

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

ON

TUESDAY 29TH MARCH 2022 AT 1:00 P.M.

MYCLEARTEXT LTD:

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

J Sinnamon
P Atherton

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 29TH, 2022:

CATHAOIRLEACH: Good afternoon, members. We are almost ready to go, so I will hand you over to Helen for a roll call and meeting etiquette. We will do the roll call first.

[Roll call taken]

CLLR CRONIN: Melanie just sent me a text to say she was running a few minutes late and to pass on her apologies.

CLLR CORRIGAN: I am here now, sorry about that.

HELEN: And Cllr R O'Connor has given his apologies he will be a little bit late.

CLLR NEARY: And Cllr Peir Leonard is about to log on.

HELEN: I would like to remind the members under the ethics legislation. When a matter comes before the meeting before 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 fully withdraw from the meeting until the matter is concluded, you must also inform the council's ethics registrar in writing, the disclosure in absence from the meeting will be recorded in the minutes and when the item is completed the member will be advised by phone and can rejoin the meeting. I would also ask members of the public to leave their cameras off, please and the elected members to leave their microphones off unless speaking. Thank you very much.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Helen. Okay, members, we are going to kick off, we are on to Level 4 plans, Baltinglass, Newtownmountkennedy and Rathdrum. We are on to amendment number 36. Before I start on this, I think we made a lot of progress yesterday. If I could ask you again for your co-operation and to keep your, keep a minimum in terms of speaking time, I would appreciate it, because we still have a lot to get through. So no long speeches and we will keep moving as fast as possible. So amendment 36 is proposed by myself and I just want to go through this, first of all, I suppose the reason, I am going to speak on 36 and 37. The reason both of these amendments were brought forward was after much discussion with the district, Wicklow Municipal District councillors and their concern about rezoning existing zoned residential land in Newtownmountkennedy and in Ashford, which we will discuss later. There is no doubt there has been a lot of development in Newtown

in the recent years. It was decided that Newtownmountkennedy would become a growth town. That was primarily because of its location and the fact that the services were available. The district councillors and they can speak for themselves, but I suppose the district councillors collectively are aware of the issues that face Newtownmountkennedy and certainly haven't exasperated the problems of zoning that exist in the current situation.

I suppose from my point of view the main issues I hear is the fact that there is a complete lack of facilities in terms of recreation, community facilities, sporting facilities, parklands, playgrounds and secondary school facilities. Unfortunately we have had a situation where a lot of planning permissions have been granted over the last number of years and what I have just described there, the lack of facilities, really have been left aside or certainly ignored and there is no point in having green space attached to a development, or an extra creche apart, attached to the development. We need much more than that in Newtown. I estimate in the region of 6- 7 million either has or will be taken in in development levies from the Newtown developments with very little investment back into the area in terms of what I have suggested earlier with facilities.

Getting back to the amendments in hand, after further deliberation by fellow district councillors we have decided collectively to land bank amendments 36 and 37. And they can be used for future development. It also has come to our attention in the last couple of days that amendment 36 has gone to An Bord Pleanála in the form of an SHD application.

So effectively that amendment 36 has been taken out of our control. I just want to conclude by saying that there has been a lot of misinformation surrounding Newtown and the history of zoning in the area. I want to confirm to the members here that I went through the plan last night and there has been four additional parcels of land in Newtown that have been dezoned for this current plan we are working on. I am going to propose that the amendment 36 is withdrawn and that we support the CE's recommendation, number 75, which is to land bank that particular parcel of land and I want to, just again conclude to say, I believe that the councillors in the Wicklow Municipal area have worked in balanced way in terms of maintaining zoned land for Newtown and also taking on the concerns of the public.

At the end of the day, we cannot lose sight of the fact we are in a housing crisis. There is many parts of these counties where I am sure the local residents don't want further residential housing, but at the end of the day we have a very serious job of work to do here in balancing what a community needs and also balancing in terms of land and what we need to zone for housing. So I am going to open it up to my fellow councillor, but that is where I stand particularly on number 36 and 37. So I am going to bring in Cllr John Snell. Sorry, if I could get this working.

