, if we see good development on unserviced land that is what we will review at the time. I think not to get hung up on the numbers. If it's good sustainable development, depending on what you have put into your Local Area Plan, when the planning applications come before us, it will be viewed in terms of what is good and sustainable development

within your town area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Fitzgerald.

CLLR FITZGERALD: Thank you, just to put that in perspective. 2010 is, most of those people were on the housing list, a lot of them went back to 2005, so that is 17 years. So thanks to the work of the housing section, there was 47 allocated. Now we have the situation into, we are going to have a dire situation because the lists are huge, all of these date back to 2011, one bed, two bed and three bed. So I mean, them figures are not going to be anywhere near the number planned, they will not meet the requirements of the people on the housing list. Some of them as I say, on it since 2011 and others and we have had many people from other countries coming in and they are welcome and that is the way it is, but them figures, I would think with the waste water treatment plant as Cllr Kennedy said you could have left it for another few years the way things are going there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think Sorcha and the director has said if there is applications and that if the target figures are exceeded they will be considered favourably. Maybe that is not acceptable to members, but it's a very clear message that has been given.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I thank Breege for stating that, but if I was on the housing list from 2011 and it looks like a long number before the numbers will be satisfied on the housing list.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to bring Sorcha in and we will wrap it up.

SORCHA: Just in relation to Cllr Fitzgerald's point, it's relevant and we have brought in to the Department. We have requested they discount or let's say ignore anything extra units that would be delivered by the local authority, or social housing. So if you have a target of 1,000 units, but the council intends to build 5,000 on its own, they would not form part of that 1,000. So we have been asked that council units aren't include in the growth figure. The logic we have for that, the reality is most of those people are already living in that town and so the new housing is not actually creating new population. We have had a look very carefully at the figures of people who are on the housing list and looked at where they are living at the moment and it is the case that the vast majority of people in each town's housing list, already live in that town. So we have made the case to the minister and the department that they would not form part of that growth target, that they are dealt with separately so to speak. So when units start, when applications come in and we are monitoring how many units are being built, Part 8s or other council or social developments would not form part of these targets that are in there. Similarly when you are doing a local area plan for any given town, if you have to ensure there is enough land zoned for 1,000 units, you are allowed to zone more land needed to meet that target, that is the additional provision, but we are going to be recommending in doing those local area plans that any land owned by the council that is designated for housing won't figure in that tally. So we have

asked for clarity in that. We understand in other counties that that is an approach which has been deemed acceptable by the OPR. So we have asked the minister to clarify that from his department rather than just from the OPR. I think we will take a very flexible and open approach to the delivery of social and affordable housing and we won't let the numbers here curtail them if they are good development where there is a demand for housing and the council can meet that housing need.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cronin, did you want to come in?

CLLR CRONIN: Thank you very much, apologies I was unable to attend earlier today. I missed the start of the discussion. I just have my concerns and reservations in relation to the numbers. There are plans in place at the moment to upgrade the water supply in many of our towns and villages and my concern is by the time these water supplies are upgraded the targets will already have been met in other towns and villages. As you are aware there are a number of upgrades going on at the moment, there are plans in place and the water supply has hindered development at the moment. So I am concerned that by the time these upgrades are complete that the targets will already have been met and those towns and villages that are waiting on their water supply will no longer be able to develop as the targets have already been met in other areas. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, we have a proposer, Cllr Timmins and was it Cllr Ferris seconding it?

CLLR FERRIS: Yes, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins, were you proposing this?

CLLR TIMMINS: I have in problem with item A we are talking about? CSA?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, it's CSA basically on chapter 3 of the Chief Executive's recommendations. So are we all agreed?

Agreed. Okay, thank you. So we are going on to CSC. Setting the LAP priority clarification of status of the LAPs. Sorcha, do you want to come in on that. It's page 810.

SORCHA: It's a fairly minor change... the OPR has asked us to set an order of priority for the Local Area Plans that are to follow the adoption of the Development Plan. So we have set it out there in numerical order as the order it will be dealt with with the adoption of the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed on the proposer and seconder? Proposed by Cllr Glennon and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy. All agreed on screen? And in the room, okay. Sorry, Cllr Bourke. Press the button... can you press your button, please?

CLLR BOURKE: Will these all be done together or one at a time? Because there will be some people looking to have reviews done as soon as possible as the plan is adopted. So how long Arklow environs have to wait?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will let the planning team answer that.

SORCHA: It will not be possible to do them all together, it wouldn't be realistic. That is the order of priority over the three-year period, 2022, 23 and 24, after the adoption of the

development plan. The existing Arklow Plan is one of the newer plans, so Bray and Arklow are one of the two newest plans. So I think it's only fair that the three older plans take priority and we also have our county town in there as well, which is our top priority.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Fine. Who was that?

CLLR O'CONNOR: Just a quick question about that. As many members know there is potentially a huge amount of development in Enniskerry. I was wondering if there is a huge development in a certain area in Arklow, will Arklow be pushed up the list or is that not possible or how does it work overall? Just a quick question.

SORCHA: This is the order we intend to do the next Local Area Plans. So we have already commenced work on Wicklow, Greystones and Blessington. We are hiring our consultants who are going to do our environmental assessments on. We already have the three of them initiated. We haven't started work as such, but we have put in train plans to review those three first. They are the three oldest plans, they need to be updated before Arklow and Bray.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, moving on we have a proposed by Cllr Glennon and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. Section CSD...

SORCHA: That has been dealt with.

CATHAOIRLEACH: CSE?

SORCHA: CSE is on page 816 of the Chief Executive's Report.

It's a new core strategy that brings together all of those figures in the preceding tables and sets them out in a format that the OPR has requested and generally aligns with the new draft plan guidelines, although they are still only draft. They could be finalised any day, so this is to ensure that the plan includes the tables that are going to be required by those guidelines.

Similarly, it sets out the existing housing, the growth targets and so on, whether there is enough land in each local area plan. There is something similar in the draft plan, which is on page 813, so this new table would be an improvement and an update on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you, Sorcha. Could I have a proposer and seconder? Proposed by Cllr Fortune and seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy. All agreed? All agreed yes, agreed, thank you. And I think the final one on this section is CSG.

SORCHA: You find that on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Page 819 and 820.

SORCHA: So this is an amendment that has been suggested by a number of different bodies, including the regional assembly that we include more information in our transport and accessibility section with regard to our international connectivity. Rightly so, because our connectivity, our role in connecting Dublin and Rosslare port is obviously very important. So we are recommending we include some extra text that reflects the importance of our ports and our access routes. It's a positive addition in that it might assist in securing funding for

these improvements of these infrastructures.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, could I have a proposer and seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Annesley, seconded by Cllr Walsh. All agreed? Thank you very much. That concludes chapter 3.

Members rather than going on to chapter 4, are we happy to take the lunch break at this point? Can I suggest maybe 45 minute, would that be okay?

CLLR TIMMINS: Just briefly, on chapter 4, I just to two amendments at the beginning there and I am travelling here at the moment. I wonder could I take them and they are not important because they are only a reflection of the hierarchy that we adopted earlier.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I another you are out of the country, so we will take those. Cllr Kavanagh, did you want to come in?

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I was asked to look at a Chief Executive's recommendation in the book, I was under the impression that there had been an amendment tabled by councillors and we would be voting on it. Now it appears there isn't. Is it possible to?

CATHAOIRLEACH: What is it?

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I am asking a general question, is it possible to propose an amendment on the day?

CATHAOIRLEACH: We would need the information. What exactly and it would depend if there is a submission relating to what you are proposing?

CLLR M KAVANAGH: This is why I am...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I suggest that you talk to Sorcha at lunchtime and we will see what the position is. Cllr Timmins. So we are on to amendment number 9, amendment number 9, 9 and 10 actually. Go ahead, Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Just to say, chairman, these amendments are just purely a reflection of the vote we had earlier in relation to retaining the existing hierarchy strategy for towns and villages. So it's just a reflection of that, it's just the wording to match what we have already agreed, so it's obviously not of critical importance, but it should be put through, thanks. Proposed by Cllr Timmins and seconded by Cllr Blake, we are all in agreement. Agreed okay. Amendment number 10, Cllr Timmins, you need a seconder for this.

CLLR TIMMINS: Same story there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Explain it.

CLLR TIMMINS: It's the same thing, we are changing the village types to reflect what we have already voted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I have a seconder?

CLLR WINTERS: I can second that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed. Okay. That is you concluded, Cllr Timmins on this section. Members, are you happy to proceed or will we go to lunch? Lunch?

CLLR FERRIS: We will go to lunch.

CATHAOIRLEACH: For 45 minutes if that is all right.

[ LUNCH BREAK ]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, members. We will do a quick roll-call before we get going again. [Roll-call]. Okay, moving on.

>> I think I was excluded. Gerry O'Neill. I am here.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We would never exclude you, Gerry. You need not worry! Right, moving on, Councillor amendment number 11 proposed by Cllr Bourke and second by Cllr Kennedy.

CLLR BOURKE: The Phelan family want to provide housing for their children, in Ballinaclesh, cuts through the field they want to - I'm proposing we extend the boundary to encapsulate a sufficient ground to give them housing, to satisfy their housing need.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, that's grand. Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: Yes, Cathaoirleach, I want to fully support it. Just to follow on from my colleague, Cllr Bourke, I don't feel we are extending the village boundary here. It's more of a rectification than it is anything else, as you can see, the line there and the map is going through the sites, and it is more to facilitate the site, not going to create any extra houses or anything, and if you look on the top right-hand corner of the line where it goes through, you will see there is a house there. On the same line as those houses, and that's a first cousin of the applicants that would want to build there, so it is a rectification, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Anne Ferris.

CLLR ANN FERRIS: Unfortunately, I won't be able to support

this. I think the Chief Executive's report makes it very clear the reasons why it should not be supported. He says it, the proposal would represent or present additional or unnecessary significant adverse effects on various environmental components, including soil, water, biodiversity, the landscape, air, climatic factors and material access and mentions the effects of non-designed habitats or species and said these lands are located on a flood zone C. For those reasons, I won't be supporting it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, we go for a vote. Sorry, Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: I know Cllr Ferris has said flood zone C, but can somebody explain to the members what flood zone C is. There is no fear of this land flooding, I can assure you that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Certainly, the area before, bringing in Sorcha, there is a lot of concern over some of these so-called lands that are flood-prone, or flood-zoned. I have certainly one that will be coming up later, and it is probably 50 metres above the lake, so I just don't understand how that happens.

>> There are other issues apart from the flood zone.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Flood zone C is land that doesn't appear to be at risk of flooding. Flood zone A is at a high risk of flooding, the one to 100 risk, flood zone B, and flood zone C is no apparent risk, obvious. With any application regardless of what flood zone it is, if it is apparent there might be a risk of flooding, even if it is in flood zone C, the application may have to be accompanied by site-specific flood risk assessment. The

maps with regard to flooding, so for every development plan we have to do called the strategic flood risk assessment, and we had consultants assisting us with that who were JBA who were one of the top consultants in the country and wrote the flood-risk guidelines for the minister back in the day. What they do is they pull together all the sources of information on flood risk. The primary source being from the OPW and their maps they did for the nation which they base investment decisions, say for flood schemes. All that information is pulled together in an appendix to the draft plan called the SFRA. For each amendment being proposed here by the Chief Executive or by the members, we have examined whether there is any apparent risk of flooding evidenced at this point in time, and these particular lands flood zone C means there's no apparent risk.

CLLR LEONARD: Look it, I'm not one for building on green field site or anything like that, but I see there is a road adjacent to the site here. I know the family, they were one of the small shops in Covid that kept the whole community going and for me, it is important to keep intergenerational little shops like this and sustain our communities throughout our communities, so I would be very much in favour of facilitating this family to keep them within the community, because they can keep that buildings going out there that is so important to the rest of the rest of the local rural community.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going for a vote on Cllr Amendment number 11, proposed by Cllr Burke, seconded by electric

Kennedy. For or against?

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

21 for, 8 against, and three not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Cllr Amendment number 12, proposed by myself, seconded by Cllr Winters. This is similar to the last amendment, this is to extend the boundary to accommodate three sites for family members on their own land. As it stand, they wouldn't be qualified to build because it is deemed rural, so an extension of the boundary would qualify effectively three members. It's not for speculation, it's just for as I say family members of the land owner. Okay. If I could bring in Cllr Ferris?

CLLR ANN FERRIS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. For the same reason, unfortunately, I cannot support your amendment.

>> I'm familiar with the site in question. Normally, if this was part of a local area plan, I would - be dealt with under that process, even though it's in the Greystones Municipal District, it's out of this scope. I would be supporting it at this stage of the process. I'm familiar with the site, familiar with the family. They're from the area, even from the boundary, just outside the boundary, so certainly there are restrictions already in relation to who can reside there, and build, so in my view, I think this is an opportunity to support this, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott?

>> Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I would agree with Cllr Ferris. I can't support this amendment. There are few enough services in

Kilpedder and Willgrove as it as and agree with the Chief Executive's response that it is not a sustainable development.

CLLR SNELL: Yes, I will be supporting this, Cathaoirleach. Small holding, the widowed father farms the land. It couldn't be any closer to the housing estate. I have no issues in regards to sight lines, road frontage, flooding - no concerns in that regard. It's for two daughters and a son of the gentleman that owns the land, and I think it should be supported. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, we're going for a vote, proposed by myself, seconded by Cllr Winters.

HELEN PURCELL: Can I just confirm Cllr Winters you're seconding?

>> Yes, I am.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

23 in favour, seven against, and two not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Moving on to Cllr amendment 13 proposed by myself, seconded by Cllr Snell. I'm going to let Cllr Snell in to speak on this. Before he comes in, this is a unique opportunity to open up Laragh Castle, a facility that people won't be familiar with, but in terms of tourism, I think it would be a massive attraction.

CLLR SNELL: This is an opportunity to enhance what we already have in the Laragh area, and our Wix is vital to the county. Up there is the jewel in the crown of what we are trying to do.

There is a lot of investment going on. Laragh Castle is in private ownership, and the family who owned it, the children are

anxious that the parents obviously would be able to settle in the area on their own lands, and they're looking for an extension of one house so the elderly couple with move into that house and live where they've lived for many generations, and in turn this gives an opportunity from a tourism perspective. The County Wicklow Heritage Forum is something we would enhance and look forward to people having the opportunity and time to be able to visit Laragh Castle and expand on the potential to increase people coming to the area. It's been up for generations for people to do but never came to pass. We have an opportunity now to support this. If members look at the original amendment from the - that was placed from the family themselves, this is Janet Halpern, it's an awful lot bigger than what is being recommended here, and through the Cathaoirleach and the planning section, they've come to this agreement in regards to producing this map today. It's quite small, and it allows for one unit, Cathaoirleach. I think it needs to be supported to enhance and give her an opportunity for tourism in Laragh and Glendalough.

CLLR KENNEDY: I won't go everything you've already said except to say it is a unique opportunity in terms of opening up Laragh. I can guarantee 99% of the members today don't know there is a castle there, but what Joe said a second ago, it's a unique opportunity, it's accommodating a house and an elderly couple, and if Laragh Castle can be opened up to the public going forward, it's what we should be looking at especially tying

in with the Master Plan for Glendalough. We are not extending the boundary there too much to be fair. I will be supporting this.

CLLR DOYLE: I wanted to ask has a commitment been made to hand over Laragh Castle or is there a plan or a design or anything to suggest it would be developed? Also, how would that development fit in with the response the Chief Executive has given about the risks to the area? I don't really understand how those two things fit together. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr M Kavanagh.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Well I would like to agree with Cllr Doyle, I would like to see a commitment to developing Laragh Castle into a tourist and I traction. It's all very well saying that you will, but we need to know how realistic they are about carrying out the work. The other thing is I am pleased to see however that I think initially it was either 3.9 or 3.5 acres that was planned. I said, because I spoke to the family members myself, I said that is an awful lot of space for one house. That is why I wasn't originally in favour of supporting it, but I see that it's been reduced quite substantially by about two thirds. So I would be in favour of it, but I would like an answer to the question of how have they shown their commitment to develop the site into a tourist attraction?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: I wouldn't be in support of this amendment. I am just noting the comment from the Chief Executive stating that lands within the village boundary, already owned by the landowner would be able to provide for an official family dwelling. I have concerns about the proximity to the Wicklow County Council SAC which has more importance on compact growth and limiting sprawl. It seems they have sufficient land to provide for the additional dwelling out this rezoning, so I wouldn't be in support of the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: I like to support this. I think it's a small amount of land for one house, so I think there is a genuine aspect to this, so thank you, chairman.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, just a quick one, a comment on, it would emerge that the SEA would be required or would be needed subject to this being agreed and where that emerged from?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I suppose I am not speaking on behalf of the landowner, but any planning permission would be on the basis of the Laragh Castle, that they would be essentially moving out of Laragh Castle into a new home. So that is the basis of what the proposal is. We are not just doing this so that they can build a new home and also live in Laragh Castle. So I think that is fairly clear from what we have said all along. Sorcha, do you want to come in on it?

SORCHA: If I could come in on the issue raised by the SEA. Every amendment that has been proposed, whether it's the Chief Executive or by the members has to be run through SEA which is Strategic Environmental Assessment. What we is provided to you here in this preliminary report is this initial assessment which has been carried out and to let you know at this stage of the decision- making which we are required to do, are any of these amendments likely to trigger worries about environmental impacts or impacts on Natura2,000 sites like SECs. Also we flag if there is any flooding impacts that might arise. Our preliminary assessment we have expert consultants to do this for us. You will have noticed that a number of the proposed amendments that involve changing land from green field to zoned will have a similar response in terms of SEA that such development could have environmental impacts. Once the amendment is passed if it is and published, more detailed are published so the public can see each amendment and whether it's liable to give rise to environmental impacts and the public can comment on that as can the various prescribed authorities. When you come back at the final meeting to decide whether to make that amendment or not, you will have information about the potential environmental impact and any views that the council may have on that as well. So this is like a preliminary SEA, just to flag at the earliest possible stage if we have concerns about environmental impacts.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, going for a vote on amendment number 13, proposed by myself and seconded by Cllr Snell.

[ VOTE TAKEN ]

SORCHA: 23 for, eight against and one not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on.

CLLR DOYLE: I had my hand up before the vote to come in again, but the vote went ahead anyway. I just, if we could all get the answers to our questions or be allowed speak before a vote, because it's very important I think that we are all heard. I don't feel that my point was recognised at all. We are being asked to consider this amendment in light of a rationale that is saying that Laragh Castle in order to allow its development for tourism purpose, with no evidence of that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I didn't see that you were indicating, I tried to give everyone the opportunity to come in. I certainly didn't intentionally leave you out, but the vote has been taken at this stage.

CLLR DOYLE: I understand it was, it did happen without coming back to me. It would be great if everyone could get the information you need.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I certainly didn't intentional leave you out. I am trying to look at screens here and I am sorry that it didn't. Maybe just, for anyone that is remote, maybe you might speak out, because as I say, we are trying to look at two screens here. If I missed you, I do apologise.

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on to amendment number 14, proposed by Cllr Bourke and seconded by Cllr Tommy Annesley. Sorry Cllr Kennedy.

CLLR P KENNEDY: I have a conflict of interest and I like that recorded in the minutes.

CLLR BOURKE: I have decided to withdraw this proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Withdrawn.

Okay, that concludes the members amendments for chapter 4, so we are going on to the Chief Executive's recommendation in chapter 4, which is page 834. It's SSA, pages 834. I might bring Sorcha in when we are ready.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. SSA there, it relates to the settlement strategy and the Chief Executive had recommended that the strategy be amended to five tiers instead of ten. This has been dealt with under chapter 3, where the members have agreed to keep it at 10. So essentially it's agreed, unless you want to...

CATHAOIRLEACH: I might get a proposer and seconder. Could I get it proposed by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy and seconded by Cllr Glennon. All agreed? Yeah. Agreed. Okay, chapter 5, we have nothing for chapter 5. Sorry, we have one more on chapter 4 it's SSB, page 849.

SORCHA: This is the proposed amendment to the boundaries at Kilpedder recommended by the Chief Executive as part of his report. A submission was made in relation to the boundary that it didn't include some already developed areas, which is correct. So we are recommending that, if you look at page 849, the areas marked in navy, hatch B, they are mostly fully built out, there might be the odd infill site, but it's nothing significant. Coupled with that we were conscious of an area that is hatched to the north of that. That will be a high voltage power line that goes through it, given the setbacks required from power lines it isn't really developable. So as part of that amendment we are recommending that come out of the Kilpedder boundary. So one addition and one removal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we all agreed with this? Could I have a proposer and seconder please? Proposed by Cllr Bourke. Seconded by Cllr Mitchell. All agreed? So that is chapter 4. We don't have anything for chapter 5. Moving on to chapter 6. We will take the elected members proposed amendment. We are starting at amendment 15. Amendment 15 is in the name of Cllr Behan and seconded by Cllr Fortune. Cllr Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I first started out with regard to this amendment trying to find the location in the plan that we could take a stand as an elected body against the selling off of entire developments of either apartments, houses or duplex units to investment funds, or corporate bodies. Because, as we all know, that has been the practice now and become increasingly frequent over the last couple of years. It denies our constituents, particularly young people, starting off, trying to buy their first home. It denies them the opportunity to actually buy a home of their own, even a starter home, even an apartment.

As we said before, and I highlighted this before, the Government are actually saying on the one hand they are supporting young people and they want people to go out to work and on the other hand they are giving money to this council and other councils to give to approved housing bodies to buy entire developments, including one in Bray of in excess of 200 units, where the council are involved, but an approved housing body is doing the work of channelling the money through. In fact 200 people are coupled who might want to start off with a house of their own are being denied that opportunity. I don't blame the council, they are looking to increase supply for social housing, I do blame the Government, because they are saying one thing on the one hand and something else on the other. Now I wanted to put in an amendment into the plan that would prevent any further sale of any further units as a body, a group to any entity.

I was sent through Bernadette which has more or less said that councils can put a planning condition that prevents the sale of multihousing or duplex units to one seller, but in fact the Government left out the apartments end of that.

I feel this is supposed to be our plan, this is an issue for many of our constituents, there is something wrong with the system, if we can't put something, some requirement in our plan that would prevent the selling off wholesale of apartments to investment funds or corporate bodies. However, because no submission had been put into the plan, by any third party I was told I couldn't do this, unless I had some way of finding a way of making it relevant to this particular meeting.

On reading, I discovered that one aspect that was mentioned in the Chief Executive's report, which is quite surprising when you look at it, is that we are supposed to have done a housing need assessment before this plan is passed. The Government policy is that you must look to see what is your housing need going to be throughout the lifetime of the plan. That makes sense, because if we know how many houses we are going to need, we will be able to plan accordingly. However, for bureaucratic reasons, basically the circular came out after we started our process, I have been told by the officials, therefore they don't have to do this assessment at all. To like I was left with a situation, I don't think that is right, we are making decisions here and we don't know how many houses we are going to need, we are doing stab in the dark here the whole time, but also I do think that the issue of selling off multiunits to one owner and one corporate entity is wrong.

Therefore, what I put in as my amendment was that a housing need assessment, a housing need demand amendment will be undertaken prior to the adoption of this development plan and the sale of all residential units, including houses, duplex units and apartments to commercial institutional and investment bodies will be prohibited until the housing need demand is assessed is satisfied. So in other words, what I am saying is until we do this housing needs assessment and land assessment we should prohibit the sale of apartments, houses and duplexes to single entities who want to buy the whole lot. On that basis the amendment is relevant, Cathaoirleach, I think it addresses a lot of need for a lot of people who are currently in a situation where they can't house themselves in this county and they are moving down to county Wexford and they are

moving to Carlow and other places, because they just can't live in their own county anymore. I think it's worth considering, Cathaoirleach and I would ask the members and I want to thank Cllr Fortune for seconding this. He may want to say something on it himself, but I would appeal to the members...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Fortune, did you want to come in?

CLLR FORTUNE: Basically Cllr Behan has covered it very well. I would just support everything he has said and I think it ties in very well to the way we kicked off our meeting this morning when we talked about what we are at here today and the housing end of it. We should be making this, number one understanding very clearly what the demands are. I think there is an element that we don't, that things are just happening. There is, as I said myself earlier, there is kind of confusion I think coming from Government level about everything and I think this is adding to what Cllr Behan is addressing here. So I think this is something that should be done and I think, hoping that the members in total will agree to that today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: Thank you Cathaoirleach and Cllr Behan for bringing this motion. For me, I totally agree with him. The thoughts of big businesses and vulture funds coming in, buying up blocks of apartments for their own benefit really and then renting them back and things like that. So I have serious problems with it. The people who move into these apartments never own them and anyway, as far as I am concerned apartments are a no- no for me. I would be supporting Cllr Behan's thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy.

CLLR FLYNN KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach and my question is probably more a point of clarity. I agree whole heartedly with Cllr Behan and Cllr Fortune in relation to vulture funds coming in and buying large developments, I have no query there. My issue is in relation to the comments around a corporate body, because we have seen large, approved housing bodies come into our county and provide very much needed social housing. A lot of those approved housing bodies are registered charities, but they are a single enterprise in themselves and while I agree with Cllr Behan, particularly in relation to some of the larger purchases, as is the Southern Cross in Bray, I think it would be unfair not to I suppose acknowledge the fact that yes those 200 units have not been made available for people who maybe want to have start- up homes, but those 208 units will also be available to people who are currently on the local authority's social housing list and very much needed accommodation. It's a difficult condition because you don't want to

balance the need of one group against the other. So I suppose my question for clarity is is by bringing in, by supporting this motion, or the concept of it, would it prevent approved housing bodies from playing their role in addressing the housing need of people in our communities and maybe the planners could advice on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you Cathaoirleach. Cathaoirleach, I first of all want to say I absolutely understand Cllr Behan's amendment and the feeling behind it. Because it is something that makes us all mad with the situation. I just want to get clarification from Sorcha. In the SEA response it says, 'Given the timeframe let out for plan making and the stages left to complete, there is no scope to integrate the finding in the assessment in the plan as this stage. ' Is there any timeframe that we could delay the plan to get this done and what would happen if we agree to this assessment and didn't get it finished and voted on within the timeframe. If it's a case we can't do it and there is a timeframe, on it unfortunately I won't be able to support it. It might be somewhat construed as undemocratic as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Irene Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Along the same vein as Cllr Ferris, I would love if we did have a way of stopping vulture funds coming in and buying up housing estates or apartment blocks or whatever. I do think we should hopefully be able to do something to stop that and to allow people purchase their own homes. However, I don't know if it is legal and if we are allowed to do that? My understanding of the County Development Plan, it's about land use. I am not sure that we have the authority as councillors to dictate who can or cannot buy or purchase land. I am just looking for clarity on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thank you very much. The amendment, the housing needs demand amendment I understood that was required by local authorities. Was that country by the end of last year. As I said before I diplomacy turned on my mic, I would agree with the trust of the proposed proposal. My second question was in relation to, it's already been covered by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy in relation to the approved housing bodies part in all of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Pat Fitzgerald.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I am just going to be brief, because what I was going to say has been said, but I want to know that I fully agree with the proposal of Cllr Behan and seconded by Cllr Fortune. Something needs to

be done, because we have many people who are looking for houses and can't get them. There is a lot of vulture funds. Say what you like, whether it's legal to stop them or not, but the housing bodies are doing excellent work, so I wouldn't want to see them interfered with in the situation. We have some of them in Arklow at the moment. So look it, I fully support the motion.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy, you just want some clarification.

CLLR FLYNN KENNEDY: Sorry, just two things one is the housing needs assessment. I know there is one in relation to the housing list, can we get clarity that this is separate and the second one just for being transparent, most people know I work for an approved housing bodying but I want that noted and it's not the approved housing body that is operating in Bray.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Kavanagh.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I want to know for the proposal itself should we clarify within the wording of the proposal that approved housing bodies are outside the scope of what Cllr Behan is referring to? Just in case there is anybody down the line misinterprets it. I am not 100% sure it's enforceable, but I do think it's a very good step. Even if it's past a day and we have down the line, it is proven to be unenforceable. I think it's sending out a very clear message and there might be something, a better statutory instrument down the line that might make this possible, but I do think it's a very good stop- gap measure, so I will be supporting it. I do think that the question about the approved housing bodies needs to be clarified, whether it is or isn't in the proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Just really quick, I think we can't underestimate the importance of housing need demand assessment at the moment, considering the context we are in in Europe, where there is an unprecedented movement of people, namely Ukrainians landing in Ireland. We have not a really clear sense of what the future might hold for them. I think that should be also a driver for how important it is to do this type of amendment going forward. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: There is a few questions for Sorcha there.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, there was no requirement to do a housing needs assessment because of the state of the plan we were at when they came forward. It's not that we chose not to do it, it's that the plan was too far along to do one. I am not sure the councillors are aware

of this, the housing needs amendment is a housing strategy by another name and another methodology.

We have a full housing strategy, it's an appendix to the development plan and it fully sets out the demand for housing arising in our county over the lifetime of the plan. The different land banks and the need for social housing, so that is already in the plan, it's not that the plan doesn't address where the housing need will arise. As some councillors have brought up, this would appear to be more of an issue for national legislation rather than a county development plan, because it would significantly impact on property rights and the market and I don't think it's appropriate for Wicklow County Council to try and do a solo run on something like this that is so significant in terms of legal consequences, but look, I think the most important point to make is if the members want a housing need amendment done at this stage, we will have to make a planning process, or halt it, because we would have to stop the planned process and go and do this HNDA and stop where we are and come back to you in two to three months if you want to have it integrated into the plan. Anything you decide today gets published in three weeks. That is what happens to the amendments and they go on public display. An HNDA is a specialist complex data number-crunching exercise that we will have to tender outside expertise to do it and I would estimate two to three months for it to be completed.

So if this is something that the members want done at this stage we will have to pause the plan at this stage, go away and do that and not continue for the time being.

We would have concerns, we are already heading towards perhaps September for adopting this plan. It must be adopted by November, because that is your outside date to have this plan adopted with the extra year agreed to be added on. If the plan doesn't get agreed and finalised by that later date we have agreed, November this year, the Chief Executive can step in and make the plan, which we obviously do not want that to happen, it's your plan, we want you to adopt it. So we would suggest that the Chief Executive and the director might come in on this, that we don't stop the plan-making process to do this, given we have a housing strategy that addresses most of the concerns, I feel you have raised in terms of identifying housing need and coupled with the fact that I am not sure if you are legally entitled to preclude any particular

purchaser at this stage without any national legislation supporting that move.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Breege, I will bring you in.

BREEGE: Thank you very much, Cathaoirleach. I wanted to reiterate the point and I think the proposal coming from Cllr Behan and the way it was worded was to assist Cllr Behan to make a proposed amendment at this stage, but what he is really asking for is that it's an amendment to the current legislation, which does allow, or does prevent bulk selling by vulture funds in relation to houses, but doesn't include apartments. I just wanted to clarify for the rest of the members, it isn't that we didn't proceed with the housing strategy, without looking at the housing, at the housing need. The point is that we weren't, at the stage that our plan was at, it was at that point that we couldn't incorporate the new rules, etc, associated, that will produce this new document called the housing need demand amendment, but the background and everything else associated with it is within the plan and it's how the numbers are put forward. It just doesn't follow on what was produced after we started our plan- making process, but it was through here, as we have emphasised on a number of occasions that we, you can't just take proposals, or proposed amendments that aren't linked to an existing submission. This was to allow Cllr Behan put forward his point which we all agree is very valuable, but there is already legislation in place in relation to houses and I have just, I have just sent a text to say I think I have looked at a planning application already that limits sale in terms of units to vulture funds. I have put in a text to confirm that. I don't know if that is clear at this point in time, what I am trying to say to you?

>> That condition has been applied to permissions.

CLLR BEHAN:

BREEGE: Am I correct, you want to add in apartments, because apartments have been excluded at this point?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will let the Chief Executive in.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I will reiterate what Sorcha and Breege have said. Due to the timeline here, we would have to take a pause in the whole planning process. It's even questionable whether we can actually progress with the meeting this afternoon, because we don't know the implications of the decision to look for a housing needs assessment at this point in time, and the knock-on effect it would have for the rest of the document. I could share the frustrations of the members in relation to vulture funds, but as pointed out, there is guidelines and legislation in place, albeit only for the houses and the duplexes. I suppose we are restricted at the moment, and it's questionable whether any amendment we could put forward which

would be legally implemented, so I would I suppose implore the members to continue on with the planning process as is.

CLLR BEHAN: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, thanks, everybody for their comments. I haven't had one person, neither on this side nor this side say there was anything wrong with the idea - the principle of ensuring that houses that are built, blocks of houses which apartments and duplex units should not be available for purchase to the people we represent. The question is, if that is our view and we are going to do something about it, are we going to pay lip service and move on or continue on? I do not accept for one minute that if a government policy states that a housing needs assessment demand should be done, that the minister would not give us permission to extend the planned process to enable us to do that. Because it is obviously something important for the government, because they've asked every council to do it. We are racing ahead here the whole time. We are leaving behind the thousands of people, couples, families, who desperately want to get on the property ladder and have security of tenure, and they're not getting it, and they're being forced to pay exorbitant rents, and never be able to save for a deposit and never able to purchase a property. I think it's our plan, it's our plan, it's always our plan. Here we have - no-one has said, "I don't think it's a good idea for these funds not to be allowed to buy up these units." No-one has said that. I'm taking it that most people agree with that. I'm asking members to consider whether there is not a way that we can actually ensure that there is fairness and justice for the people that we represent right across the county. With regard to the approved housing bodies, I accept the point that Cllr Kennedy has made, but I would say they are designated as charities, but they seem to pop up - I don't know how many there are in the country at the moment - but, for example, with that one in Bray, that was an entire development built by administration developers and a housing body appeared, it wasn't a local housing body, some other housing body, and it has bought them all with government money. So if we are against the idea of funds buying all these units in total, we have to be a little bit careful that we don't just say, "But it's okay if an approved housing", because the fund might sell them to the approved housing body, but the people that are, our constituents get short-changed, and people on the housing list. I want to see a balance, and see local authorities build more of their own houses, but maybe approved housing bodies are doing that. Like there was an example in Bray where there was an approved housing body in the centre of Bray, and we are waiting four years on for it to even start, but that's another issue. So, in my opinion, Cathaoirleach, I welcome the fact that there is support in principle for the idea; I know everybody here would be very unhappy if we suddenly said, "Right, we are going to stop everything here today and we have to wait for two or three months", but I'm going to put the motion to a vote,

Cathaoirleach, and I think people have to decide whether they feel the issue of ensuring that whether they're apartments, houses, or duplex units should be available for purchase by our constituents, is that an important issue for you or not? If we have to wait two or three months, if we have to get a consultant in, so what? We are actually doing what the government minister has sent in a circular for all councils to do in the first place. I can't see how the minister would object to that, and I think it's an issue worth pursuing, and on that basis, Cathaoirleach, I would ask members to consider it. I understand people have reasons not to vote for it, but I'm asking that it be put to a vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I don't think anybody is disagreeing with the sentiment of what you put forward, and I think it's very important and valid, but I do sense that none of us want to pause or stop a plan for three or four months on the basis of that. I'm asking is there a way to facilitate Cllr Behan without stopping the plan, before I bring in a few other members? That is something I need to have a look at. Cllr McManus?

>> I'm not if the wording "constitutional and investment bodies" would include HHEs, and I don't know who can bring clarity to that, whether we think AHBs should purchase properties or not, I'm worried about the wording of this particular amendment.

GERRY O'NEILL: Just to say I agree with Joe there, Cllr Behan, and ask his - ask the question, the housing bodies at the moment, just on the, you know, to revert back to this morning with there for a moment, the council voted there to give the green light for 106 houses on public land. These units will be built by a housing body. I know it's a 25-year lease, but just to remind people the shady waters we are in. Again, I - I'm ferociously ... there are no affordable houses going up there, but I'm just saying this in passing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erika O'Doyle?

>> I think we all agree with the sentiment, well I think we all agree with the sentiment of Cllr Behan's amendment. At the same time, none of us want to pause the plan. I wonder if Cllr Behan would think about possibly a suggestion that we as local authority rights to administer and suggest he includes apartments in the legislation of the joint body, just a suggestion? Thank you, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Chief Executive?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I want to make crystal clear to people like the HNDA, if that was undertaken, it doesn't change national legislation. In order to put in the restrictions we are talking about in relation to apartments, the legislation has to be changed, so it is two separate things, really. So I don't really see the point in pausing the

whole process to undertake an HNDA when the legislation still remains unchanged. So, I think people need to be crystal clear on that. As regards the time frames, there is no provision in the law at the moment to further extend the extension from November. So we're under a lot of pressure in relation to the time frame, but, look, maybe there's an alternative solution. We could do that as was pointed out, I think it was Cllr Corrigan about rights to administer in relation to the legislation, or Sorcha, can an amendment be done on Cllr Behan's proposal?

>> I don't think I have anything to suggest that I think would be lawful, but in terms of separating this out from the HNDA process, the other alternative is actually to propose a new objective, a simpler objective, as simple as no unit shall be sold to ... and it doesn't mention HNDA, it is a straightforward say what you mean objective. I don't think it will stand up to scrutiny from the OPR or potentially the minister at the end of the day, but a more direct objective that it is your proposal, you want to put it in the plan, and then the members can vote on that, and then it will be published, and it will go through the process. What we would have to do is sit down with you later on and see what that wording would be, but I can't think of any wording that would be sound, it would be your wording and we wouldn't be advising you to do it in the sense that we don't think it would stand up to test in the courts, for example, but that would extricate it from the HNDA delay potentially. But, just the thought. I haven't really thought it through. We might need advice from the law agent.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring in the other speakers, and I will bring you back in, Cllr Behan.

>> Maybe if it went to the council as motion, and we write to the minister, and that means it doesn't hold up the process, and it isn't something that isn't going to be enforceable by law. Just wondering, would that be an alternative?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fitzgerald?

>> It is my understanding that when the planning application comes in, they can deny that planning to the fund? That's my understanding.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

>> That a condition can be put into it. I just confirmed that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

>> So that's the understanding I have.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring back Cllr Behan now.

CLLR BEHAN: I always want to be co-operative! [Laughter].

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm not even going to comment on that! I think you're getting huge support here.

CLLR BEHAN: I'm not used to it! [Laughter]. But like I think what Sorcha has put forward there as a suggestion is a worthy one to consider, and I'm happy to disentangle it from the needs assessment, if that allows us to continue on with process of the meeting. But I know her counsel and where it is coming from, but a motion from the council is not as strong as putting it in our development plan. Okay, we will provoke a reaction from the regulator, but if the regulator comes back and says that's not legal been then what are the government at talking about ensuring that young people can go and buy their own places? So I think it's a stronger challenge to have it in the plan as an objective, and if that can be done throughout the afternoon, I'm willing to pass on the other one for the moment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: As amendment has been withdrawn, and I'm correct.