Okay, Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. And thank you for your summary of what is realistically happening in the Newtown district for this County Development Plan. As you say, we as a Municipal District and District Council met on a number of occasions to discuss anything within east Wicklow, including Newtownmountkennedy. We were in favour of not dezoning land, land that had been zoned in numerous county development plans, going back two and three, but the reality is we have to weigh up and balance what the community needs and Newtownmountkennedy in particular has an awful lot of live applications. We passed our last amendment yesterday evening, it was for 57 units in Newtownmountkennedy.

People say that is a contradiction, but we explained why, because that was land that had serviced and provided for educational and also employment status. Unfortunately, I am sure members in their own districts will understand that the communities as a whole lose out when developers and land owners go through a strategic housing development and make an application straight to An Bord Pleanála. Thankfully those days will be behind us soon enough, but the reality is we have lost out in east Wicklow for that very purpose on a number of occasions and we will discuss them later on. But the reality is the community lose out. So from the recreational point of view, from the sporting and voluntary sector, our parks, our playgrounds and our community centres. There is a lack of them in Newtownmountkennedy.

I think this is the most logical thing to do. We are not in favour of dezoning land, but in reality I don't think there is a district in this county that has dezoned more than east Wicklow will have dezoned land, particularly in Newtownmountkennedy. The Cathaoirleach says about four parcels of land, there is also another two, for different purposes that haven't been supported, because we felt they weren't appropriate to go into this plan. Again, like discussing yesterday about the council that will

come in after us. They will make the decision after 2028. This land will be land banked. It won't be used in the lifetime of this plan. But the council will come in for the next plan in six years' time, they can make a decision. But the reality is that this is a strategic land for a link road to join up all of these houses, so therefore it wouldn't make any sense to actually dezone it to agriculture. Because it's always been strategic land for previous councils.

The reality is it won't be used in the lifetime of this plan.

The reality is that it won't be used until the lifetime of this plan. The reality is that we as councillors have agreed that we will not support this, going forward, with regards to the lifetime of this plan, but it will be land banked. I think Cathaoirleach, we have done a good service to the people of Newtown, with what we are doing here and I know that other districts will have to face the same dilemmas that we did. But the reality is that the six councillors in East Wicklow took this very, very seriously, to such an extent that we met on a number of occasions ourselves without any officials to come to a decision. I made it clear, felt it was unfair to dezone land but the other side is that there is an obligation on us to make the right decision. I think this is the right decision. We are agreeing with the Chief Executive. Unfortunately, a number would slip through the net in doing their own things and going through An Bord Pleanála through strategic housing development but the reality is that we, as six councillors I believe have slowed down what was potentially going to become a train wreck in Newtownmountkennedy. We are safe guarding the employment status on the existing live applications. And there is nothing we can do about that. But the reality is, we still have to service Newtown with residential units. So, I will be supporting this Cathaoirleach, as my fellow councillors are.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Gail Dunne.

CLLR DUNNE: In fairness to yourself and Cllr Snell I think you have outlined the reasons why we have taken this decision. I think, we can look back at other plans and what is going on in Newtown and the amount of housing that is, you know, that has zoning there. But the problem I found was that the infrastructure around it, there seems to be a problem with it. You know, football pitches as the councillor said. And going forward, I think we need to look at, if we are keeping land in, or down the road, if we are supporting anything, that we have to look at the infrastructure around it and how the community gains by it. The likes of community halls and things like that. I know of anything I have done in

this plan, it was at the back of my mind, we couldn't just build houses, we had to have individual services as well to the community and anything I have done, was with that in mind. I think about what has happened in Greystones and what they got back in the day and I suppose that is the one to look to. I think the six councillors have taken this very seriously, and with regard to what Cllr Snell said on a number of occasions, we tried to find common ground on the proposals in front of us. And I think we have. And I will be supporting this as well. And hopefully, in Newtown, going forward, they will get the infrastructure and the services they deserve. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Dunne.

>>: I want to concur with what Cllr Snell and Cllr Dunne yourself said with regards to what has been done in Newtown. Newtown has my sympathy and support in terms of the housebuilding going on and the lack of infrastructure that has not followed through. But I have been privileged enough that I can call my house a home since 2004. At the moment, it's a dream and an aspiration for people to do that. It shouldn't be. It should be a reality. But they are not going to get that reality if we cut off our nose to spite our face, you know. And, I heard Cllr Snell saying Newtown got ten extra classrooms, it transpired to be ten new classrooms to replace existing classrooms, which is a dreadful sight to hear and see. But the average teacher earns 59,000 a year and they can get a mortgage of 200,000. They are not going to buy a house in Wicklow, Ashford or Newtown, so why we might be able to build the schools at a later date, unless we do something in housing and as someone who works in [inaudible], I know how hard it is to get teachers, but we are not going to get teachers in these schools, what I have been using as an analogy; you don't turn off the water in the middle of a drought. That is what we are doing by de-zoning land. I was delighted to work with my fellow councillors in the Wicklow Municipal District area, to ensure we don't de-zone land, the stories I'm hearing, people breaking down on a phone, not being able to afford a house or languishing on the council list for far too long, I will work with my fellow councillors to ensure infrastructure Newtown gets the infrastructure it deserves and I would urge the council to keep proactively working to reduce the social housing list in Newtown and elsewhere.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I'm happy to rezone the house to SLB, in that which it protects the zoning, but it also cuts down on the element of development going on. Because, as Cllr Doyle referred to yesterday, the number of people contacting most of us, over the last few weeks, has been

phenomenal. People from the Newtown area saying, "We need more infrastructure. We don't need any more building." And I agree with that. And while we are in the middle of a housing crisis, to just keep throwing houses and houses and houses on top of each other is not going to solve the problem, it'll create more problems down the line and I understand exactly how difficult and how important the housing situation is in the country. But, throwing fuel on a fire does not put the fire out. So, it's strategic development that we should be looking at and I'm happy enough to support this proposal, that both 36 and 37 go to strategic land bank.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Sorry, councillor... [inaudible]?

>>: I don't have any difficulty with what the councillor in the area are proposing. I want to ask a question and it was mentioned area, a number of us will be aware of a dire need for a second-level school in Newtown as well additional primary school places. Can somebody confirm - is there a site, somewhere in Newtown now, for a second-level school, if the Department decide that they are going to build it? Because, it has obvious implications for Newtown but also for Kilcoole and the additional numbers trying to get into the second level schools in Kilcoole.

CATHAOIRLEACH: A very good point, and I mentioned that earlier with the lack of a secondary school. There is land available but I will get Sorcha to clarify.

SORCHA: Thank you, large block zones in the Moneykyle Road(?) big enough for a secondary and a primary.

CATHAOIRLEACH: To amendment number 36 is being brought and we are agreed to the CE's recommendation of number 75 in the draft development plan, to effectively put this land into strategic land bank. OK. So, could I have a seconder for that? Cllr Snell, second. Moving on to amendment number 37, it's proposed, by myself and seconded by Cllr Snell to change from residential zoning to strategic land bank. Are we all agreed?

CLLR WINTERS: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, thank you.

OK. Moving on to amendment 38. I'm going to take amendment 38 and 39 together. They are effectively the same thing. I do note that the second one probably has more information in terms of reasoning, but I will go for both together. So, I'm going to bring in Cllr Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Just again, tying in with what you said at the beginning, I'm the proposing... The recommendation in this particular situation, due to the fact that this particular zoning that is there at the moment is, I believe, integral, not alone to Newtown but

integral to the area because of its location. I think it is strategic and I think of the impacts and to a certain extent garden villages is isolated from both the Newtown (?) and it could do with linkage. And it provides employment opportunity and some community gain. But a key part of it, as well, is that the Garden Valley Road needs to be upgraded to link say, Kilcoole up to the N11. I have been speaking to the residents up there, and they would be basically supportive of what I'm saying, albeit that they have a keen interest in making sure sewerage is sorted. The interest they have from the point of view are the points I'm making, is the access to Kilscoy (?) and we know from experience what is happening in Greystones and everything else, we are talking years from when that will happen. So I think it is a very, very important zoning that is there already, and I think it would be a mistake, for the reasons I have outlined, to dezone it, so I'm recommending that really we don't accept the CD's recommendation at this stage and leave it as it is, due to the fact that it benefits all round, and it is integral, not alone to say, there are two districts involved in it, and it is an important linkage, because in Kilcoole, on the south side you have a massive amount of industry and we are going to have to get access there but also, running it through the R761 which is building up at both ends, if you move outside Kilcoole, it is building in the Greystones area, so I believe there is a strategic reason why it should stay as it is.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Sorry we have got [inaudible]. I have to bring in Cllr Crean.