CLLR BEHAN: Provided I can reintroduce ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: On the basis that you can come to an agreement on a new wording. Are we all ...

>> [Inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we're deferring number 15.

CLLR BEHAN: Deferring it for the moment, yes. All right, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 16 proposed by myself and seconded by Cllr Melanie Corrigan. This came back in October for the draft development plan. Again I suppose the idea of it, it was passed on that day, and the idea really is along the lines of trying to protect local people in their communities in being able to purchase a home. And I've said sometimes the level of affordability can be a barrier against somebody buying a home in their own area of where maybe they've grown up. And I feel what - the follow-on from that is a displacement of communities. I've given examples before where you have people from in Bray and Greystones moving to Newtown, moving as far as Ashford because of the affordability, and what I put forward is that a percentage of 25% of units over ten units be set aside to give people in their own community a chance to purchase a home, so I think people are well aware of it. Yes, I understand that it may not be lawful when it goes to the minister, but as I said, my very opening remarks today when we started, this is about a plan about the people of Wicklow, and that is who I represent, the same as everybody else here, and, for that reason, I support this particular amendment. Cllr Melanie Corrigan.

>> We should be encouraging people when able to stay in their own communities. 25% is a fair amount to be asking. You know, I think Covid has really taught us of the importance of communities and keeping people together, as much as we can, you know, obviously, we need to be encouraging new people into communities as well, but to give people the opportunity, and as you said already, it is our counter development plan, and we have to support the people that we represent. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Gerry O'Neill, are you indicating to come in?

>> The red hand here, or the hand comes up red some of the time and white. It doesn't indicate whether I'm on or off. Sorry about that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erika Doyle?

>> I don't really understand this, so, any additional information I could get would be great. So just a couple of points, or questions: if I've moved out of my local area because I couldn't afford to live there five years ago, and been listening somewhere else since, then then I'm not eligible, ten years ago, or whatever. That means I'm not eligible. Also, if 75% of the homes are sold, let's just say, for argument's sake to - and then I come in, am I going to be refused? You know, we're in a place now where we have borders aren't what they used to be. We have people who are living in different ways for various different reasons, and I'm not sure, like is this potentially discriminatory? I just? I understand the reasoning behind it, and it would be fantastic if all people could live where they wanted to live in the town or village of their upbringing. But I just would worry about how that would impact on other people, and that there would be effects that maybe we haven't even thought about. The fact, Chair, that you're acknowledging that it might not be legal before introducing it, obviously, there is that, but there is a sort of for me a sort of ethical aspect to this as well, and I would be interested in hearing the views of the other members. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Vincent Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: Thanks, Chairman. I did vote against this at the last meeting as such, to my recollection. I'm not in favour of all these restrictions in such a form. We had a huge number of them in the past, and we are starting to bring them back in. But it was passed, and we should honour that decision that was taken the last time and therefore I wouldn't be - therefore, I would be in opposition to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Derek Mitchell?

>> Thank you. I would have concerns about this. I understand that the concept behind it, and I'm sympathetic with that idea. I think to say for

instance that 25% of the houses in Greystones have to be kept for people from Greystones, I don't think - first of all, I don't think it's legal, and secondly, I don't think that is a reasonable concept. I think we have in some of the much smaller communities some other part of this plan which does restrict the houses, or some of the houses in those small communities to people from those small communities. I think in the bigger towns and settlements, I don't think it's - and the last speaker, the previous speaker said, that we have all sorts of people coming from all sorts of places. I don't think we should be introducing additional restrictions on who should be living where apart from the fact that I don't think it's legal to do so. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Before I bring in two more speakers, I want to come back to Cllr Doyle, and the reasons behind this is for any new first-time buyer who has lived at least three years in County Wicklow and in 15 electromagnetic terms of the proposed development site, it is really targeting people who have never had a home and who want to try and, I suppose, settle or have a home close to where they were brought up. I suppose that's really in a nutshell what the proposal is about. So I'm going to bring in the last few speakers. Cllr Grace McManus.

>> Thank you, I also appreciate what you're trying to do. I'm in the generation of unaffordability. I'm uncomfortable with this amendment because I don't understand where the arbitrary limits have come from. Why three years? Why 15 kilometres? Why 25% in? The era of working from home, where the - we're the generation of job mobility, we change jobs all the time, people might need to move for their jobs. I will be concerned while what you're trying to do is allowing people to have homes in the - local homes in the affordable area. That's nominate the need looking for first-time buyers at the moment. It's not people outbidding each other from other areas, that's why we have an affordability crisis, it's many years of bad policy and over reliance on a market. I'm uncomfortable with this amendment as it is. Thank you.

>> I wanted to mention a point of information that Cllr Kennedy and myself on behalf of the Arklow District Members had a suggestion for Root drum that they be - Rathdrum that they be designated as only affordable sites for local people, but there was a precedent of a court case in Kildare where it was not legal to do it. It's not dissimilar with what you're trying to do for this motion here to put those restrictions on. I'm a bit puzzled.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Anne Ferris?

CLLR ANN FERRIS: I have problems with this. I agree with Cllr Doyle. She mentioned the scenario if you're born and bred in Bray, for example, you lived here all your life, but you decided, you wanted your home, if you can't afford it, so you go, you might have to move down to North Wexford

maybe to be able to afford to pay a rent. So if you're going down there for five years or whatever, and then you won't qualify, because it's outside the 15-kilometre zone, and you're gone for more than three years, and say somebody who has just moved into Bray from say South Dublin, and they're just there the three years, that they would be entitled to it. I don't think that would really stand up. I also have concerns in relation to what is mentioned as the Flemish case in the European court of justice, and it was probably on a constitutional matter, so for that reason be I won't be able to support it. I know exactly what you mean. I have a daughter in the same area, you know, with the problem that she can't afford to buy a house in Bray, so I completely sympathise with it. But I don't think that it is the right way to go. Sorry, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott.

>> I think all my points have been made but I will speak briefly. Again, I appreciate the sentiment behind this amendment, and I support the sentiment, but I can't support it the way it is written really for the reasons that other people have gone through in details, that I don't think it will work, and I have concerns about the legality of it as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Kavanagh?

>> Yes, with regards to the legality of it, I don't think it's legally enforceable at all, because the European Court of Justice has actually ruled on it, on the right of freedom of movement within the EU. So, I do agree with the sentiment of it, and if there was another way to do it, maybe not this way, but some other way, that we could apportion a certain amount of houses for local people, but I just think this is going to be absolutely fraught with problems, and very, very difficult to enforce.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. We're going for a vote on Amendment 16 proposed by myself and seconded by Cllr Corrigan.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

13 for, 16 against, two not present, and one abstained.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, moving on to amendment number 17, proposed by Cllr Grace McManus, seconded by O'Brien.

>> Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I know we did have a discussion on this before and it was a close vote. I actually think that the public have made clear on public housing on public lands, and I hope colleagues have had a chance to listen to the people we represent and consider this proposal. I won't go over the arguments I made the last time which is the amount of public land that we have and council land at the moment is not adequate to provide social and affordable housing for our social housing list, so we should be saving every little bit for our own builds, but I did read the

transcript of the last debate of this, and a couple of points to make on the issues raised at that point trying to maybe convince the members to support this, this time round.

The first point that was made was that private developers might be necessary to build houses forth council, and in my opinion this amendment would not stop that. It would mean the land would be retained in council ownership even if there is a public/private partnership for the delivery of the housing. We need a moment to consider the national maternity hospital and the land ownership issues there, and we can see the complex knot that can leave us in. The second point what about affordable housing? Even today, members have spoken so passionately about the need for affordable housing. This amendment I don't think would stop AHBs providing particularly a cost rental, and the SPC we recently got a presentation from an AHB who would be involved in providing affordable housing, and this amendment wouldn't stop there their involvement in providing affordable housing. The third argument that came up at the last discussion was this isn't a land-use policy, but like this is our land, and it is how we will use our land, so I don't know how this wouldn't be the place for this kind of amendment in this decision. And finally, some members were concerned with hamstringing ourselves. I would say every discussion we have had today - and we have had healthy discussions - is about setting parameters for what we think would be acceptable for the development of our county over the next number of years and this is simply saying that land is council land should be for public housing and shouldn't be sold off to private developers for them to make a profit. It's one of our most important resources that we have and I think we should be using it for the good of the people on our social housing list, the people who need affordable housing, and we need to maintain this very precious resource for public housing only. I would ask members to support this amendment. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Anybody wanting to come in. Cllr Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: We have a couple of sites that are owned by the council throughout the county, and we have had numerous discussions about them here in the past as well about moving them on and selling to people who are on the council housing list in dire need to build their own house but can't afford a site or affordable sites here in the council. I'm wondering what effect would this proposal have on those sites? A number of them, they're in Tinahely and other places. There are a number around the county. There might be some in North Wicklow as well. I wonder what the effect of this proposal would have on those particular sites?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in the Chief Executive first.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: In response to that, without knowing the size, but my understanding would be that this proposal would prohibit the sale of those sites in that particular case, and I suppose in general, why I understand - while I understand the sentiment in relation to it, I would have serious concerns about the delivery of the housing strategy being restricted or hamstrung. We need flexibility in order to deliver our housing strategy, and I think obviously first and foremost, any land that we have, we are already focusing and prioritising social housing and affordable housing, so that has been done anyway. So I don't think we need to include it in the County Development Plan. That is our focus, our priority. As I say, I would have serious concerns that any implementation of this would inadvertently hamstring us in relation to achieving our targets and the housing delivery strategy. Thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Crean?

>> I think this is important. If we're going to accept amendment 15 that Cllr Joe Behan has proposed, this balances that in terms of making sure that we protect public land for people on social housing list, and particularly in relation to affordable housing. So I think it's a very important amendment. I would like to support it. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: Most people in society want to buy their own home. That is the majority preference and I suspect most people in society do own their own home. I don't think we should cut out people who want to buy their own home at the market price from council land necessarily. Councillors do have to approve the disposal of land, there may well be appropriate times, certainly in larger schemes, it may well be appropriate to have a variety of different ownership structures on large council- owned sites. What our prime responsibility is to make sure that homes are constructed so there is housing to buy, to affordably purchase open to all and to give social housing. So I think all of those things should be, have the ability to be catered for on public land. We have the decision on each case. There may well be cases where I think it could be necessary to bring in a private developer, in some cases and in some situations and I wouldn't agree with this, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR BOURKE: I am wondering what is wrong with the current system where it's a reserve function to dispose of Council property and the councillors decide? It's worked well in the past I would have confidence

that the member was the Council would make the best decision for Council property into the future as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: I also feel that we don't need to pass this today, because every parcel of land has to come in front of the chambers and the elected members. Really what we are doing is trying the hands of future councils. We may not be here after the next local election and by implementing this we are restricting the powers of the people who are going to come in behind us and the reality is that it's much easier to deal with it case by case. Every Part 8 has to come into this chamber so you are dealing with it and the fundamentals around it. Everyone is furnished with the document beforehand so you know what you are talking about. This is bland and open-ended the reality is there is lands out there and I brought it up in the May meeting of 2021. The local authority owe money to central Government for lands, such as in Greystones. By restricting what we can put on the lands in regard to how we are going to come up with a financial package to deliver housing units, if we are restricted that the department can only allow us or give us the money to build our own land, affordable and social, it just won't happen and I would be fearful that we are restricting ourselves. We are actually hampering ourselves going forward. I am not in favour of giving away land, I am not in favour of selling off land, but I would like to deal with it case by case as it comes in front of us.

If, as might happen down the line in the likes of Greystones or north Wicklow where land is expensive, that you end up with 200 units, whether they be affordable and social and 50 units private, it's better than having none at all because you will still have 200 people on our social waiting list with no hope of getting housed. So I would rather take it on a case by case basis, Cathaoirleach. I said it at that meeting before, the members agreed with it and I think that we should leave this for the members that are elected to do their job, we have very little powers and by putting this in today you are taking away the powers of future councillors.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, and I think it's important to have these conversation and some really interesting stuff from members there. I think what is important as well is that we are able to prioritise and that our intention is the response to the emergency that we are facing rather than just business as usual approach. There was a report out this morning which again shows us the bleak picture that the house prices in the first three months of 2022 were 9% higher than they were

this time last year. So that is, again we are on a journey towards people not being able to afford to buy their homes. So again we have notions about what people should be able to do and how we want them to flourish in the county, the average price of a home in Wicklow is €394,000. So for me this proposal is really about setting our intention in the right place and really pursuing that for the good of the county and the people again who will again haemorrhage the people who can't afford to live here, if we just keep doing business as usual, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thank you, Chair. Again I appreciate the sentiment of this amendment, but I would agree with a lot of what Cllr Snell said. It's the removal of the flexibility for me. It is a reserve function, we can deal with it on a case by case basis. There may be scenarios where it ends up beneficial to us and to our waiting lists to actually look at other options and I am not comfortable with just completely removing that flexibility, while I do support the spirit of what is being said, I think maybe there is another way of dealing with it and that is with a reserve function on a case by case basis.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I agree with the motion, but I do have concerns about the fact that it would not allow us to offer, say for people to buy affordable sites for themselves to build on. Now I am just wondering could the motion itself be amended to include that if the propose earn and seconder were agreed? But, you know, I take the point from the Chief Executive that the county development plan may not be the place for it, but I certainly support the thinking behind it and I would just like to know if they would agree to just add in a line saying they would agree to affordable sites being sold out of the public- owned land, if you know what I mean?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Like others, I think the intent of the motion is well- meaning. I must say I have a problem with the affordable housing side of it. I think affordable housing is just generally speaking from all quarters getting lip service. We keep talking about affordable housing, the majority of calls I am getting currently would be from people who can't afford to buy a house and are looking for affordable housing and trying to understand what do we mean by affordable housing. I think that is the massive challenge and even when we are talking recently in the chamber about different developments and part of them being affordable housing, the affordable housing disappears down the line because it's a different department, so that is what I mean

by lip service. I think we should be very careful that we don't throw the baby out with the bath water by tying our hands in the wrong direction. Maybe we don't do that, but I think there is a danger we could.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Neary.

CLLR NEARY: I support this amendment, but like Cllr Ferris I need more clarity on the affordability, affordable housing section and then also if this will impact on our ability to get finance to build social and affordable in future? I and, at the same time I respect the notion that it is our right, as councillors to have that flexibility to consider applications, but also we could be our own worst enemies. Councillors have been voting down social housing in my district as well and sometimes I do wonder if, would we be getting more social housing units if we took out that step? I don't want to see it resort to that. If we could get clarity on the affordable housing aspect, I would be more inclined to support this amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, like previous speakers I understand and support the sentiment around the proposal, but I also understand that the inflexibility and the restrictiveness that is around it and the points made by Cllr Snell there earlier, I certainly concur with and the elements around affordable housing. There is still not enough known about what is affordable housing and particularly in north Wicklow. So I think it's too restrictive and I think we should be left by case by case basis for future Part 8s.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Grace McManus.

CLLR McMANUS: I don't know if Joe Lane is there, but for me, the only way that a Council land would provide affordable purchase homes unless will is a scheme for council affordable purchase which is through the shared equity scheme, which is selling land to private people to build homes and couples would have to apply for the shared equity scheme, which is bad for local inflation. I don't know what affordable housing schemes are coming down the track. There was an interesting point at the start of the debate about selling council land to people on the social housing list to build. If Joe Lane is there I would like more clarity on that.

But one other point and I think Cllr Snell is right about not, ensuring that we go on a case by case basis, but my issue with that is both the land development agency and what we are seeing recently with Part 8s is things going to An Bord Pleanála is our power being taken from us all the time. What this is doing is trying to set an intention that we won't accept, the land development agency, or Government policy changing or any

other mechanism coming in and taking council- owned land and selling it to private developers. So that would be my response to that. But Cathaoirleach, is it possible to postpone this, like the way we did Cllr Behan's, what I am hearing is there is a lot of agreement in this. I have no problem working with any councillor or official who wants to amend this so it's more flexible so we can get something workable, rather than put it to the vote and losing the sentiment that so many have agreed to. Is it possible to postpone and agree to do that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in Cllr O'Neill.

CLLR O'NEILL: Briefly, Cathaoirleach. I know where Cllr McManus is coming from. As I mentioned earlier on, the Part 8 we talked about, that land is council land, public land and the, but housing body will have a lease of 25 year on that. I just wondering, how do we come to that conclusion? I think it's a bit of a gimmick in one way. There will be no one in this chamber, well, very few in this chamber in 25 years' time, or how is that agreement comes into place where, who determines whether it's 25 or 50 year? That is where I am confused on this. I generally agree and I know where Cllr McManus is coming from, it's totally wrong for public land to be used by others for profit.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to bring in Lorraine here for clarification.

LORRAINE: Just to say that Cllr Bourke made a good point about the reserve function of the elected members. It is the elected members reserve function for the disposal of all property. So that is enshrined in law, in the Local Government Act. So by considering a policy that flies in the face of, or hinders in any way the elected members reserve function, I am not a law agent, but I would query that and members should be aware of it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr McManus, do you want to go for a vote?

CLLR FERRIS: Defer.

CLLR McMANUS: Can I defer it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Defer it. Council amendment number 18, proposed by Cllr Behan and seconded by Cllr Mags Crean. It's to do with the economic and social need of rural planning. I will bring Cllr Behan in first.

CLLR BEHAN: Cathaoirleach, I won't delay, it's fairly straightforward, I want to put in two particular sets of wordings. They are aimed at trying to assist people who have a strong intrinsic link to a local rural community and they have access to affordable housing or an affordable site. So it doesn't apply widespread, it's not a general principle, it's a very specific one in specific situations.

So Part C there is local applicants who are intrinsically linked to the local area and while not exclusively involved in agriculture or rural employment have access to an affordable local site. In the past what councillors have done in previous councils is try to in some way ensure that local rural applicants had some access to planning permission. It was agreed if they could prove an economic or social need to live in the area, that that would allow them consideration. What I am saying is that now, given the price of land, the price of housing, where there are genuine intrinsically linked local applicants and they have access to an affordable site they should be included. The second part is relevant after Covid, apart from other applications that local applicant who provide care services to family members and those working in family healthcare provision locally. So in other words to extend the criteria for rural housing to include those two particular elements. That is my proposal, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, I am going to bring in Sorcha here.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. With regard to the first proposal, it's the bullet point C in green in the document. This relates to local applicants with an intrinsic link who do not engage in agriculture or rural employment. I would point out that it should not be under the heading economic need, because it relates to people with social need rather than economic need. If you turn over the page and read what social need is, the very first paragraph of that actually covers exactly those people that are set out in Cllr Behan's proposal. Planning authority recognises the need of persons intrinsically linked to rural areas that are not engaged in agriculture or rural-based occupations to live in rural areas. So that is in the plan under social need. With regard to the second bullet point, we would also consider that different circumstances, such as those taking care of people or working in healthcare are already provided for under social need under the very bottom paragraph that says, 'And other such persons that may have a definable strong social need to live in that particular rural area which can be demonstrated by way of evidence to strong social or family connections as may arise on a case by case basis.' So we would suggest that both of those categories suggested by Cllr Behan are already fully covered by the policy that was set out in the draft development plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you, Sorcha. Cllr Behan.

CLLR BEHAN: Just in relation to the agricultural employment, my wording is not exclusively involved. The interpretation being put on the planners is that they must be exclusively involved, that is their primary activity. I mean I can't see if the planners think there is nothing different about this, why can't we just include it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think Sorcha's point was that your first point C...

CLLR BEHAN: We can move it to the other.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Social.