CLLR CREAN: I have to leave the meeting for a little while, I will say this quickly. I support this, but my main reason for supporting this, not changing the zone is related to concerns for residents of Garden Village with the sewerage. I would be willing to accept the recommendation, if there is assurance that that process is not delayed with regards to garden village and access to the mains. That is my rationale for supporting this in particular but I take the CE's recommendations, if I can get that reassurance for residents of Garden Village that there would be no delay or problem with the sewerage issue with that estate. But I have to leave the meeting now as a matter of urgency. My son has had an accident in school. I'm going to the hospital. OK.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I just confirm, are you seconding the full proposal or not?

CLLR CREAN: If I can get assurance, but I'm waiting to get a taxi but I don't -I'm happy to accept the CE once I can get assurances for the Garden Village residents.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK.

CLLR CREAN: But I will not be here for the vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Well hopefully all is well.

CLLR CREAN: Thank you.

CAROLINE: Cllr Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: Thank you, Cathaoirleach, I was a motion down not to accept the CE's decision to take out the zoning which has been there for about 15/20 years, probably more. And, I support all the things that have been said about it. And first of all, the need for this road is absolutely vital. The Board (?) said there could be a 7,000m extension to a Bullford?() Rd estate unless this condition was in, it was put into position by the board. Since then, the council has done nothing to get it built. The residents between garden village and Kilcoole are plagued with heavy goods vehicles and also with the tourist resort. The main street in Kilcoole, the R761 is also heavily over HGVs because there is no proper access to the successful industrial estates in the south end of Kilcoole. So, it is essential that this road is built. And it is essential that the council gets moving on it, as well. So, this is one point. The other aspect is - it is hoped to provide a footpath and cycle access, along the road from Newtown to Kilcoole and this would help with that. The cycle path could be built along here and under the N11 at the Garden Village roundabout. These are two major settlements of 5,000 people each, joined by schools, etc and it is important that children can get independent, from the other. So, it is very important this is done. But also, it is a significant commercial estate and on some of the land, public facilities, which would be available to all the residents so. There are many advantages to this. We need these jobs. The area has got the lowest jobs ratio of local employment ratio of County Wicklow and probably Leinster and we need jobs at this location and also in Kilcoole, very much part as modern policy, and also this is suitable for logistic on the N11. I'm strongly in favour for this. I'm happy to have the names of those had agree on the one motion, because it is the one set of wording with more explanations

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are you happy to second Cllr Fortune, you have the same amendment, 38 and 39. Are you happy to work together?

CLLR MITCHELL: I am happy to work together. I would like the bigger explanation. This will probably end up on the desk of the planning regulator and minister. I want to see the best explanation possible, which also should include the fact that there are three bus services an hour to this site. It's not a rural location.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in the other speakers and come back.