CLLR BEHAN: I accept that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So you are looking for both points looking to be put in under social need as bullet points.

CLLR BEHAN: That is fine.

SORCHA: I suppose, Cathaoirleach in response to that, Cllr Behan has asked why not have it in if it's already in. The whole thrust of the new policy that was adopted last May was to try and rationalise and clean up the Rural Housing Policy, to make it simpler to understand. At the moment we have 15 odd categories of people who are eligible in theory for rural housing. Very hard to understand, some of them aren't well-written, are a throwback to 20 years ago. A lot of work was put in this time last year to strip this back and make it much clearer that it was about social need, economic need and what did that mean.

For the first time since we have had a Rural Housing Policy to include a catch all that says other such persons on a case by case basis that may be considered eligible. That was to cover those unusual one-off situations that only arise once in a while. If we are adding in categories now we are going back to where we were from 1999 onwards. Back then when you first had a Rural Housing Policy there were ten categories and by the time it was up to 15 or 17 because each development plan a new category was added on. Usually to accommodate one or two applicants that the member maybe had in mind or someone who had been recently refused. We are trying to get, to move to a place where it's simpler and clean and the categories are clearly specified and they don't drill down to that level of detail, such as someone working in healthcare.

If you were to go down that road it could become someone working in education, recreation, to specify one profession over another starts bringing it down a different road and that is why we would have concerns about that. We would feel that people who have a genuine bona fide need to live in a rural area, even if it be for care services to family members, can be considered under the new wording that was published last June.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Crean.

CLLR CREAN: I take Sorcha's point in relation to the professions, but I do think the sentence "*local applicants who provide care services to family members.*" That is really important recognising care in terms of social and economic needs for rural planning. I think that is an important part to keep in it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: As I said earlier on we have a restrictive nature in terms of rural planning in Wicklow. We have protected the countryside over the years. As far as I am concerned, I would be very much supporting Joe's proposal here and if he has a few more I can throw them in and I might support them as well!

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we in agreement... with Cllr Behan, sorry Cllr Mitchell?

CLLR MITCHELL: Can I say, I said the remarks in relation to an earlier amendment that I am not in favour of making it easier to build one- off houses in rural areas because I think we could make ourselves very popular and line all the roads of north Wicklow within ten years if we choose to do so. I think that would wreck the county. I appreciate there are many difficulties out there, but I think in particular the one- off rural housing is destructive. I think there are a number of proposals which have been going through today, for one or two houses on the edge of settlements which are not of significance in terms of county, but I think the one- off houses, they make, everyone has to drive, you have to drive to school, there is no foot paths and street lights and I think it's the wrong way to go, so I will not be in favour of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Cllr Timmins. You are probably in the airport at this stage, are you? You are on mute.

CLLR TIMMINS: Can you hear me?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR TIMMINS: Just to say I would support this. Sorcha said we worked hard to simplify, we worked hard for 20 years to come up with the original proposal with the 20 points in 2023, so anything that would, it's lessen that the impact of the vote we had last year, in my opinion it's going to make it harder to get rural planning. Anything to mitigate that I would support.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to bring in the Chief Executive next. Cllr Timmins, would you stay on the plane because you are up next:

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: I wanted to highlight the part under economic need, there was a reference to access to affordable local site, just to highlight

the point made in the Chief Executive's Executive Response, it should be noted that affordability is not a criteria for rural houses provided by the NPF or ministerial guidelines. Just to make that note as well. We can't really enforce that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I think we are going to go for a vote on this. So I will just quickly recap. It's amendment number 18, proposed by Cllr Behan, seconded by Cllr Mags Crean. So I will pass you over to Helen for or against.

HELEN: Am I correct to say that point C is to be moved to social need rather than economic need? Yes, thank you.

[ Vote taken ]

HELEN: 27 for and five against.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. Amendment number 19 and 20 are the same. So I am going to withdraw 19 and let Cllr Timmins deal with amendment number 20. Cllr Timmins, are you there?

CLLR TIMMINS: Just briefly, Chairman, you can speak in favour of this as well, it's basically just confirming what we agreed last May, that we would insert this, or retain this in the draft development plan. It's already in the existing plan, as regards rural planning and now we are just confirming that we want to keep it there. This was voted through last year and it's a very essential part to allow, help people get rural planning, it's already very difficult. This has been in place, it's not always recognised, I have to add, but it gives people some chance of getting rural planning. It's already in the plan, so I think we should continue to retain it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am seconding that proposal. Are we all agreed? All agreed.

CLLR SCOTT: No, no, vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr, who is coming in, Cllr Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: I can't support this amendment. Just concurring with the statements in the OPR, just the concern about having too much development, one-off houses in the open countryside, cumulatively it has significant adverse effects on the environment and on general commuting into towns and local services so I couldn't support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, we are going for a vote. Proposed by Cllr Timmins and seconded by myself. Over to Helen.

[ Vote taken ]

CATHAOIRLEACH: It is on page 853 of your draft plan. I might bring Sorcha on this one.

>> This is the section on chapter 6 that Cllr Behan had initially proposed his amendment under. I think we've moved on from that. I think we need now to decide on whether the members are happy with the proposed wording change set out on page 853 with regard to the HNDAs. It basically gives more information about what an HNDA is and when it is going to happen or why it didn't happen before the plan was done, so essentially just fleshing out the position on HNDAs. That is the first - that is number HA.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could I have a proposer and seconder, please, for that? Proposed by Aoife Flynn Kennedy, and seconded by Cllr Behan. All agreed? Yes. HB page 853, Sorcha?

SORCHA: That is an amendment that appears in a few places throughout the plan to change the text or refer to the fact that the law has changed, that 20% in social and affordable housing is possible in certain circumstances, rather than 10%, and that was a change just before Christmas, so it is anywhere in the plan where we seek up to the maximum of 10% social housing, it is now up to 20% and affordable housing, but there are caveats on that, to do with the timing, so the wording is "in certain circumstances". So that that will appear on page 853 and 863 so appear twice in the plan. It's a clarification of the new law to make sure that we can take 20% if the circumstances allow.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, proposed by Cllr Mullen, seconded by Cllr Behan. Thank you. All agreed? Thank you. HC ...

SORCHA: HC related to your proposal, 16 is and 162. Number your proposal EM16. That is already dealt with.

CATHAOIRLEACH: HD864.

SORCHA: This policy relates to social infrastructure audits and repeated in chapter 7. When we finish at chapter, there is a proposal from Cllr Timmins that we categorised as being related to chapter 7 and it relates to chapter 6 as well. We should possibly deal with Cllr Timmins' proposal that EM21 which we have down on the next page as being related section.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we go back to this?

SORCHA: EM21 will affect chapter 7 and chapter 6.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will go back to our Cllr amendment 21 before we can move ahead. So, it is proposed by Cllr Timmins. Cllr Timmins, do you want to come in there? Cllr Timmins?

EDWARD TIMMINS: I think that's okay. That's a follow-on from what has where been agreed.

SORCHA: In the current County Development Plan, there is a provision that developers have the infrastructure audits as part of a planning application to show how social and community facilities are adequate to meet the needs of the new residents in the area or that they propose to bring into the area. The Chief Executive in light of number of concerns that had been brought up, particularly by members of the public, rather than prescribed agencies, felt that that policy should be stronger, so rather than saying in certain circumstances we will ask for one of these, or we may ask for one of these, our proposed new text is where significant new development is proposed, the infrastructure, audit shall be required. [Inaudible] to bring it back to "may" rather than "shall".

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we happy with Cllr Timmins's amendment? First of all, are we happy with Cllr Timmins's amendment? I do need a seconder. Sorry, I'm going to have to bring in Cllr Crean first of all.

MAGS CREAN: I suppose I'm speaking from the perspective here in Greystones certainly, infrastructure with loads of housing growth and lack of infrastructure, so I would be concerned if we don't include what has been recommended, so I wouldn't support this recommendation or this amendment. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr McManus.

>> I don't support this amendment for the same reasons.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr L Scott. Cllr Dawn. Sorry, I can't hear you? Cllr Jones, I will bring you in.

>> I'm the same, I would rather - so many houses, and there is very little, sometimes, there is no infrastructure, and something that I'm passionate on, that should be done, so I would be in agreement with a lot of the councillors. I think it should be "shall".

CLLR WALSH: I should I would leave the word "shall" in especially with the amount of development in our area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Tom for the R Fortune.

>> I would prefer "has to".

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins, can I bring you back in there?

EDWARD TIMMINS: Sorry, I couldn't connect there. The reason I say to put this this is because it should not be an automatic requirement. Like there's enough onus put on people trying to do, put in for planning applications. Let the planners at their own discretion do this. It just adds another layer of bureaucracy to getting things done. As I've seen myself, there are massive layers of bureaucracy to getting any planning permission through, and let it be at the discretion of the planners whether it is necessary or not. This could be applied to lots of different planning in the same area and lead to duplication and delays.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, I need a seconder. Cllr Glennon. Okay okay. Going for a vote. Helen?

HELEN PURCELL: EM21. [Votes taken].

Irene winters is not present as well. So it was nine for, 21 against, and two not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we're back on to HD864 of our draft plan.

SORCHA: That's right.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on to HE page 868.

SORCHA: That relates to the Chief Executive's recommendation to delete the rural clusters which you've decided are staying in, so that is dealt with.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Finally, page 871.

SORCHA: That related to the rural housing policy by you've already dealt with.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So that concludes chapter 6.

If we go back to the elected members' proposed amendments, and we're on to Amendment number 22 in the name of Cllr Scott. Can I have a seconder first of all before we ...

>> I'm happy to second it - Cllr O'Connor.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So Cllr Scott, when you're ready.

>> This is to add in the words "community gardens" on to the CPO748, and the Chief Executive has already had strong sort of support for objectives in the development of allotments and community gardens that's been left out of this particular line.

Just for those of you who don't know, there is a difference between allotments and community gardens. Allotment is a garden by individual, often a fee paid, whereas community gardens tend to be smaller and are a communal effort, if you like, in looking after them rather than the

individual, so I just think it's important that just both are acknowledged under this objective, and it is something that we as a county are deficient in as well, and it is something we need to be supportive of and have a policy about.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are we all agreed?

>> If I could come in there.

SORCHA: There are two proposals here. One is to put the words "and community gardens into CPO748" which there is no issue with whatsoever because we've added it in other places where we mention allotments. The second sentence is not a land-use objective. It is about the council's operations and management of its own land. And it don't sit in a County Development Plan. It's about the council's management of its own corporate estate. I would suggest that this is inappropriate for inclusion in the County Development Plan.

It is unclear what is meant by "planning regulation". There is no planning regulations with regard to community gardens, so I just am I bit concerned that is not clear what that sentence means, and as I said already, it's trying to direct how the council will manage its own land bank and how that isn't an operational plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I bring in Cllr Scott. [Inaudible]. So on the first part, on community, we are all agreed, it's - yes, all agreed, it's proposed by Cllr Scott, seconded by Cllr O'Connor, full agreement. Moving on.

Amendment number 23 is proposed by Cllr Derek Mitchell, seconded by Cllr Gerry Walsh. Cllr Mitchell, when you're ready?

>> Yes, I'm proposing that this small plot of land be zoned for a nursing home. This was zoned as part of the Druid's Glen, and adjacent to the golf club and resort, et cetera. It has a large amount of flat walking roads, and the [inaudible] zoned at the beginning of this plan without anybody noticing. Now, it does South in here that this was accidentally included in the zoning, and this wasn't the case, it was originally deliberately included in the Druid's Glen resort zoning, and I'm proposing this would be a suitable use for it, seeing as it has been changed, the zone.

>> I think the site in question, as Cllr Mitchell, was zoned as a tourism zone [background noise interfering with speech]. Proximate to the villages of ... Newtownmountkennedy.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed? Thank you. Moving on to the Chief Executive's recommendations for Chapter 7. So number 3 is on page 10. Give me a second.

Page 10 of your draft plan, it is Chief Executive's recommendation number 3. Sorcha?

SORCHA: This is a proposal setting out a description of what the [inaudible] and young people's plan is, simple factual statement of the existence of this plan [inaudible]. It provides some context in the community development chapter.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all in agreement? We are. Could I have a proposer and seconder, please. Proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by Cllr Fortune.

Chief Executive recommendation number 4 on page 10, so directly underneath. Sorcha?

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. This relates again to what Cllr Scott mentioned about allotments and community gardens, and it's just to update the text to refer to "community gardens" and give a bit of a description of what community gardens are, and also within the same section of the plan, there is actually, this is the section of the plan that sets out different types of recreational uses that people make of land, and there was no mention of swimming, and the number of swimming groups brought up the lack of information about swimming or positive enforcement of swimming activities, so, again, this is just a small piece of text just describing the importance of swimming, and supporting swimming.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. All agreed again? Yes, proposed? Cllr Glennon, seconded by Cllr Mullen.

Executive recommendation number 5, on page 11. Wording to be you had included. I don't think you need to come in on that, Sorcha. Are we all agreed on number 5? Could I have a proposer and seconder, please. Cllr Kennedy seconded by Cllr Snell. Item number 6.

SORCHA: This is about the social infrastructure audits, so we have already dealt with that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will get a proposer and seconder. Cllr Dawn and Cllr Ansley.

SORCHA: Yes, they're regularly done and regularly submitted planning applications. Might include assessment of school places, sports grounds, creches, playgrounds in a given area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Number 7: page 11, again, extra text. We all agreed again? Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by Aoife Flynn Kennedy? All agreed?

Number 8: page 11, which is the final one there, again, it's just three extra words "national sports policy". Could I have a proposer and seconder, please? Cllr Scott? Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes. Yes, okay. Thank you.

Item number 9: page 12. Again, just extra wording. Could I have a proposer and a seconder? Anybody remote? Want to come in there? Cllr Dermot O'Brien? Proposed. Cllr [Inaudible], is it? Rory O'Connor second.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed again?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Finally number 10 on this section, on page 12, again, it's only two words, proposed by Cllr Fortune, seconded by Aoife Flynn Kennedy. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

That is chapter 7 completed. Chapter 8, we have page 13 of your draft plan, and it's number 11. Again, it's extra text. If you just want to have a quick read of it.

We're taking out "or local authority"" and putting in extra text. Can I have a proposer and seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Flynn Kennedy, seconded by Cllr Kavanagh. Again, all agreed? Okay

Number 8: ... chapter nine. We are moving back on to the elected members' proposed amendments, so we're on to amendment number 24, in the same of Cllr Paul O'Brien. And I will just bring Cllr O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Dawn.

>> I'm looking to propose that the B5 site be zoned for a service station. The days of pubs on the motorways are finished. This was a service station granted by planning permission before by Wicklow County Council. As we all know, the M11 is becoming more busier, with a 68% increase last year alone and the footfall from Europe. Anyone living locally knows the increase of traffic on it. We know these ... coming in Arklow will increase the footfall and the traffic on the N11 as well. With Rathnew, the Southgate way into Wicklow town, and we don't want sites lying empty there. As I said, the days of the pubs on the N11, every motorway, is finished, so I want to see an employment opportunities for people of Wicklow, and that's why I'm proposing this amendment. Promotion. Sorry.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr O'Brien.. are we all agreed? Cllr Scott?

>> I don't support in amendment. I just have concerns about the location. It's on a rural road, essentially, and I just don't think - I do

agree with the CE's responses in this, and that it doesn't actually follow the correct sort of planning framework, so, no, I wouldn't support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, we are going to go for a vote on amendment number 24, proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Dawn. Before we go, Cllr Doyle, I noticed that you are your hand up again. Go ahead.

CLLR DOYLE: I was about to put it down. Yes, just the out-of-town destination element of this proposal wouldn't sit well with me, so unfortunately I won't be in a position to support it. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr dawn?

>> Yes, it is on the motorway as well. It's not on a rural road, and the other thing it is in striking distance of Kilmacore House, and people coming out there looking for actual and food, and et cetera, so I will be supporting Cllr O'Brien's motion. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Yes, as previous speakers said, this was granted planning permission by this local authority at one stage, you know, so it is - it was something that the officials of this council felt was important at the time. The reality shall is that we've seen too many vacant units heading southwards which were in the past thriving businesses. We don't want to see another vacant premises. The reality is that the road network was put in at huge expense - huge expense. If you're coming south from Bray towards Arklow, Wexford, once you leave Kilmack, there is no other service station on the left-hand side. People say you can go on the undercarriage and go over. Motorists don't do. They genuinely don't do that, and the reality is that this is an opportunity - it is an economic opportunity to create employment on our doorstep. And I think it should be welcomed. I understand that people have concerns in regards to other aspects of the County Development Plan, but how anyone couldn't see the benefit of employment status within our County Development Plan is just beyond me, and our planners agreed with it in the past. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I'm going to go for a vote. There are two more. Cllr Fitzgerald first.

>> I'm in agreement with this. It's very much welcome on the M11 and N11, so, very few options, a long spell before you have to come off the motorway, so I just welcome this - I will be totally supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Councillor, be brief.

>> I omitted one thing which is of benefit again with the size of the site, it could easily be transformed into a park-and-ride as well which would help.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going for a vote. I reiterate, it is a Councillor amendment number 24, proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by Cllr dawn.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

25 for, six against, and one not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Moving back to the Chief Executive Recommendations on chapter 9. We're on to Amendment number 12 on page 14 of our plan. The draft plan.

So effectively, this is Mountkennedy, Demesne, Kilpedder to provide a data facility and uses. It's page 41 of the draft.

>> Someone remote has their microphone on.

>> It already has the planning, hasn't it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, it does. It has planning. There are two years left to run on the planning.

>> We are doing the word change.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Word change.

>> The reason I'm hesitant in addressing it is why are we proposing a word change?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring Sorcha on this?

SORCHA: The chief executives is recommending that you receive this from submissions received from the OPR and the regional assembly raising concerns about this zoning. They raise concerns about the number of the employment zones that are not related to towns, the Kilpedder Interchange is another example we're going to come to. In light of the concerns that they have raised, and some of those bodies actually had, in fact, suggested that the zoning be omitted entirely, but the Chief Executive's recommending that the zoning be retained given the long history of the zoning on the lands, but that it is rationalised use is allowed on the land to strictly data centre facility only. The wording in the draft plan I can carry forward from the previous development plan did have an extra caveat that allowed for additional uses. However, given the concerns raised by the OPR and the EM we're recommending that you strip that back to Strictly data centre only. Should the members decide not to proceed with the Chief Executive's recommended change there, they will need to put on the record very clearly what their reasons are for

doing so, because a report must go to the OPR after this meeting with regard to any amendments which they recommended and the members did not accept. For the vast majority of proposals put forward at this meeting, the amendments have provided in advance their reasons in writing, and so we can utilise them, but for this particular one, nothing has come forward to us as yet in writing, if it is the case that the members do not want to accept the Chief Executive's recommendation, please be careful to put your reasons on record now, and we will get them off the transcript and put them in that report.

>> Can I just ask to clarify what ancillary uses are? Just so that there is no misunderstanding here?

SORCHA: Uses related to data centre. So operation as a data centre.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fortune go ahead.

>> Thanks for that, Sorcha. I would be proposing that you leave it as is, leave the changes as proposed by the Chief Executive. The reason for that being that back in 2010, 2011, when this particular project was very much the vogue, I supported it here in the chamber, and indeed at a subsequent County Development Plan meeting, and for all kinds of reasons that would take a good hour - it would be an interesting debate, it seemed to be sideways for all kinds of reasons that I personally didn't support, so I would be strongly recommending that it is zoned and we leave it alone, and we don't make the changes proposed. I think at the time, there was massive support for it from the community in Newtownmountkennedy because of the economic benefit and the potential commercial added value that it was going to bring to the area. I think that if you go back on the records of the council, you will find that what I'm saying is accurate.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Do you have or do we have a seconder? You're proposing to leave it as is in the blue text, essentially?

>> Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Cllr Snell, I bring you in?

CLLR SNELL: I will come in on that. I can - I can recall what Cllr Fortune was saying, I remember the debates, and I remember the support generated not just in the immediate area, but in the whole county, there was a fabulous opportunity for County Wicklow at the time. I wouldn't like to see anything - any change in this plan that would hamper the potential growth of that area and what it was designed for, and I think it still could be a marvellous facility.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I'm going to bring Sorcha back in just to clarify.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. To clarify, there is no proposal to remove the zoning, but change the wording what is allowable on the site with relation to to the data centre. I'm not sure I can grasp the reason put forward for this not accepting this particular change. I accept that you want it remaining zoned but not for accepting the Chief Executive's recommendation. If you have anything further you want to add, it would certainly assist in this report we have to send to the regulator because they need to know why you are not accepting this.

>> I'm recommending what I'm saying is because in saying what I'm saying, it is important that we maximise the potential benefit of the project, and the wording as is originally there, without being deleted, maximises in my opinion the project in a more constructive way for both the developer and also for the community at large, because back in the day, when this was being developed, there was a part of the project was that there would be the power that would come out of it that would be gathered up, could be used locally for other kind of industries and various things like that. That potential is there, as I understand it, and so it is for commercial and economic reasons I'm saying that it should be left as is.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have a proposer and seconder to leave the blue text and not support the Chief Executive's change. Are we agreed with that?

>>: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Right, we are requesting for a vote. Basically it's on the Chief Executive's recommendation number 12. It has been proposed by Cllr Fortune and seconded by Cllr O'Brien, to not support the Chief Executive's changes, correct?

>>: And to leave it as it is.

CLLR DOYLE: Could I have that clarified, I thought I heard a double negative, can I clarify what we are voting on?

CATHAOIRLEACH: If you are voting against thence Chief Executive's changes you are voting against.

SORCHA: No, you are voting for. Cllr Fortune has suggested it's left as it is.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So you are voting for the proposer and seconder?

SORCHA: If you are in favour of Cllr Fortune's proposal to leave it as it originally was, you are voting for.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry about that. Before we proceed, Cllr Crean, did you want to come in.

CLLR CREAN: Just more clarity the difference in keeping the wording or not. What is the significance of refusing to accept what the CE has recommended?

CATHAOIRLEACH: It's been pretty much outlined.

CLLR FORTUNE: Can't explain it any better.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have you got the report, Cllr Mags Crean, it's page 14.

CLLR CREAN: I am looking at it, I suppose I am trying to work out, if it's still zoned as a data centre, I am not sure what the issue is.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fortune is not accepting the word changing.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: So therefore if we are voting for... voting against...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, so if you are supporting Cllr Fortune you are voting for, in other words. Isn't that right? Okay.

HELEN: So it's to leave it as is in the blue text.

[ Vote taken ]

HELEN: That is 25 for, six against and one abstaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, moving on to amendment number 13, Chief Executive recommendation number 13, on page 14, it's a follow on from the last one. This is to do with the Kilpedder interchange. I will bring Sorcha in to clarify first of all.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, it's similar to the last one. A number of the prescribed bodies, including the OPR and the regional assembly and the NTA have raised serious concerns about the entirety of this zone. Their concerns principally relate to the fact that it is separate from a settlement, it is car-based and it is adjacent to an interchange. There is also the question of whether it might prejudice a future lay out of the N11 in the area, a project I know that is currently paused, but there were options being looked at for the area of this land adjacent to the N11. Although these agencies have suggested that this zoning in its totality be omitted, given that the southern side is partially developed and has planning permission for further development, we are recommending that

that stay untouched and stay zoned, where as the northern part, where there isn't live permission at the moment and there has been a couple of refusals on it more recently, with issues raised on, like I said, the N11 prematurity and other issues, we are recommending that the northern part of this block be omitted from the development plan. Again, if the members decide today to not accept the Chief Executive's recommendation, I would request that you set out your reasons verbally here very clearly so we can make a note of them, because it will have to go on the report to the OPR.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: I don't agree with deleting this objective. It's important that there is employment in the area. There is a significant shortage, I think the area has the lowest jobs ratio of any in Wicklow and possibly in Leinster, but this particular site, the northern section, which is listed here, there is a degree of development on it, but there is a ramp down from the roundabout from a previous planning permission, which is probably expired. But it also says that, although it's portrayed as being out in the middle of the country, there is an excellent cycle path and footpath all the way from Greystones. Probably the longest cycle path in County Wicklow. There are three buses per hour stop near the site.

The zoning of the wording, which you can see here in blue struck out, secures the mass path to Kilcoole, joining to Delgany which has been a subject of contention, so this will provide public benefit to the area. I also say that and I don't want to see any potential N11 improvements jeopardised by this zoning, but it's my understanding that they were not going, even before it was paused, it was not going to come through this site and, as far as I could see from the road reservation, it didn't include this site. So I am proposing for those reasons, which I have stated that this is a good site for industry, particularly lorry- based industry, which we don't want those trucks and HGVs in the community. We want them to stay near the motorway and I think this is an appropriate site.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just before I bring in Cllr Walsh, I want to add to what Derek Mitchell has said. There has been a lot of work done with Irish Water in the last year- and- a- half to develop this site. There was a problem with water and waste water which has been resolved now which would make it easier in terms of commercial development on the site. Cllr Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Again I would agree with the sentiments. I don't think it makes sense to be taking it out of the plan. I noticed EMRA and TII in their submission to the draft plan recommended that Greystones be

downgraded to a self- sustaining town from a self- sustaining growth town. To quote that further considerations should be taken, focussed in terms of the weakness in the employment base. The low ratio of jobs to resident workforce and recommended. This flies in the face of what we are talking about. 80% of the population are leaving every day to work outside the county and here we are in the lands designed for industry and designed to create employment and we are dezoning it. The location, it was pointed out, it's not rural, it's approximately 2km from the Charlesland roundabout. A round about at its entrant, cycle paths, foot paths, a direct link to the N11. A live planning application on a section of these lands to build a business park with companies ready to move in there. Again, the lands to the south of it are practically fully operational. As I said at the outset it doesn't make sense at this point to go ahead with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: Most of what I was going to say has already been said.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. All right, so we have a proposer from Cllr Mitchell, am right? Seconded by Cllr Walsh.

[INAUDIBLE]...

: I think Cllr Dermot O'Brien was still talking.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, I thought you had stopped.

CLLR D O'BRIEN: I think I muted myself in the process. All good, carry on.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So proposed by Cllr Mitchell and seconded by Cllr Walsh. Are we all agreed? Same as previous, you are retaining what was already there, essentially, Cllr Mitchell, is that right?

CLLR MITCHELL: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed?

CLLR DOYLE: No, chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Doyle was it?

CLLR DOYLE: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we are going for a vote.

HELEN: We are going for a vote to retain the existing wording.

[ Vote taken ]

CATHAOIRLEACH: For is supporting Cllr Mitchell and Cllr Walsh.

[Vote taken again ]

HELEN: 27 for, two against, two not present and one abstaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on to number 14 of the Chief Executive's recommendations, it's on page 15 of the Draft Development Plan.. it's effectively adding some text. If you are agreed, could I have a proposer and seconder, please?

CLLR O'CONNOR: I am happy to propose or second.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Who was that?

CLLR O'CONNOR:

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr O'Connor. All agreed? Cllr Bourke of.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed? Agreed. Okay, amendment number 15, just underneath, again it's add in text. Do you want to come in, Sorcha?

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. We just got a submission from An Post looking for some positives to support the development of their postal facilities, given we have moved into an area of a lot more home deliveries, they are just looking for a bit of support on their future development plans. It's probably not that significant we have it in the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Snell and seconded by Cllr Mullen. All agreed? Agreed. Okay, number 16, on page 15, Sorcha.

SORCHA: This is a request from the OPR that they, as we in chapter 9, which is the employment chapter, we have a section on mining and aggregates and so on, they felt it would be useful if we had an aggregates map included in the plan. They have maps on everything else so why not have a map on that. That is what it would look like, the data comes from the GSI.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Kavanagh and seconded by?

Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? Agreed. Okay. So that concludes chapter 9. So we are moving on to chapter 10. We have nothing on chapter 10, so chapter 11, on to tourism and recreation. So we have one amendment,

amendment 25 from Cllr Bourke. Cllr Bourke, proposed by Cllr Bourke and seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald. Tourism objective.

CLLR BOURKE: This comes from Tadhg Kennedy, the owner of Jack White's. It's zoned in the existing plan, the outgoing plan, I am seeking on his behalf, that this be retained. He has proved his work as a very progressive businessman in this location and has, he is very progressive in terms of managing to keep the business afloat during Covid. He had the outdoor dining experience during the summer last year, which was very effective and has maintained a lot of employment in Jack White's facility. He is getting a lot of people coming looking for extra facilities like motor homes, looking for places to stay overnight, a park and ride to get to Brittas Bay would have been useful when you couldn't get down there. If he had that facility opened there, it would have been useful for people visiting the beach to get down there safely.

So on that basis I believe this should be retained. I do believe he will have a planning application on this site within the next year or so. So I am happy to commend that to the members that it be retained, in the same way we have supported The Beehive further up the road. This should be maintained, for the duration of this planning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you, before I bring in Cllr Murphy, I want to extend the meeting, I don't know what time to, we are going for an extension and we will worry about that in a little while. Sorry, Cllr Fitzgerald.

CLLR FITZGERALD: We would want to be leaving at 6.30 to make it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think it was our plan to continue at least until 7.00. I don't know how that is with everyone, I think the general consensus we would go as long as we could to avoid coming back tomorrow.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I will do it in the car on my way to Arklow. Is that all right?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Anyone else other than Pat Fitzgerald.

CLLR MURPHY: I have to go to a meeting at 7.30.

CLLR FERRIS: I have a meeting at 6.

>>: And we don't want to come back.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I don't want to come back tomorrow. I thought we agreed to keep going until we finished? We will keep going for the moment. Could I have a proposer and seconder to extend the meeting.

Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy and Cllr Mitchell. I like to continue. So Cllr Miriam Murphy, good to hear from you.

>>: Sorry, I am seconding for Sylvester Bourke here.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Miriam Murphy was in before you, I will take her first and come back to you.

CLLR MURPHY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, welcome back. I would like to give 100% to this. This is a well- based businessman in the area and on lots of reasons we, he gives a lot of youth employment there in the area and he is a very good supporter of the community events and groups and it's vital that he would improve his business tourism attraction because it's between Arklow and Wicklow, which is a great bonus for us here, so I would certainly second and propose this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fitzgerald.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I will second it then! You wouldn't want to wear glasses. Doesn't sound like me. I would...

CLLR MURPHY: Better looking than you, Pat.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I just want to second it, all joking apart, this man has been through a rough time over the last two years and he has been a huge asset to the area and I would ask the members to support Tadhg and his family. He has built up a great business there, he is off the N11, there is no traffic issues whatsoever, Brittas Bay and everywhere. He has 14- 16 people working there. His policy is to give employment at the weekend to young people and he is great at it. I think it will be a great asset, it will continue to be a great asset to the area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: Thank You, Chair. I have never claimed to be a planning expert, but I am hearing a lot about how nice certain people are and I am sure they are wonderful individuals, but I don't really know if that is what we should be basing our decisions on. I would be more likely to base my decisions on the comments from the Chief Executive and the planners on the effects of cumulative unsustainable planning decisions. I would recommend that people maybe pay closer attention to those, because it is cumulative. It's one little thing here and there and just one line there from it, the zoning of unserviced lands remote from settlements is likely to undermine the role of settlements as tourism centres and tourism hubs. So we have to think of the effect that this is having on our settlements and our towns and villages. The more we put things into green field sites, firstly they are car dependent and you are removing life from the areas you are living in and trying to protect. So Jimmy down the road might be a great man altogether and I don't know this individual or I

don't know any of the other individuals to be honest, but that is not how I am going to make my decision. So I can't support this for that reason. Thank you, chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Look it, I will be basing my decision on what I already know in regard to the area. It's part of the Arklow Municipal District and it was in the past part of the Wicklow Municipal District. But Brittas Bay in general is a huge part of what we have to offer in Wicklow and I think Cllr Bourke has hit the nail on the head with regard to the potential to get our tourists from Jack White's down to Brittas Bay in a safe manner and get away from the congestion which has happened in the past. I know both Municipal Districts are looking hard do this. But this is a tourism potential an employment opportunity and it's my objective to try and help people who are really lifting their head above the parapet to try and create employment. This is an opportunity we said it with regard to the Beehive, we only had to see what happened to The Tap and Lil Doyle's, no one wants to see that type of skeleton development from what would have been a golden era for pubs, but the reality is that pubs alone will not survive. This is an opportunity for tourism and we, as the Garden County, should be promoting tourism and promoting employment and I will be supporting it, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Peir Leonard followed by Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR LEONARD: I would like to support this as well. Look it, nobody wants, we would love a perfect world where everyone is not in cars and stuff like that, but I see this as a lesser of two evils. We need beds for accommodation in Arklow to promote Irish tourism and staycationing. Jack White's has always been a very important tourism hub that links Wicklow and Arklow. It's only ten minutes from both really. It's right bang smack in the middle. We can look at things like link bus and things like that to bring people from Jack Whites to the beach and into Arklow town centre. We have a lot of tourism offerings, but the one thing we are lacking in is accommodation and beds and having hubs like that. So I will be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR P O'BRIEN: As the councillor who lives closest to the area I have seen the benefits this can bring. To Red Cross it's a huge success and I am sure it will be a huge success at Jack Whites. We have been crying out on the Tourism Alliance for extra accommodation in the county, especially around the south of the county. For that reason I will be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: I agree with a lot of the sentiments that people are expressing here in terms of the need for providing tourism facilities and employment in the county. I just can't support this amendment because I don't think you are looking to provide them in the correct place and moving your tourism employment accommodation away from our towns and villages to my mind and obviously from proper planning perspective as well it's not the right move. So I couldn't support this. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. So just we are going back to amendment number 25, proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke, seconded by Pat Fitzgerald, so we are going for a vote.

[ Vote taken ]

HELEN PURCELL: [Inaudible] ... against.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Chief Executive's number, page 17, the first one, number 17, is basically a change of numbers. Figures, so could I have a proposal and seconder, please.

>> I will second that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Anyone on remote there?

>> I'm happy to second that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed. There is some text that is explanatory.

Proposed by Councillor winters, seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Are we all agreed? Number 19, on page 18, it is strategy for tourism recreation, some changes in numbers again. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please. [Inaudible] all agreed? Amendment number 20 is on page 19. Again, just a few words, extra wording. Can I have a proposer and seconder? Proposed by Cllr Tavener, seconded by Cllr Ferris. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Item number - amendment number 21, again, it's a new paragraph, I might just get Sorcha to clarify anything new on this. Number 21, Sorcha?

SORCHA: Thank you. We have had a few submissions relating to purpose-built holiday homes and their function, and we had some suggestions that they be allowed use to change into permanent homes. What this policy would do is generally say we would resist change of holiday homes to permanent homes. They're part of our tourism stock, unless it can be demonstrated they can comply with the design standards for permanent occupation as well as the objectives for that area, so if they are in a rural

area, for example, that the people occupying them would meet the rural housing need. Just the plan is silent on it at the moment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could I have a proposer and seconder, please. Online? ... Winters.

>> I will second it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Who is that?

>> Grace McManus.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Number 22, visitor facilities. One word. Can I have a proposer and seconder.

>> I propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Colour Snell, seconder Cllr Ferris. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Item number 23. Amendment number 23, again, we're adding in Delgany, Kilcoole, Newtownmountkennedy.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 24, recreational teams and products, inclusions. Proposed by Cllr Cavener, seconded by Cllr Dunn. All agreed again?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment 25, on page 20, again, this is a new paragraph. I might get Sorcha to come in and clarify this.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. This came from Fáilte Ireland and the next policy as well. They expressed that we have a more positive and explicit support for Glendalough and Wicklow Mountains master plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by gale Dawn.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 26. Sorcha, clarify?

SORCHA: Same thing again.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I propose. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Then 27 is just a few extra words in there, proposed by [inaudible]. Seconded by who was that? Anne Ferris. Amendment 27 all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment 28, again, it's just some extra wording trails, and horse riding, and so on.

>> [Inaudible] Cllr Doyle.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed on 28?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 29, just extra text with regard to Glendalough and the Wicklow Mountains National Park Master Plan and Strategies. I have a proposer?

>> I will propose - Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Number 30 is on page 21. Again, it's just removing two words. Could have I have a proposer online?

CLLR ANN FERRIS: I propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That concludes the chapter 11 tourism ...

>> Can I just ask, is there any chance of a ten-minute break?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can do. What time is it? Yes, we have tea and coffee here for five o'clock, if that is okay, can we wait until five o'clock.

>> I don't think you're going to get my coffee down to Bray that quick!

CATHAOIRLEACH: You're going to have to make your own, unfortunately! We're on to chapter 12, sustainable transportation, and we are on to amendment 26 from Cllr Timmins.

>> I'm happy to second that.

EDWARD TIMMINS: I'm surely have lots of seconders.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead, Cllr Timmins.

EDWARD TIMMINS: Briefly, I'm on a bus here. This amendment was brought forward in the last draft development plan last May, and it was brought to a vote, it had overwhelming support, and I think it is fairly obvious the reasons behind it. NU81 was shelved so we have no upgrade of infrastructure in a long, long time in West Wicklow, no train, no DART,

just the country bus, that's it, and not any prospect of any one being upgraded, so that is why I put forward this proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed to the proposal amendment?

>> Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Cllr O'Connor. We are all agreed? Agreed. Okay, moving on to the Chief Executive's recommendations for chapter 12, it's page 22. Number 31, amendment number 31, again, it's just text. Do I have a proposer and a seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Scott seconded by Cllr Pat Fitzgerald? Okay. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Amendment 32, again, it's just some extra wording, Baltinglass ... all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment 33, again, extra text, climate action and environmental protection objectives. Proposed by Cllr Annesley. Second in line. Seconded by Dermot O'Brien. Amendment 34. Public transport objectives, two words - proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by Cllr Winters. All agreed on that?

>> Agreed.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 35, public transport objectives again, again, extra text. That is actually, yes, okay. So I don't need a proposer and a seconder for that, do we?

SORCHA: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, item 30, amendment 36, is that the same? No, that is not the same. This is the DART to Greystones. Could I have a proposer.

>> I will second it, Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, that is agreed on that?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 37, again, extra text. Proposer, please?

>> I propose, Anne Ferris.

>> I will second, Cllr Corrigan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, 37. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 38 seems to be taken out completely. I will bring in Sorcha here.

SORCHA: This objective is now rolled into CP1222 on the previous page. It didn't need stating twice. It is about the electrification of the line south of Greystones.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed, seconded? Proposed by? Cllr Winters. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 39, just extra text on public transport objectives. Could I have a proposer. Cllr Snell. Seconded by ... online. Cllr Winters. All agreed again. Number 40, again, extra text and general road objectives. Proposed by Cllr Gerry Walsh, second [inaudible]. Seconded Cllr Corrigan, was it?

>> Yes.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Strategic sites in Bray, objectives, 41, it is extra text. A proposer and seconder, please.

CLLR ANN FERRIS: I will propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded with Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Services we have no amendment of this chapter 14. Chief Executive's recommendation is number 42, and it is on page. Number 42 again, it's just extra text, so if I could have a proposer and a seconder for this one, please. Cllr Snell?

>> I will.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Chapter 15. Nothing on that. Okay. Chapter 16. Information, communications, and energy. Okay, so we are on to page 28 of your draft development plan, and it is amendment number 43, electricity generation. Again, I might bring Sorcha in on this because this is a new paragraph.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Number 43 and 4 come about from the OPR and the Regional Assembly, so if there is any reason that the members don't want to proceed with these, the reasons will have to be

clearly stated. We requested in line with government policy to make it clearer what our goals and targets are for renewable energy in County Wicklow, and the regulators set out guidance on how we would determine what our target would be, and it's based on our national share, based on our percentage of land that Wicklow occupies of the country, which is about 3%. So, target for renewable energy is set out to be 250 megawatts for County Wicklow to deliver as part of its share of national targets. So the first paragraph, 16.2.1 is about renewable energy generally, and then 16.2.1.1 below it is about our share of wind energy which is to be half of our overall [inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, Sorcha. Can I have a proposer and a seconder for number 43? Proposed by Cllr Bourke. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Are we all in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Amendment number 44: wind energy. Sorcha has already covered that. It sets out our county targets. Could I have a proposer and seconder?

CLLR WINTERS: I propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mullen?

CLLR MULLEN: I have to oppose that one, it's an onshore target, and I come from an area where the only onshore windfarms exist in the county, along with other members in Wicklow, and I think that is imposing an unacceptable impact on our environment, so I would be opposing that one. I would like a vote on that one, thanks.

>> Is there any questioning being considered to the offshore capacity on this, or is that outside the lifetime of this plan?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring Sorcha back in in a second.

CLLR MITCHELL: What Cllr Walsh said, Wicklow is going to be the largest amount of offshore wind of any county of Ireland by 20 30. In terms of getting credit for it, we should get credit for the fact we are going to have to look at them all up the coast, and I don't see that - I have no particular suggestion for how we should do that but just to give us 3%, the percentage of our land area without any recognition of the fact we're going to have to look at them all up the coast is a bit strange.

CLLR LEONARD: Is there any possibility of split be the wind energy on offshore and onshore to vote separately on those?

>> The onshore targets are provided in national policy. There are separate offshore targets. So what we've been requested to do is indicate what share of the onshore target Wicklow will absorb, so offshore is

counted separately, and the OPR has recommended that we aim for as high a target as possible, you know, as we have capacity for, but as I said, as a guidance, if we can't determine what our target should be, a rule of thumb could be used which is take our share of the target based on our land area which as I said is 3%, and that is the advice that the OPR's given us, but these are completely independent of the offshore targets, so the national policy is requiring [inaudible] to absorb their share of the renewable energy target that we need to meet in the country. Perhaps Breege wants to come in?

BREEGE: I wanted to outline for the members is that when this recommendation came in from the OPR, myself and Sorcha spent a considerable amount of time going through this because we were very mindful of how the members feel in relation to this, and the fact that we think that it is the members' view that there is - Wicklow's contributing a lot of its renewable energy from the offshore element but it's very, very specific, as Sorcha said, they want numbers for us in terms of the offshore. What we did is we have actually effectively tampered with their recommendation, and rather than specifying the number you will see there in the proposed amendments that we said, or by any other means, which would allow for other types of renewable energy, like solar panels, for instance, so to leave it a little bit open, but once again, this is a recommendation coming from the OPR. We will have to give a very, very strong report back as to why we haven't taken their recommendation on board, and it is one they're going to really push us on. So I just wanted to put that in context for the members. We have actually gone beyond what the OPR had asked us to do in so far as we're not taking their recommendation fully.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Joe Behan?

CLLR BEHAN: Well, maybe we could find that if we agreed to the wording, does that commit the council in granting planning permission for windfarms up to that capacity? Can an applicant windfarm company claim that because this objective or this target that is in our plan, that they are entitled to get planning permission?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I just bring in Cllr Dunn and then I will bring you back in?

>> Yes, I think like a lot of recommendations from the OPR, it's very narrow-minded, that you don't take into consideration the offshore, because at the end of the day, the Codling Wind Bank will provide power for 1.5 million houses in the country when it is completed. So, in my opinion, I sat in here at meetings, people coming from the south of the county, and had to live with these onshore windfarms, or turbines, and they're - in my opinion, they should be never entertained at all. It's

coming from the OPR. As far as I'm concerned, it's narrow-minded for not to consider what is going to happen, probably the east coast, how many wind turbines are going off the east coast? I will not be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Kavanagh?

>> I wanted to know what the options are if we don't pass this, if we don't accept it? I like some of the other councillors have huge reservations about this. There are people over in ... trying to defend the imposition of three giant turbines in an area of huge historical significance, older than Newgrange. When they've not taken into consideration what Wicklow are going to be contributing in terms of our whole shoreline down to Dublin as far as Wexford will be, nothing but wind turbines, and now I believe they're going to be 33% higher than originally planned, which means they're going to be massive. They're going to be three times the size of what is visible down in Arklow at the moment, and so I won't be supporting this, either, but I just want to know what happens if we don't accept this?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring back Sorcha there.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. The first thing to remember is we have a wind energy strategy. The - we have had it for many years now. It's a traffic light strategy where we have green, amber, and red zones. The red zones are areas where wind turbines are generally not be favoured. That does not exclude them completely. It's not favoured, and were someone to apply for planning permission, it will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The amber is less favoured, so somewhat favoured but not significantly favoured, and again doesn't preclude and then we have our green areas where wind is favoured. And that is 52,000 hectares of the county, so a significant part where wind energy is admitted in principle, but Cllr Behan said the word "entitled" and no-one is entitled, whether it be a traffic light, zoning map, or a figure, or a target. Each application will be dealt with on its merits, and there are numerous criteria, as you all know, that one has to fulfil to get a wind turbine development across the line, including visual amenities, soil stability, traffic access, and so on, archaeology. I suppose the question is what would happen if this was not passed? We still have a wind energy strategy and still obliged to assess application that is come in for wind turbines against the strategy, whether we have a target in numbers or not. I would suspect that the OPR will come back to us and ask to push further on that to include something on it in order to comply with the national policy on delivering your share of wind energy nationally. But again, as with some of the others who pointed out to you earlier, if the members choose not to go with the amendment, the report will have to go to the OPR clearly stating your reasons why so they can understand that, and, if

they wish at the end of the process, make a recommendation to the minister that you haven't fulfilled your obligations under climate strategies and so on, but I can't predict if that would happen. We don't know if the minister were to intervene on that. So that is the outcome of not accepting the OPR's recommendation at this stage of the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: There are about seven people indicating to speak on this, so can I ask you to be brief if possible. The first one this is Cllr Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I just want to ask quickly: do they have to be industrial turbines or could we not achieve the targets with individual turbines like we do with solar power on houses? Smaller scale.

>> I'm for this in general. Looking what is happening across the world, how important energy security is. If it stops us from importing Russian energy, I think this is the way forward, and I think we do need to seriously look at renewable energy across Wicklow, and I would be proud if Wicklow is the capital for renewable energy, and we will be rewarded in the long-term for doing that.

>> Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I agree with Cllr O'Connor, and I'm happy to propose this.

>> Yes, it is a little bit, I suppose, confusion, because on the one hand, I can see a bigger picture, and as Cllr - we've all experienced residents coming in to vote local chambers, and the county chambers, crying on the effect of this, of these everyday lives, but we also have to, I suppose, go back economics and the way forward. I know there is a very big - the companies themselves are selling this as a huge benefits community because they are increasing now the community grants, and local community will benefit from it. So, it is very hard one to decide for me. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Erica owe Doyle.

>> Well said, Cllr Connor, view as a Luxembourg - a view is a luxury, we can't continue to support Russia. Well said, Cllr O'Connor.

>> Yes, I mean, obviously, this is a very important area. But, I think Wicklow's quite unique. And probably unique versus most counties. Based on what is before us here, they're talking about 110,000 hectares. How do we answer them and how do we respond? An important part of the response would be what we're going to provide on ... at from the Greystones area. That's going to be phenomenal. I think we can make a case, because we also have to - I know there is a comment being passed and heritage and tourism and stuff and that has to be protected as well, and it is an important economic indicator for this county, so I would think

we need to be careful, because there seems to be different bodies, or different entities driving different elements of renewable energy, and I just think we need to make sure that there is a bit of joined-up thinking and that people are talking to each other. So that it is done properly and fairly. Based on the conversations and meetings I have had with offshore, there's going to be a phenomenal amount of energy generated off our coast. I think there needs to be a fair balance.

>> I fully support this amendment. Cllr Fortune said a phenomenal amount of energy offshore. We're going to need it to transition to a clean-energy future. Which has to happen - no doubt about that. You know, I do accept concerns raised about the onshore windfarms and there is a necessity for them to be placed in the right place, but I do have confidence that our planning processes will ensure that that will happen, so I fully support this amendment. This is a good opportunity for Wicklow to lead the way.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: What we're looking at here are target based on the national targets, based on land mass, etc. I have no difficulty with it at this point because I think the focus will change with the advancement of the offshore facility which will maybe have, provide a different perspective on the overall what we're talking about here on the onshore. Look it, I think it's a target, not set in stone, so the situation, I think it is along with the development of offshore.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Thank you. I wanted to reiterate the hectares are in south-west Wicklow, every single one of them. So when other councillors make comments about we need to depend on wind, the only onshore wind energies are in south and West Wicklow and, in fact, the south-west corner of Wicklow. That's the fact of the matter. Wind energy is one of a number of renewable energy platforms of which solar energy is one. Singling out wind energy in our so-called County Development Plan is wrong. And I do think that like we saw yesterday on the news that a turbine is going to have to be taken down in County Down because it's in the wrong place. So, so I just think this is a very, very sneaky way of putting in from the officials in the department a statement of somehow consent to wind turbines on the ancient landscape of Wicklow. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay. I'm just going to bring Sorcha in for a final comment. We have a proposer from Cllr Winters to accept what is in front of you. So do I have a seconder for that proposal? Cllr Bourke. I will bring in Sorcha to conclude and go for a vote.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, I suppose this is really about national policy, which has set out targets with regard to onshore and offshore wind with separate targets. Each county is being asked to take its share of the target for onshore wind. That is our total target based on the pro-rata land area of Wicklow. As Breege said, we thought carefully about this proposal before putting it up before you, because we know how some of you feel about wind energy. Like Breege said, we haven't taken the OPR's recommendation verbatim, they have asked us to be more specific than that, for example how many wind turbines and exactly where and show that the amount of land in our wind energy strategy where it's open for consideration could accommodate all of these extra wind turbines, if that is what it was. We have recommended to you that we keep it general and include a caveat that says: 'Unless other source of energy regeneration allow the target of 255 to be met.'

So we are conscious of some of the issues arising with regard to onshore wind. But the fact that the national policy, Government policy and national targets have set out a target for onshore, on land wind turbines and all counties are expected to absorb their share of it. So that is all I can really add to it, unless Breege has anything further? That is the wind energy map. The green energy zones are the most favoured. They are not wholly located within the south west of the county. The orange zones are less favoured but open to consideration, you can see the large block is on the east side of the county. The only areas that are excluded are the protected sites, the Wicklow Mountains National Park, SACs and SPAs, the extremely sensitive coastal areas, just the coastal strip. So the orange and green areas are, throughout the entire county. It just so happens that the wind turbines built in the county to date have been in the south west of the county.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, so we are going to a vote. It's amendment number 44 of the Chief Executive's recommendations on wind energy, proposed by Cllr Winters and seconded by Cllr Bourke.

HELEN: [ Vote taken ]

CLLR BEHAN: 14 for, 16 against and two not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We just have a few to finish off in in this chapter. Amendment 45 is a new text. I think it's fairly self explanatory. Could I have a proposer and seconder, please? Cllr R O'Connor. Seconded by? Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Agreed. Agreed. 46 general objectives, another paragraph, self explanatory, a proposer and seconder.

CLLR CREAN: Propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by?

CLLR WINTERS: Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 47, again general objective. Again self explanatory. Could I have a proposer and seconder? Proposed by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy and seconded by Cllr Scott. All agreed? 48, which is on page 29, again self explanatory. Proposed by? Pat Fitzgerald. Seconded by Cllr Glennon. All agreed? 49, bioenergy objective. Again just a paragraph, proposed by Cllr Fitzgerald. Seconded by... anyone.

CLLR CORRIGAN: Cllr Corrigan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. 50 transport energy objectives. Again the extra wording. Seconded by Cllr Snell and seconded by Cllr Fortune. Okay, that, all agreed? That concludes chapter 16, so I think it's time for tea.

15 minutes.

Break until 1720.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, members we will get going. I will just do a roll call before we start again.

[ Roll call taken ]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, members, I know some of the, some of you are time constrain tonight, so I think we are proposing to go until 7.00pm if that is okay this evening. I would like to go further, but unfortunately there is a number of members who said they can't continue past 7.00pm. Well that is the other, my next part is, there is a number of people that can't do tomorrow morning, so are we happy to go from 2.00pm to finish tomorrow? Can we cancel that? We have to finish this.

It's very hard to keep going when we have Arklow members who are putting forward amendments who aren't here to discuss them.

The Municipal District... what time?

CLLR WINTERS: Chairman, we are only hearing you, nobody else.

CLLR FERRIS: I will only be free until 4.00pm, because I have a lecture between 4- 6.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, members we need solutions to this, we can go to 7.00pm tonight. That is obviously to support the Arklow members.

Sorry, the members outside can't hear, so if you can put on your...

CLLR BEHAN: What I am saying is it's tweedle dum and dee, some people can't be hear in the morning. Unless you put it on in the afternoon.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If we go from 2.00pm tomorrow we have to go to a finish.

CLLR FERRIS: Can we not start in the morning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: The problem with the morning at the moment, three or four people have said they have hospital appointments and other problems they have to attend to tomorrow morning. That is why I was putting it back until 2.00pm. We can compromise and maybe go at 1.00pm tomorrow.

>>: We have a Wicklow tourism meeting tomorrow at 3.00pm, but this really takes priority.

>>: An Mermaid board meeting as well, Melanie.

CLLR SNELL: Just to bring a bit of normality to the proceedings, we set aside two days for the county development plan. We said at the time this is the most important piece of work that an elected member would carry out in the lifetime of this current council and I understand that people have appointments and otherwise, but the reality is two days was set aside. Next Monday we have our own special, our own County Council meeting, there is stuff to be presented at that that members are interested in having an input into and the reality is that you can only go to 7.00pm tonight. It wouldn't be fair on the Arklow Municipal District if the members can't be here. We have given it a long day, from 10- 7. I think we need to establish fairly quickly, if we have to come in here at 12.00pm tomorrow, because it will have to run until conclusion. Tourism meetings, Municipal District meetings, no matter, if they are SPC meetings, the reality is they fall into insignificance compared to this, this has to be finished.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: We got two months notice of this, that we were going to finish it in two days. Bearing in mind, at the Greystones meeting, the Baltinglass meeting was meant to be on at 10.30 this morning we had to change that meeting in order to accommodate what is the most important meeting we will deal with this year. So we are committed with two months notice to finishing in the two days. I am happy to come back tomorrow at 1.00pm to finish it. Whatever suits people.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I go with 1.00pm tomorrow? That is a compromise in my book. Can we go at 1.00pm tomorrow to finish. To a finish. So whatever else is on tomorrow, has to be sorted, whether that is true your district administrator, or whatever, nothing else as Cllr Snell said should finish this. Is that agreed 1.00pm until a finish. Can I have a seconder for that, Cllr Snell and Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR FERRIS: I will be here at 1 and gone at 4.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on to chapter 17, it's amendment number 27 of the councillor's amendment and it's proposed by Lourda Scott, seconded by Cllr R O'Connor. Cllr Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Thank you, Chair. This is in relation to the national heritage and biodiversity objectives. It's really just expanding, expanding, I suppose the ease of making tree preservation orders. Particularly when they are in danger and particularly with response to local communities. At the moment, this was once every five years with the county development plan process. It's not often enough, it needs to be more reactive, I suppose to coming in from requests to local communities. I get contacted an awful lot, since I have been elected [INAUDIBLE] groups of trees having preservation orders on it. The importance of this is we are talking about our climate and biodiversity emergencies, preserving the current trees we have is so important. They increase in value the longer they remain. We need to show our ambition, I suppose, as a County Council in our CDP, which is our strategic document for land use, as has been said quite a lot and part of that would be to facilitate the making of TPOs in response particularly to requests from local communities who know their area best and know those trees that deserve to be preserved best. I note there that in part of the Chief Executive's response, he is concerned about creating a false and unrealistic expectation amongst the public. I would just respond to that, by saying that the public have high expectations of this council, particularly since the previous council declared a climate and biodiversity emergency. They have asked through numerous submissions really to add this, really they already have this expectation and really if

there is staffing issues or need for resources then the council needs to rise to that ambition and meet those needs. It's not a reason not to include this objective, I consider anyway. I note that the Chief Executive has no issues with the number, the second number two on this proposal, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Winters.

CLLR WINTERS: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I actually agree with most of what Cllr Scott has said there. I do know and I just can't see where it is now, so maybe Sorcha could advice, there was a tree preservation order put on Burkeen, I don't see it in the amendments so if she could point me in the right direction.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I have to be honest, Cllr Scott, I do have some concerns about this. I am certainly supportive of not cutting down trees willy- nilly, but what does this actually, how far do we go with this in terms of woodlands of high amenity? That is the first question. Secondly, if you have dangerous trees that are a hazard, or even dangerous branches that we often see hanging over roads and different things, how does that come into this? I am just concerned that if we have tree preservation order across the board that it could maybe cause more difficulty than actually solves problems. So that is just my initial thoughts on it. I would like to hear more views on it. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

>> The importance of this for me is tied into the fact that we are literally within a biodiversity emergency, so, again, the way things would have been done before, and again, even the legitimacy of how they were done before has to be looked at. I would very much support all of these submissions in this proposal, because this is where we need to be at now in terms of really making a difference when it comes to this emergency. Thank you.

>> Thank you. I get the spirit of the motion, but, just to there are - there are a few things that bother me. The main thing is how do we distinguish between dangerous trees or trees that could do damage in a certain area as Cllr Winters mentioned - the wooded area up there. I know there's been fences broke, things like that, and, like, I do get dispirited, but I'm worried about if a tree is dangerous, what mechanisms are in place that can be cut down to everybody's agreement? Because, you know, I do have land owners saying they have to cut down their trees because it is a danger to the public. So where do we draw the line on it?

>> I would certainly be fully supportive of this, but I had in a proposal that councillors are notified before trees are felled, and anyway, that went by the wayside. I just felt that if people know in advance, then we can know the reasons why, and it was to identify whether it was a health and

safety issue, whether the tree was diseased, whether it was about to fall in a storm because it was shallow-rooted, or whatever. And, I think it is easy to identify the trees that are a health or safety issue. I don't think ... but I really do think that people need to be notified, instead of just cutting down trees and then after the fact informing people, because, sometimes, there's a genuine reason, and sometimes there's a kind of a spurious reason as to why it was cut down. I think it is important that people know. I will certainly be supporting this anyway.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake.