CLLR WINTERS: You know yesterday you were saying we weren't to have the same thing in the plan twice for a lot of proposals that came up. So 38 and 39 are basically the same. So I would like to second Cllr Mitchell's one and if Cllr Fortune will work with Cllr Mitchell to combine, or use Cllr Mitchell's wording, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Gerry Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I am down as seconding Cllr Mitchell's proposal on the document. Just to confirm I support the proposals, both of them. I spoke yesterday about the lands there at the Kilpedder interchange and the northern section there, at the Farrankelly Road. The submission from NTA and others, outlining the lack of employment opportunities and employment zones and it also included Newtown, so we are back on the same point again, the lack of employment lands, it doesn't make sense to take those out. In relation to the road, again, that there is an area based transport assessment being carried out. That will look at the opportunities and the potential on those and again I support the proposal around that. Cllr Crean's about the sewage treatment plant. I received correspondence from residents in the Garden Village they are concerned that this might impact on the progress being made and fantastic progress being made by the water services section in Wicklow County Council in relation to that DPI and the ongoing works to have it decommissioned and have it connected to the public sewage system in Greystones. Monies have been awarded and approved for that work carried out. So anything that might impact on that would be worrying.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I don't think there is any dissent on this. So can I suggest we put forward both amendments and maybe Cllr Fortune and Cllr Mitchell could work with the planners for final wording? I think that is the best thing to suggest so, Cllr Mitchell could I have a seconder for yours. Cllr Snell. Okay. So, first of all amendment 38 proposed by Cllr Fortune and seconded by Cllr Snell, are we all in agreement? Just to complete amendment 39 proposed by Cllr Mitchell and seconded by Cllr Walsh. All in agreement.

CLLR FERRIS: Sorry, could we get a response from somebody about the road. The questions that Cllr Crean was asking. She was saying she would support the CE's recommendation if she could get assurances that the sewerage scheme would be done?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I can get clarification later if that is okay, Cllr Ferris. All seem to be in agreement with the two proposals.

CLLR FERRIS: So it will be coming back, will it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No. Like Cllr Crean isn't here. I have a new seconder, we got a new seconder for Cllr Fortune's amendment. As far as I am concerned we have passed both amendments at this stage. Okay, Cllr Kavanagh.

CLLR M KAVANAGH: I was going to raise the same point. Just a lot of emails coming in about what the status of the decommissioning of the sewage treatment plant will be up around there, regardless of whatever, what they are actually saying in all the emails is that regardless of whatever way the zoning goes, can we have clarification that the sewage treatment plant will be treated as a priority.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I am going to bring in Breege, just to clarify.

BREEGE: Just to say and this would have been in response to our, Marc Devereux in our Water Services Section to Cllr Mary Kavanagh earlier. I think just about last week, wasn't it?

Basically that approval has been given, as Cllr Walsh had pointed out there, of a grant to replace the developer prepared scheme. Wicklow County Council have hired consultants and have spoken to the landowners involved. So we have proposed design for the pumping station, rising main and sewer to connect into the Woodstock Road sewer. So we will be engaging again with the landowners to see if we can get agreement on the wayleaves. Mark says clearly here the zoning of the lands does not effect the plan to construct the sewerage system. That would clear that up, but also to say to you there is still a process, so if you are looking for guarantees, there is still a process, there is landowners involved and all of that has to go through. So we can't give you a full guarantee, but what can he can do, as Cllr Walsh had indicated is we are progressing with this as fast as we can in accordance to proper procedure.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Okay, moving on amendment number 40 proposed by Cllr Pat Kennedy and seconded by Cllr Pat Fitzgerald. Cllr Kennedy, when you are ready?

CLLR P KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I think we did vote on this before and what we were looking for here is, I suppose if I give you the background first. Many of you know and probably all of you in this chamber know that Rathdrum is built on a hill. It's very difficult to do a lot of things in Rathdrum and the one thing that the people of Rathdrum are crying out for is another supermarket. Now we do have a site located for a supermarket down at the old VEC school, the old tech. It's where the council have provided probably 25-30 car parking spaces. It's the only car park the council have provided in Rathdrum and there is a road due to go

in through there. What we are looking for here, we did propose wording that the Chief Executive has not accepted. The wording was:

'Subject to compliance with the retail planning guidelines and the sequential test that lands zoned for employment at the Corballis Upper may be considered for the development of a supermarket. '

All we are looking for here is that the council retain about two or three acres on that site for a supermarket. That land has lain idle for about 20 years. Nobody that I know of, only myself who has done a huge amount of work to try and bring employment to that land and I hope in about six weeks time we will have that before the council here, for employers will be looking to build on that land. But the town needs a supermarket and this is not disjointed from the town in any shape or form. This land is only about 300 metres from where the square in the town as the crow would fly. It's also the entrance to where there are housing estates. But putting a supermarket where it is planned at the moment is not suitable, in my opinion and in the opinion of most of the people in Rathdrum. It's on a hill. Old people are not able to push a trolley down the hill and they are certainly not able to push it back to the trolley bay when they are finished.

But subject to the sequential test, the compliance with the retail planning guidelines, sequential test, all we are asking for that is that wording to be reinserted and that the council ring-fence two or three acres on that site for a supermarket for the people of Rathdrum. Rathdrum is growing and it needs another supermarket. That is all I am asking the members for, to please support what the people of the town are looking for, thank you, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Pat Fitzgerald.

CLLR FITZGERALD: Cllr Kennedy has given a good insight to what he wants and I fully support his proposal. I am a regular visitor to Rathdrum. I see the issues there in the main street and I totally agree that two acres should be retained for a supermarket. As he said 300 metres from the square. I know from the mood in Rathdrum, it's wanted and I second Cllr Kennedy's proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Sylvester Bourke.

CLLR BOURKE: I will be supporting this, because knowing Rathdrum as I do, if you were to bring another supermarket on to the main street you

wouldn't get up or down it, it's hard enough as it is. If the council had built the relief road on the plan for the last 20 years or more... [INAUDIBLE]... main street. As a back-up plan, I think this is a good idea and I will be supporting it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Miriam Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I want to just say I will express my support for this as well on the issues that Cllr Kennedy has outlined. Also we want to invest in Rathdrum in which we are investing with the Avondale Forest Park. There will be a volume of visitors coming to Rathdrum and I think the choice of shopping there would be enhanced by a supermarket and I would look for your support.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I am going to bring Sorcha in, first of all.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I suppose ultimately the reason why the Chief Executive is suggesting this objective be omitted is bus the site doesn't pass the sequential test. It's all well and good to put in an objective that any planning objection would have to pass the sequential test when the zoning doesn't. I suppose we would be concerned it would give a false hope that this is being identified as being suitable and grantable and some sort of guarantee it will pass the test when it comes to the planning application stage.

But, look ultimately it's the Office of the Planning Regulator which has come back to us and said this does not pass the sequential approach and should be removed from the plan. So if the members decide to retain this objective, again this will have to go in the report to the Regulator why the members have chosen not to follow the Regulator's recommendation. I think Cllr Kennedy has set out in his proposal reasons and more reasons have been set out verbally by other members here today, so we will be able to put this in the report to the Regulator.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: One more reason for this to be supported is we are facing severe weather going forward with climate change and stuff like that and for the residents of Rathdrum to have to traipse in to Arklow on bad roads and with Covid we have seen the importance of local amenities and facilities to get supplies. So they are two valid reasons for this to be supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 40 proposed by Cllr Kennedy and seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald. Have we agreement? Sorry, Cllr Edward Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: One quick question. I hear the Regulator is against it, but I like to ask a question, has the Regulator actually visited the site or has the Regulator ever been in Rathdrum? Are they familiar with it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think you know the answer to that. Okay, are we all agreed? Agreed. Thank you. Amendment number 41 proposed by Cllr Pat Kennedy and seconded by Pat Fitzgerald. Cllr Kennedy, you are up again.

CLLR P KENNEDY: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I suppose we have all heard, we heard a few minutes ago about the traffic problems in Rathdrum. There is a serious traffic problem in Rathdrum. Over the last number of years I and members from Rathdrum have worked closely with Sorcha, with the former Chief Executive, with the senior engineers from the Council here in trying to come up with a plan. You will all remember that we do have an application in under the RRDF. Part of that application was that we would create a new street, which means that the road would go in, as I mentioned a minute ago, we would bring a road in at the old VEC school and we would run parallel to the houses on the left as you travel south in Rathdrum.

Now that would mean that the road must come out somewhere. In the plan, what the planners have done is they have decided to bring the road out through the memorial park. The only thing that Rathdrum has, the jewel in the crown that Rathdrum has is that park. There is no way that the people of Rathdrum would accept that. There was a number of suggestions, one was that we would create a car park at the upper end of it, near the memorial park, but on the Church of Ireland lands. We would create a hammerhead there or come back or that we would create a new link out of the memorial park. The memorial park was developed by a local group, called the Rathdrum Development Association. They developed that park out of bingo on a Friday night. It's now a jewel in the crown in Rathdrum.