CLLR BLAKE: The first person to be called out after a storm is our own staff here, and in one of our staff lost their lives a few weeks ago. I would be very concerned about putting an order right across the board in terms of trees. I do know that a lot of farmers because of incidents in the past as well, and neighbours got on to him, people used the roads about trees overhanging, and they've taken them down because of their concern that they will be responsible for the death of somebody on the road. So look, it's not - there is no easy answer to it. We all love the trees, but I also love to live as well. Losing life out there because of trees hanging across roads. As I said again, our own staff would be the first to deal with it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Gillian Murphy.

>> I was agreeing with the point that Cllr Blake spoke on there. I mean, we were, you know, saddened and shocked, and some people in the chamber knew the man who lost his life. That was a huge health and safety issue. For years, the Vale Road here had many leaves, and to see the improvement and the safety of that road now, it's just fantastic. I was out there yet; the job, the council undertook to bring safety to that road, but I would be a bit concerned as well regarding farmers - I don't know whether this would be included in this motion, who have trees on, you know, roads and they're not maintaining their trees, they are cutting them down, and even issued with letters from our council, and they are still not - I mean, how does that enforce here? Thanks.

CLLR KENNEDY: Yes, thanks, Cathaoirleach. I fully understand and appreciate what Cllr Scott is coming from with this. You know, and as I listen to Cllr Kavanagh a few minutes ago and talking about her motion a few months back, I felt for her, and speaking as someone who has made his living from trees. I don't think there's a one-size-fits-all. There is no one one when it comes to trees, and especially dangerous trees. And trees on the side of the road: you can get an arborist to look at it and they tell you the tree is safe but the road is underneath the roots of the tree. I could give you hundreds of examples of trees that could be healthy but may need to be reduced and pruned back on the sides, or reduced from the Crown down. I don't think, while I fully understand where this is

coming from, and as someone who actually loves trees, and I'm almost contradicting myself when I say I take them down, but as someone who loves trees, there genuinely is not one policy that fits all in relation to protected trees and cutting trees. There has to be a common-sense approach to trees, or there will be - we will be reading headlines in papers into the future. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

>> Look it, I fully support this from Lorde and Rory. There is a process, what they're talking about is the Tree Protection Orders is that five years is too bait - in Arklow, we've lost valuable forestry rezoned as residential throughout the years, ancient soil and forestry, just gone overnight. This isn't about dangerous trees, this is about our beautiful urban trees that everybody loves that are healthy. You know, and if - if we have a process that is every five years, you know, we're going to look at in the next few years are just whole areas of forestry, and urban trees wiped out if we don't have a more regular process in place. The process itself will determine whether the tree is healthy or dangerous, or whatever, but we - like, we can't just ignore it, you know? We have to put a process in there. It has to be more regular than five years. That's what Lorde and Rory are trying to do here, and it is so important. We have to have the will to want to do this. I understand health and safety, and actually, I come from a town where everybody values trees, and nobody batted an eyelid at removing the dangerous trees on the Vale Road, as much as they love biodiversity and native trees, they understood the reasons, and that is not what this is about. This is about something else. This is about protecting, and, you know, what we have, and teaching, and educating our youth, and more so our older generations, I think, to the importance of this, and looking after our natural environment, and if it was a building, you know, you would have to have planning permission of a demolition, and a notice before you remove something, but with a tree that's grown for hundreds of years, it can be wiped out overnight without anyone knowing or being accountable for the removal of it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle, I'm going to have to move people on, so I'm trying to keep the thing moving on. Be brief if possible?

>> Thanks, Chair. Getting a TPO is a process. So it is not like there will be this blanket thing across all trees, and it is possible to remove dangerous trees. You know, this wouldn't affect that. Like any dangerous trees, for example, if they're in - the ESB can move trees with TPOs on them if they're a danger to life, so it does not mean trees at all costs. At the moment, we're at the mercy of a developer, and once it's gone, it's gone. As Cllr Leonard said there, you can have trees there for hundreds of years, and at a whim, it's gone, and you can't undo it. It is offering protection. There is still protection for land owners. This is not trees at all cost.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Gerry O'Neill?

GERRY O'NEILL: I will be brief there. I think, the ... have to be included in any tree management of the county. I know in west Wicklow, there are huge problems created by plantations, et cetera, and removal of trees, like last year, they planted I think 22 million trees in the country, so I think they had to be included. And also it is a shame to see, and I see it happening, where trees in the States had to be taken down because the wrong type of tree that were planted in the first place, you know? They're tearing up footpaths, and drains, or whatever, so it is well worth looking at and thinking about. I think we must also be the big player in tree-planting in Wicklow.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, I'm going to ...

>> Sorry, Chairman. Just, Cllr Winters, I have a question in relation to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead.

CLLR WINTERS: Just, if, say, the tree preservation orders go ahead, my understanding that people can still cut down their trees but they have to get permission from the council. And, I suppose the concerns I have is how long would that process take? Who do they contact? Who will make a decision? And you know, so if a tree is dangerous, how long does the land owner have to wait for the council make that decision to actually agree that they can cut that tree down? Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Final word to Cllr Scott and I will ask Sorcha to come in at the end. Sorry, my fault. My fault. Go ahead?

>> It is good to hear such a positive endorsement of trees, if not of TPO, in the chamber. To reiterate, like, this isn't relating to having suddenly a blanket tree protection order across every tree in the county - like, I wish it would personally, but that's not what it is about. To apply for TPOs, you have to go through a very specified long drawn-out process, and there is a period of public consultation, so it's not like waving a magic wand and you can't go near a tree in the county. Also, just in terms of the health and safety issues, this doesn't stop - TPOs don't stop addressing trees that are in danger of falling, or that have branches that are in danger of falling, or if there is a power line or whatever cut up. Common sense will prevail if there is a danger to human life - of course, that will take priority. But it is just about protecting what we have, and it is making that process that the public can submit TPOs more quickly than every five years as it is at the moment as well and making that process more transparent to the public, because it is really important that we do protect the trees that we have, and that we're not removing them ad hoc.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha?

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Something I really - something Cllr Scott has hit on is that there is a process. So the majority of times we get a request to protect trees, it's the public looking for something to be protected instantly, so, say, for example, someone has applied for planning permission for something and the development includes the cutting-down of trees. We get this sort of reaction from the public saying the council should now go and protect the trees in order to prevent this application from going ahead or being granted, or being granted in the way in which it has been proposed. There is no way to do an on-the-spot tree protection, and I wouldn't want to give people false expectations that all they have to do is write into the council and a tree will suddenly be protected, and this application is scuppered in some way. There is a process. And, at an absolute minimum, there is a public consultation process, which is six weeks long. But in advance of that, and after that, the first stages to evaluate any trees that someone may indicate to us or suggest to us that are worthy of a TPO, and the trees will need to be assessed in accordance with quite strict criteria, and it is not just their existence that they're there and they're tall: they have to have a landscape quality, longevity, and so on - there are certain criteria they have to fulfil. That assessment has to be carried out by a professional arborist. There is no professional arborist on the staff, and the current going rate is 2,000 per tree or group of trees assessed, and we had a group of trees, and it cost 25,000, that was the best rate we could get in the market. So it would have to be assessed by professional arborist who would prepare a report, who may come back and say yes we recommend that the tree be protected. The next thing is to establish the land owner, which can take a bit of time, and some of the TPOs we've not been able to establish the ownership and we're doing our best to send letters to people all around the area of these trees to establish ownership and starting the public consultation which includes notifying the owners. Six weeks' public consultation. The submissions from the public have to be assessed, and a report prepared, and the report back to you, the members. If you think about that, you're talking a couple of weeks to procure an expert, a couple of weeks to get the report, six-week public consultation, a couple of weeks to prepare their second report, and you then consider it at the report a couple of weeks, so you've got there anything from 12 to 20 weeks, so it not an instant thing that can solve an instant problem of an application coming in which appears to be where the key concerns are coming from. It is resource-heavy, as I outlined, and that is why we only do it once in a while because we wait until we have a batch of trees, and try to get the best price in the market, rather than doing them one by one and costing more resources. We will endeavour to do them more than once every five years, but as you know, things are very tight at the moment, staff resources are very curtailed, and so on, but we would

always endeavour to do it more often than that, and we will try to do it when we do each local area plan, and certainly when we do the County Development Plan, but it's very similar to the protected structures. We have thousands of them, and people writing to us all the time about adding more or taking them away from the list, and we have to wait until we have a batch of them so we can hire a specialist and go out to assess them. We want to protect the trees as much as you do. We feel that this wording would give false expectation or false hope that all a member of the public has to do is request and it happens. It is just not as straightforward as that, and I think it will lead to pressure on yours, ourselves, and create a false expectation. We don't want people to come away from their interaction with the council without a positive outcome, and feel that this policy would be somewhat misleading in that regard.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay. So, going on to a vote, Councillor Amendment 27, proposed by Cllr Scott seconded by Cllr O'Connor. Sorry, so, we're actually taking this two votes on this: it is number 1 first of all. It is in the green text, that is inserted instead of the blue text. Okay?

HELEN PURCELL: So this is a vote on EM27.1, and we will have a vote on EM27.2. [Votes taken].

CATHAOIRLEACH: This is Cllr Scott's proposed amendment. Taken in two sections. This is section number one. If you have it in the book there, it's the green text. It's on the screen. First paragraph, yes.

[Votes taken].

HELEN PURCELL: 24 for, 11 against, one not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving to the second votes on amendment 27, again proposed by Cllr Scott, seconded by Cllr O'Connor. It is number 2, to amend the objectives on submissions as follows. Is it all agreed.

So amendment number 28, proposed by Cllr Erika Doyle, seconded by Cllr Mary Kavanagh. This is tree protection.

>> We had a vote about the conversation there, maybe not fully accurate information, but this is location-specific, so Sorcha was saying she would consider a batch, so maybe we have a couple of the batch here, but I'm going to let Cllr Mary Kavanagh take the lead on this one. She has some more location specific detailed information that she can share if that is okay.

>> I only have a couple of that I submitted myself. But I think basically, you know, as we said earlier, that the TPOs, they're an expensive process. They can't be done every time somebody's decides that they want a tree preserved or whatever.

Areas that we feel should be assessed for protection, like, woodland areas which are quite close to areas which may be developed and things like that.

So, basically, it's just to include locations for consideration for TPOs under --

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I ask you, is there a specific location for this proposed amendment?

>>: There's a number that were sent in, I know I sent in one out in --

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just for the members to know what they are voting on. I have no idea what this is on.

>>: I think the number in the amendment might actually be, it's down as 248(?) -- but I think it might actually be 284. Season Park Farm House. Is that what you're talking about? The forestry?

>>: What site is it in?

>>: Where?

>>: Councillor Doyle do you have any specific location?

CLLR DOYLE: It's the land at New Town, Kennedy, the location is there as C2-248. And Councillor Kavanagh had a more detailed submission, I'll just read from part of that. Where she was saying that there is a request from some local to Councillors to put a link in through the local culture forest, as expressed by the -- if this was approved this would -- northern most part of the western relief road to facilitate through the land requested by the office of the planning regulator and recommended by the chief executive to be rezoned. The development of this land would seem to put the the woodland -- under real threat.

So it's that location, there. I'm not sure if the number given is incorrect as Councillor -- said.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm confused completely on this because as far as I'm concerned there is no road going through that forestry so I'm at a loss to know what exactly this is about.

SORCHA: I know we received an email there from someone.

>>: Councillor Kennedy, go ahead?

CLLR KENNEDY: Could we postpone this one to tomorrow to give Councillor Kavanagh time? I'm sure she has something in mind.

CLLR KENNEDY: There's more than one but anyway the one that Councillor Doyle is referring it is EN36, it was -- there are native woodland, the subject of the TPO. And I think these were given to

Councillor Scott as well, photographs of this. There would be a big biodiversity loss if that area of land was developed so it was basically just to recognise that forest in a TPO and have it --

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members are you okay if I move on to the next one because there's total confusion here, I'll ask Councillor Doyle and Kavanagh to work with the planning team before tomorrow's meeting, I think that's a reasonable suggestion.

>>: I'm happy to do that, we'll tidy it up and present it in a clearer fashion tomorrow, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 29 is in the name of Councillor MacManus seconded by O'Brien.

>>: I would like to hear from maybe the Chief Exec why it wouldn't be proposed to accept it. I know they said it's already other areas of the plan which is obviously welcome but I think putting it in as a stand-alone objective strengthens our stands on this, it has been thrashed out already we're in the middle of a climate and biodiversity crisis so the more places it's in the plan, the better.

So that's just why I would be proposing that we proceed with this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we in agreed with Cllr Winterers, Mcmanus? Agreed, Sorcha are you okay with this?

SORCHA: I'll come in and say that what the objective that is requested it is already in the development plan so I suppose we're just doubling up and repeating ourselves and, if you look at page 55 and 56 and 57 of the report you can see lists and lists of objectives that already cover completely this additional executive that's proposed.

I think we can all agree that the plan is long enough without saying the same thing twice in a different way so we would recommend you don't recommend with this because it's already in the plan and including amendments that the chief executive has proposed himself completely covered this area so mentions of swift bricks and boxes and towers is already in the Chief Executive's recommendation number 90 so we would end up with having it in two, three places in the plan so I don't think it's necessary.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Councillor Mitchell.

>>: I don't think if it's already included in the plan we should put it in again because there might be, there will be confusion. There could well be inconsistencies between the different statements in different parts the plan so if it's covered I don't think we should put it in.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Councillor Mcmanus are you happy this is already covered or do you want this to go to a vote.

>>: I can withdraw if Councillors are satisfied it's there.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

Okay. Going onto Chief Executive recommendations back to your draft plan, page 40, it's amendment number 51. Again, it's just a little bit of text change. I think it's fairly straightforward, could I have a proposer and seconder, please, for number 51? It's on page 30. Proposed by Councillor Scott. Seconded by Councillor Paul O' Brian. All agreed? Number 52, again, it's just taken out some text -- already dealt with. Moving on. Number 53, again, it's amending maps. I think again it's fairly straightforward, I might just get Sorcha to explain.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. This is -- there have been requests to change it's land scape designation to area of outstanding natural beauty and the Chief Executive is proposing that to you now to change the landscape map for that area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay are we in agreement with that? Happy to propose that and agreement? Seconding by Councillor Kavanagh, all agreed? Okay. Moving on to the Tree Preservation Order, this is on page 1036 to 1038 in your draft book.

SORCHA: Members, this is a number of proposed new TPOs or amended TPOs, in the draft development plan. TPO really alongside the development plan but it's a separate process, so the report on page 1036 sets out any submissions that have been received in relation it those proposed new or amended TPOs and the Chief Exec's recommendations. The upshot is that all of those TPOs that were recommended, new ones or amended ones that were recommended and set out in the draft plan the Chief Executive is still recommending you proceed as proposed and, if you agree that here today that's the end of the TPO process. There's no -- it's a separate process, the TPOs are effectively made as of today. They don't go back to public display or anything like that. So you can either take it as all of the proposals are deemed acceptable by the members or we can go through each of the proposed new or amended TPOs one-by-one.

Very few submissions on this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we okay, members, you can actually see it there from a page 1036 to 1038. There's only, what, two, three submissions? And I think they've been dealt with, by Sorcha. Are we all agreed with that?

>>: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer and a seconder. Proposed by Councillor Kennedy, seconded by Councillor Fortune.

SORCHA: This is a slightly separate process so these TPOs are now being made so that's the final thing on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Snell?

>>: Thanks, just before you do that, will that interfere with the proposal that we just had, the amendment, from Councillor Doyle and Councillor Kavanagh? Passing this now, will it override what they're proposing and come back to us tomorrow, should we not hold off on this? Because I know we've been through -- it was mentioned in C261 of this. Was Councillor Kavanagh going to bring something different to the table tomorrow in regards to that? Sorry, Councillor Kavanagh, let Sorcha come in and address what Councillor Snell's point is?

SORCHA: What you have just passed and agreed and proved is the making of the new TPOs that have gone through the process of public consultation, landowners being notified and published in the draft plan and you're now making them TPOs and confirming them at TPOs. The landowners have informed their trees are now preserved trees and that's the end of that process for that batch. Anything new that comes today or tomorrow from the floor, isn't a TPO. All that could come from the floor is for a new process to be initiated. That's as much as good can come from the floor tomorrow.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving onto amendment number 30 and we're onto chapter -- infrastructure.

With the amendment number 30 from Councillor Erica Doyle, do you have a seconder for your proposal?

CLLR DOYLE: Not yet, would anybody like to --?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Scott?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment, Councillor amendment number 30, on page 58.

>>: In relation to the TPOs, Sorcha or somebody never answered the question, once a TPO is in place how does somebody get the permission from the council if it's -- because if we have to go out to get it, say, -- we have to pay 2,000 pounds to get it to say that a tree is worthy of having a Tree Preservation Order on it, if a landowner then thinks it's need to be fixed or amended or cut due to for whatever reason, and they need the council's permission, do we have to wait for that process to hire an expert again? What is the process? Once the TPOs are in place if someone does genuinely need to address a problem tree?

SORCHA: There's no issue with management and pruning and potentially even removal of a tree if it's dangerous or dead, even if there's a TPO on it. I'm not sure what else someone would need to do to alter a tree other than if it's dead, dangerous or dying, that's provided for in the act but they don't need to come in and get a special permission, it provides for it.

>>: Okay, that's fine. I just wanted clarity on that, that's fine.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay so we're onto Councillor amendment 30 proposed by Doyle and seconding bid Lorde and Scott Councillor Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: This is quite straightforward, there's a lot of talk about green ways at the moment and a lot of discussion about just how green greenways are and a lot of that centres around how they're constructed and the surfacing. So this is just a small amendment just to say that the county council will prioritise in the design of the roots and surface selection so it doesn't limit or propose any specific design or lay out or construction material it's just saying that within that environmental protection will be prioritised of the area because the whole point of greenway is that that they are along green routes so they should be environmentally sensitive so just a small amendment to ensure we keep high standards.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I would assume this would anyway with any of our council greenways but I'll bring Sorcha in to clarify.

SORCHA: This is something that has already been said in many places in the plan already. If we were to say after every objective it was subject to best environmental practice, the plan would be twice as long as it is already. We feel it's already included in the development plan, that environmental protection is at the utmost of our minds when the council is designing anything, a greenway or council how long development, it doesn't do any harm.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Councillor Doyle do you accept what Sorcha is saying that it's already covered in the plan or do you want to put this to a vote?

>>: I think Sorcha says it doesn't do any harm I suppose this is because it's a greenway and we assume that a greenway is green but it isn't always so I think it's nice for people to have that reassurance, particularly along green routes that will be, that that is understood.

So I would like for this to be supported, thank you, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Doyle, do you accept that it is covered in the plan or want to put it to a vote in

>> I suppose because this is a greenway, and we assume that a greenway is green but is not always, it is nice for people to have that reassurance along green routes that it will be, that that is understood. Yes, I would like for this to be supported. Thank you, Chair.

SORCHA: Could I add that a greenway to be a greenway has to meet certain standards which relate to the width, alignment, the length, and the surfacing, and, from, for example, a particular type of surface, like a flat, smooth surface can't be achieved, it may not be able to be considered a greenway, so there might be a slight contradiction in terms there that development of a greenway which requires the flat smooth surface suitable for bike-riding and so on, might not be achievable if that conflicts with environmental protection.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, I will bring in the Chief Executive.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Yes, I support what Sorcha is saying there: there is a huge amount of criteria in relation to the guidelines for the implementation of greenways, and there is a new code of practice for best practice for national regional greenways, introduced this year, so that is another layer on top of already in place guidelines for green ways, so, and we've said already, there is not a need, and I think any greenways out there, you can see the amount of environmental reports that have to be produced in relation to it, so it is not a case where that's not being looked at, it's without question being looked at, so I don't think there's a necessity for that. It is belt and braces.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Kavanagh, we're going to go for a vote now.

>> That may be in essence what people are looking for, but the reality is that sometimes there are actual disasters. One here that I'm looking at is a picture of the river in County Longford, where there was not an appropriate assessment carried out. Trees were destroyed willy-nilly. They put this hard-core in which is leaking down into the river and destroying the roots of trees, and hedgerows that are planted along. It's absolutely disgraceful. I think it wouldn't be any harm to copper-fasten in the development plan that best practice should be sought and achieved, because these pictures are environmental disaster. So I don't, as I say, because it says greenway, it doesn't mean it's green.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We go to the vote, proposed by Cllr Doyle ... .

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

22 for, 10 against.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, moving on to Chief Executive's recommendations for chapter 18. It is on page 31. Amendment number 54. Again, it's just extra text being put in. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please?

CLLR WINTERS: I will propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Winters. Seconded by Paul O'Brien. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 55, again, it's just one extra word, proposer and seconder please? Proposed by Cllr Bourke and seconded by Cllr Flynn Kennedy. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 56: again, it's just taken out three or four words and putting in "trails". Proposer and seconder, pleased? Proposed by Cllr Walsh, seconded by Cllr Corrigan. All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Number 57: recreational use of natural resources. Again, just extra recording put in. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please? Paul O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Flynn Kennedy. Are we all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. Finally on this section, number 58, public right of ways objectives: this is a new paragraph, Sorcha. Can we get you to give us a view on this?

SORCHA: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. The Development Plan, the draft plan and previous plans, lists some public rights of way, but it doesn't actually have an objective outlining what our aim is for other public rights of way that aren't actually listed in the plan but do exist legally. When we come across those, if somebody tries to block one or something like that, whether or not it is listed in the development plan, we have an objective [coughing]. [Inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Kavanagh, seconded by Cllr Mitchell. Yes, certainly, just press your light there been please.

>> Is this for existing rights of ways or allowing the public to access shore, riverbanks, and sea shores?

SORCHA: These are existing public right of ways.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. So we have a proposer, Cllr Kavanagh, seconded by Cllr Mitchell

Chapter 19, marine planning and coastal zone management. We are on to Chief Executive's recommendations number 59 on page 33 of your draft plan, so it is removing some text and putting in some text. Could I have a

proposer and a seconder, please? If you're agreed on this? Proposed by Cllr Bourke. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Are we all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay.

CLLR DOYLE: Chair, is that bill now an act?

SORCHA: Yes, it an act that hasn't been commenced.

CLLR DOYLE: Okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you want that word changed, Cllr Doyle?

CLLR DOYLE: I think it is now an act. I think it's moved from being a Bill to an Act.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will get that changed to "a planning Act". That's all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Number 60, National Planning Framework. Again, there's an extra paragraph, Sorcha, is that right?

SORCHA: Yes, relates to staying an objective of the National Planning Framework.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could I have a proposer and a seconder. Proposed by Cllr Flynn Kennedy. Anyone online? Seconded. [Inaudible]. Thank you. All agreed with that?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Number 61. Marine planning objectives, again, this is removing some text and putting in some text. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please. Proposed by Cllr Bourke, seconded by Cllr Scott. All agreed? Again, yes, that will be maritime area planning act, okay?

And next one, number 62, it will be Maritime Area Planning Act as well. So could I have a proposer and a seconder for 62. Proposed by Councillor Walsh seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald.

That's all agreed? Yes. Moving on to volume 2, Level For plans - so it is Councillor amendments. Councillor amendments number 31. Cllr Timmins, do you have a seconder for this?

EDWARD TIMMINS: Yes, Cllr Blake should second this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you want to go ahead?

EDWARD TIMMINS: Yes, this wording was agreed with the planners. It's the object is to allow the possibility of a sports centre to be built on

council director owned land in Baltinglass, and doing the zoning to allow that to happen. Sorcha came up with the wording and I was happy to go with it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we all in agreement with that? Okay. Thank you. Councillor amendment number 52.

EDWARD TIMMINS: Chairman? Chairman? Could I come in there? Just briefly, this amendment relates to a radial road out of Baltinglass where a member of my family lives, so I will have to absent myself from any discussion of this or any vote, so I ask that someone call me when the vote is complete.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment - Cllr Mullen, when you are ready?

CLLR MULLEN: Thanks. Again, just to remind members we voted on this proposal at the last alterations process, and we voted for this, but it's been taken back out now, so we were asked to vote on it again. The reasons haven't changed why we should have it in. In my view, it's part of the town of Baltinglass. It's a narrow road, but it is the narrow rural road served by convent land houses that we developed ourselves for the primary health care centre that we developed ourselves, and this morning we passed the - if it was a narrow rural road for developments, of an infill nature. An infill pedestrian pathways and public lighting put in. More likely they would be put in if there was development in the infield fields is - it is a very well well used road, the Shroughan Road. They have flood road C on it which is no apparent risk. If that road is an flood risk, the entire town would be flooded beforehand. We voted on this last time, and we are having to put it back in again this time, so I can't see why we are changing our minds. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A correction, Cllr Mullen. It was not voted on in the draft plan from what Sorcha is telling me?

SORCHA: Yes, these lands aren't zone in the draft plan. That was not approved last year. That was not in the draft plan that was published last June.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead.

CLLR MULLEN: There was a proposal put in, maybe not in the existing plan, you're right, but we did vote on the alteration stage is my recollection last whenever that was ...

SORCHA: If it was voted on last May, it was defeated because it didn't end up in the draft plan.

CLLR MULLEN: I don't think that's right.

CLLR BLAKE: This is a road that is very, very close to the town, and we actually need [someone coughs]. We do - the way we do improve roads is to ask people who live on it with foot paths and whatever else on it. If there is one way of enhancing the surface of the road, and the safety of the road as well, but this is one road around Baltinglass that does need to be upgraded and preserved, it is a road that people use extensively in terms of its difficulty, for traffic. It is a bypass for some people in Baltinglass, so we do need to improve and this is one way of actually improving it, to make sure ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

Are we happy to go with this proposal, Councillor Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: I disagree with this amendment. I think it hasn't been zoned for very good reasons and I don't support it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Councillor Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I was confused, are we saying that it was never zoned residential?

>>: It's zoned in the current 2016 plan.

>>: And there's a plan to dezone it.

>>: The draft plan, not included in that draft plan.

>>: Okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay we'll go for a vote.

It's amendment number 32, proposed by Councillor Mullen and seconded by Councillor Blake.

SORCHA: [Vote taken]

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Can we contact Councillor Timmins because the next two amendments are in his name.

>>: Can I get in there? On 66, the supermarket.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're probably not going to get to that today, Councillor O'Neill.

CLLR O'NEILL: I thought I might -- on conversion zoning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: On 33 at the moment. We'll get to it as which can as we can but I don't want to jump around, I want to go the way I'm going so Councillor Timmins, amendment number 33 proposed by yourself and seconded by Councillor Blake.

>>: This was a proposal that went through easily enough on the last Development Plan in May. And all it's doing is, it's reinstating a little radial road on out of Baltinglass and that road consists of 10, 12 houses and what I'm looking to do is extend it by probably just one extra house, maximum two. It's a very minor amendment and it got good support the last time so I don't think it was important last time so I would hope that it would go through, thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We agreed on this amendment? All agreed? Yes. Okay.

Thank you.

Amendment number 34, Councillor Timmings seconded by Councillor Blake.

>>: This is quite complicated and I've been working with Sorcha in the last week to come up with a proposal to allow the possibility of some level of tourism infrastructure in this land close to the town centre. Sorcha came up with the wording on Friday based on advice from to environmental issues and putting in a zoning that would be subject to a lot of conditions and a lot of the Environmental Impact Assessments and possibly Sorcha has a greater knowledge of this than me but I think this amendment could be a reasonable compromise to allow some level of tourism infrastructure into the site. Historically it had a planning application about a year ago for clamping and it was refused and the reason was the zoning. But I accepted the extract application will not go through on the basis of this zoning because it does have a lot of strict conditions on it and part of what that planning application applied for would work even if we go through this zoning. So it was really just to allow some level of tourism infrastructure subject to the normal environmental flood impact issues that may arise on the land in question. Perhaps Sorcha might give a more sophisticated answer?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, I'll ask Sorcha to come in and explain this because we've been given another map. I'll ask Sorcha just to clarify.

SORCHA: Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

Councillor had originally put in a proposal, the one you see before you in the booklet there, to change an open space one to tourism and recreation. However, given the funny shape that was proposed and that was to avoid areas at risk of flooding is wasn't a very satisfactory outcome and there was still residual concerns about flood risk and also about the impact on the Slaney River, and you can see those concerns set out in the Chief Executive's response on the page overleaf so, in light of that feedback that the Chief Executive set out, Councillor Timmins wanted to modify his proposal and the thing that was the document that was

emailed to you all last Friday and I believe it was handed out to you all this morning, I confirm that, they were all handed out? It's just a two page document with a map on the front that you would all have got this morning, has Councillor Timmins notified the proposal what you will see on the second page is labeled modified proposal and it's proposing changing open space area and part of the town centre zoning to tourism but with a special objective attached to it, making it clear that only certain types of development can happen in certain locations within that block to address the flood risk and the impact on the site.

We're generally satisfied that with those additional three criteria that flood risk can be managed, but we're also having to send off this proposal, if this is passed we said to our environmental consultants to run this proposal through appropriate assessment, stage two appropriate assessment to establish the impact possible on the SAC notwithstanding the bullet point there that that -- that will be published with the proposed amendment so all be able to see if there are any concerns remaining with regard to the impact on the SAC.

I think it's the modified proposal that Councillor Timmins wishes to put forward today rather than the original propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That was very clear, I'll come back to you, Councillor Timmins, in a minute.

Councillor Doyle?

CLLR DOYLE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Sorcha was coming in and out there for me so I probably missed a bit. I don't know how we're supposed to vote if we don't know the impact on the SAC at this point. It remains I presume a flood zone, and a flood risk and we are, we know that there is a potentially -- I'm not sure why this would be pushed. Why, if it's on a flood zone, is it being pushed and twisted and maneuvered to try and shoehorn something into an area that's so sensitive, is it not asking for trouble down the road? I don't understand.

And I'm not really sure on the points Sorcha made there, but if this amendment is published, that then the result of the impact on the SAC will come back to us then. am I to believe we could vote this could be supported only to find out afterwards there will be -- I don't have it straight. Perhaps that could be explained, please. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Bourke?

>>: I'm just wondering where does the access occur, it seems to be fairly well built up on all sides of it bar the river bank itself, could that be clarified?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Councillor Timmins, I'll bring you back in.

>>: There is a direct access -- the landowner has direct access onto the main street and owns a premises on the main street and in relation to Councillor Doyle's point, why are we trying to shoehorn something in, as a businessperson looking to put in a tourist development in the town, in a town that has very little employment and we're looking to see can anything be facilitated to support him, subject to all the required environmental rules and relations.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR O'BRIEN: In terms of the resources required for that consultancy will be required, we're talking about how much things are going to cost and I'm just curious about what type of resources need to be put into this to bring it to a point before it even starts getting into the conversation about what could be developed there and is that value for money? Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor Kavanagh?

>>: Thank you, do we know what kind of tourist propose it is? Glamping was mentioned and then we were told it would not be suitable because of the zones, it was applied for but it was refused. Is glamping still going to be pursued?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Councillor Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: I was wondering similar to Councillor Kavanagh given the restrictions outlined in the modified amendment what could go in there but I had a question, again, if this gets passed today and it gets sent for the Stage 2 appropriate assessment, and if that appropriate assessment says that there will be impacts on the SAC, what happens then?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, can I bring you in?

SORCHA: Thanks Cathaoirleach. Councillor Timmins' idea for the revised wording doesn't specify what uses, glamping, caravanning or something else. It specifies uses appropriate in each of the different flood zones will be open for consideration.

So, flood zone A is the highest risk of flooding and in that block there's a small area that is flood zone A. They provide a small number of development types are permissible in flood zone A and generally water compatible developments so if there was a tourism development that related to kayaking or canoeing, that might be allowed in 5. Flood zone B covering most of the site allows a different range of developments and say for example, camping and caravanning is permissible but not permanent structures so the flood zone guideline sets out which types and categories are and flood zone C means not as risk of flooding so there's a more open range there, basically, anything would go there in

terms of structures and flood zone C so the landowner might be able to calibrate a viable tourism development that encompasses term and temporary and water compatible structure, that would be up to them if they could design something that works in those different flood zones so that's why it's not specifying it's recognising something else because that will take a bit of work probably on behalf the landowner's designers to see what can fit on those lands given the level of flood risk that's present on the lands.

With regard to appropriate assessment, at this stage of plan making you the members are making proposed amendment, they're not final amendments, they're only proposals. And what we give you is a preliminary assessment.

With regards to appropriate assessment, at this stage of the amendment, members are making proposed amendments - not final amendments. What we give you a preliminary assessment, the Chief Executive's preliminary feedback from SEA and AA and flood risk, and we do that as - even though it is preliminary, we get it to as much detail we can get it to within the short space of time between you submitting the amendments to us and this meeting, which as you know was only a couple of weeks. We do as detailed an assessment as we can for you but we promise it is a fulsome assessment. So we are giving you the information to assist you in making the decision been whether you want to zone a piece of land, or do something else that might give a risk of flooding or the environment. With that information, you can make an informed decision at this stage. If you decide to agree a proposed amendment which gets published and a more detailed appropriate assessment of SEA and flood risk will be published alongside that, so a member of the public can see that proposed amendment and also see what the environmental assessment of that is. The environmental assessment or AA could come back and say there is a serious problem here with this, it's going to adversely impact on a tourist 2,000 site. When we get to the adoption stage, you will have the full information in front of you and decide whether to make the amendment of the final plan. This is not the last time you see the proposals. The next time we adopt the plan, you will have the full information. If it is the case that a particular zoning or any other provision does not Stage 1 is the possibility of an impact, the trigger is quite light, but if there is no possibility of an impact, that's fine, screening is satisfied. Stage 2 is when you actually need to evaluate the proposal in more detail. If that assessment concludes that this zoning can be accommodated, it's not going to give rise to adverse impacts on the site, that's fine, you've dealt with the appropriate assessment. You can conclude that adverse impacts are likely and you've got a more difficult decision at the next

stage where you can only proceed with that decision or zoning if you invoke the next stage which is going to the minister, and going to the EU, and all sorts of complicated stuff that you probably don't want to go into, it impairs your reasons of overriding interest. We've never done that in this council where we have had to invoke that stage three, and I would imagine it's a very drawn out and painful process because we've never had to do it before but you will have the information in front of you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If we could save that! I'm going to go for a vote. Sorry, Behan?

CLLR BEHAN: A point of information, about all the decisions we've made here today, some we made for the second time because we made them at the last meeting as well. I hope we're not going to be told that we have to go through this process a third time where we are going to have to put in all the amendments we have already passed once, twice, that we are going to have to do this a third time? Because that would not be right as far as I'm concerned. That would not be democratic. We have voted today for all of these amendments, or didn't, as the case may be. Can I get clarification: is that it now? We more or less, unless something comes in from the public that we assume everything we've decided here today is done now?

CATHAOIRLEACH: The amendments go to the public after we vote on these today?

SORCHA: All of the amendments go out to the public and every single one of those amendments will have to be voted on at the next stage. If it is something that you don't make an amendment on today, that's finished. All those elements of the plan that are not subject demand amendment today and tomorrow if we get finished tomorrow, they're finished with, they're done. Those parts of the plan are not for revisiting. But I can't say there is not something we discussed last May that we're discussing now that we won't be discussing in July or September.

CLLR BEHAN: Are we going to have to ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: And ahead.

CLLR BEHAN: What I'm asking are we going to have to put forward the same amendments a third time?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No, we won't.

SORCHA: All you do is accept or reject each amendment at the next meeting.

CLLR BEHAN: As we've decided here today? We have to decide again a third time?

SORCHA: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Doyle, do you want to come back in?

CLLR DOYLE: A quick question for Sorcha. Given the rate of climate change and extreme weather events, is it likely that the flood zones can change from say B to A, like is that something that is taken into account when assessing the area? That things are only kind of moving in one direction in terms of flood risk?

SORCHA: The strategic flood risk assessment, carried out as part of the plan which produced the flood maps is based primarily on data from the OPW, and the OPW data has included a climate change factor in its flood zone assessment, so that is built into that, but based on their predictions, and who knows if they will hold up in the longer term, but the OPW maps do include climate change, a factor for that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor amendment 34, proposed by Cllr Timmins and seconded by Cllr Blake.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

[Inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Councillor amendment been proposed by Cllr Snell, is that right? Cllr Snell, this is sight in Newtownmountkennedy that is zoned residential in the current plan, and we're looking to retain the zoning on the basis that this, there is a live application, planning application, at the moment, on these lands for 57 dwellings, and it is in further information. Ironically, one of the main parts of the information was to increase the density of the site rather than disown the land. That's another day's work. So I'm going to let Cllr Snell in just to speak on this.

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I think most members can recall back to the meeting in May 2021. It was me who suggested that at the time that public representatives would allow land owners to come forward with their submissions that we would allow the public to come forward with their submissions, and observations on all of these proposals. And that is what happened, and I know at the time Cllr McCullen withdrew this and other councils withdrew other proposals put forward on that occasion because they felt it was right and proper. I'm supporting this today because I feel this is right and proper. Newtownmountkennedy is an expanding town. And the reality is that they've got good news during the week where there's an extra ten classrooms going to be provided in Newton but they are actually replacing ten existing classrooms, primary schools. This land owner, if you look at the map in front of you, when you turn left up Rossmore, not only has he provided for the industrial employment, commercial activity, but, there is that zone there, for a

Primary School, agreed with the department of education, and also, there is enough land there that the Department of Education are looking for a secondary school in time. And I believe that time will come sooner rather than later. So, when it comes to something like this we don't support applications, you know, without putting a bit of thought into them, and I believe that this here is infill. It's creating the opportunity to infill the development that is already in existence, as Cllr Cullen said, said - he should have applied for more residential units than what is actually being proposed. I believe this is an ideal opportunity for this particular part in New Town, and as I say, because of what he has already delivered to the community, so I will be supporting it. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Erika Doyle.

CLLR DOYLE: I will be brief. Just to say that growth has to be sustainable. That's the main thing. Not just growth for growth's sake. There is a long list of reasons there and the Chief Executive's feedback as to why he can't and we shouldn't support this proposal. I will say as well, actually, the amount of phone calls and emails I had from individuals, residents groups and businesses in the New Town area who feel quite angry about a number of these proposals is extraordinary considering it's outside my district. A lot of people are very unhappy with some of these proposals. Thank you, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr McManus.

>> A point of clarification, how long has this piece of land had a live planning application for?

CATHAOIRLEACH: It's currently on Further Information. I think the due date for decision on the Further Information is about three weeks' time. So effectively, this could be the planning permission - the planning permission could be granted in the lifetime of the current plan, not the plan we're working on. Okay? So, are we agreed with this amendment, or do we put it to a vote? Cllr Scott?

>> I don't agree with the surroundings.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going to a vote.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

21 for, nine against, two not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Just coming to the end. So we have amendment 36 and 37 are also Newtown, and I will be amending the proposal what is in front of you for tomorrow, and it's probably going to take quite a bit of conversation, so I'm not going to pursue it tonight. We will leave those

two until tomorrow. Thank you all, and we will see you at one o'clock tomorrow.

>> Thank you.

>> Bye.