They realised that something needs to happen here as well.

So what they have agreed to do was they would give pedestrian and cycle access through the park to the main street and they would also give land at the bottom of the park to get out on to the R755 to the south. So what their suggestion is that with pedestrian vehicle access from the main street to the north of the 755 and on the Station Road to the south of the 752 pedestrian access to the main street will complete the loop. The new town centre car park should be located to the west of main street and to the east of main street as indicative on the AA map.

Rathdrum is supportive of the new street linking the R775 to the north and the R752 to the south. The development association is fully supportive of giving pedestrian and cycle access through the memorial park, but they are against access through the memorial park. They are also open to providing land to facilitate this at the 752 to the south, as shown on the map submitted by the Rathdrum Development Association. I think they are correct in what they are saying here. With a little bit of engineering this can be done. It would be very wrong to say, for any statement to be made in this chamber to say that this was engineered and explored in the last application for the RRDF. Because when I asked the consultants they told me it was not part of their brief to get out there. This can be done. We can put roads under the sea and we can't put a road out 200 metres?

This can be done and I am asking the members to support the wording that the RDA have supported here today.

>>: Thank you, I hear and note what the councillor is saying about traffic safety. The way the draft plan was written and calibrated was to ensure all the options for where this road might start and end will be left open and the wording set out in the draft plan, simply said, "A new street shall be provided linking the northern and southern ends of the main street and [inaudible] along same." It didn't specify where the northern or southern end was. I suppose we have a bit of concern, if it is clearly specified, exactly where this road is to go, then it limits options for when the engineering team, working with the community, come to actually design out the options, as Cllr Kennedy said, it needs some design work done, survey work done but to set out exactly where it is going now, basically limits that to one option. I think it'll be a disservice to the people of Rathrum.

CARHAOIRLEACH: Are we agreement with Cllr Kennedy's proposal, amendment number 41, all agreed.

>>: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. Number 42. Cllr Kennedy. The Cllr Kennedy show at the moment.

CLLR KENNEDY: Nearly finished, Cathaoirleach and members, if you bear with me, I will not be long on this we are doing a development plan, as

we know, that requires a number of dezonings. I can understand the merit of some of what we have been doing, I have not looked through the merit in Rathdrum, apart from this one.

This land has already been dezoned. There is a live application planning at the moment for 46 residents to finish out the site. When this first came to light in the community, this planning application was being lodged, I had said I wouldn't support it for the very reason, this is to the west of Rathrum. The one thing we don't have, because we got left behind for years, we have no facilities at all. So, I asked the developers, if they would work with the council, and do an area action plan for Rathrum that I think is the right way to go it is the first time an area action plan has been done in Rathrum. They did that and in fairness they worked closely with the planners in the council here and worked closely with the community section here in the council. And what they identified was that there was a lack of facilities in Rathrum and what they are providing is the, they are providing two sports pitches, a full-sized GAA pitch, a full-size soccer pitch, a playground for Rathrum and a nature trail in a wooded area for the community. And they are providing a relief road which Rathrum is crying out for. We come in on the Greenan Road(?) and exit on to the Arklow Road which will help to alleviate a huge amount of traffic on the main street. Again, I say to members, this is not a rezoning, it is already zoned land. And the community gain with this one is huge for Rathrum. It is something we have never got before. I suppose you could say to yourself. Which is more important. Is it the sports pitches and playground for the children? It is all equal. The whole community and the rural community will now be able to travel from the south to the north-east without having to go into the town by coming through that road. I would ask the members, please to support this, to leave the zoning on this land because the community gain outweighs, as I said, they already have planning permission for 92 houses and a live planning application in at the moment for 46. And I would ask the members, please to leave that zoning on that because the community gain is something Will something we have never got in the town.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment 42 proposed by Cllr Kennedy and seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald? All in agreement. Agreed?

>>: Agreed.

>>: Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You are selling it, Cllr

CLLR KENNEDY: Amendment 43 proposed by Cllr Bourke. Cllr Bourke, do you have a seconder? Cllr Kennedy, OK. Go ahead.

CLLR BOURKE: When you look on page 84. The map there, it isn't the map I'm proposing. The map I'm were posing is the one on page 85, which is a suggested map from the planner. This is for a local need for four houses for a local family. Actually, recently had a planning application withdrawn on this, very close to that particular spot. We discussed the before in the draft plan. It didn't actually make it on that occasion. But the applicant asked to recommit again on to the full county development plan. An invitation for submission. So, it is here before us today and I'm proposing that we give the family this piece of ground, for residential use for local needs for four family members. We have done something similar yesterday, I think in was it Kilpedder, the proposal you had, Chairman, for three members of a family.

CATHAOIRLEACH: To be absolutely clear, the map being used is on page 85, just because, I just want to make sure that Members are aware.

CLLR BOURKE: That is the map, yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, Cllr Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I want to....

CLLR BOURKE: There are services there because there is housing development right up beside it and there was planning granting on the north of it, previously, for an estate which was undeveloped.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: Yeah, just looking at what the Chief Executive has said and for the Members, on page 85. Would the Members be minded to consider additional zone in this area, this is suggested the zoning be limited...

So, I will only agree to this, that A and B and C are adhered to.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, thank you, Cllr Ferris.

CLLR FERRIS: Thank you. I was going to make the same point as Cllr Kavanagh, because, the first, in the initial feedback, the CE says that there are alternative sites within the built-up area that need to be prioritised and then he has put in, you know, wording. Some of us voted against similar proposals yesterday, even though they got through and those of us who did, I think need to be consistent. But I would be happy to support it if the proposer accepts the Chief Executive's wording.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Miriam Murphy?

CLLR MURPHY: I would like to give this support. It is a family where they would like to come back to where they live, to give back to the

community, economic and everything else that goes with that. So, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Paul O'Brien.

CLLR O'BRIEN: I wasn't here, I said I would support zoning land that has already been zoned, I would not support extra zoning, I had a couple of queries, what guarantees can we be given that it is for houses and that it is for family members only? As I said earlier, I'm very much in favour of people owning their own home, I don't think it should be a privilege, I think it should be reality. But I would have concerns if it is not for four houses and not for family members, what reassurance can I be given?

Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Yes, echoing what was said, if this were to be passed, I would like it to be passed by achievement of the Chief Executive's three recommendations and what recommendations do we have that that it would be adhered to?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Derek Mitchell?

CLLR MITCHELL: I would also like to ensure that the recommendations of the Chief Executive, which are put down there, that the four houses and the two acres, those points, are built into this and that this family gets, we don't get more than four houses. So, I support it, if those are put in.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Cllr Bourke, can I bring you back in, just to clarify a couple of questions there?

CLLR BOURKE: I propose we adhere to the manager's recommendations, therefore, only two acres closest to the existing developed area. I would like to remind Members that the land to the north previous had planning, an undeveloped grant of planning was previously in the previous Rathrum plan and as far as I recall, the planners took the drawing off of that and put it on to this, the one that Cllr Kennedy was discussing earlier, the previous submission for that land now has 90 houses granted. Most of the zoning in that area was taken off it and put up in ([inaudible] for the last plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: For clarification, you are putting this forward with the Chief Executive's wording is that correct?

CLLR BOURKE: Correct.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Fitzgerald?

CLLR FITZGERALD: Agreeing that it should be limited to family only, four houses only and two acres only and land adjacent to the existing area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we in agreement?

CLLR FERRIS: Can I raise something else?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead.

CLLR FERRIS: In fairness to the family members who would be housed on this site, I don't think it is realistic that we, the Member, should insist that they live there until, you know, that they live there forever, you know. Because various reasons they might need to move or move to a different area, etc, etc. So, what I'm suggesting is that could it be conditioned that they would live there for ten years after the houses are built? You know, because you have to be fair to these people, you know, like anybody else, that they may, for whatever reason, want to move. They don't want to be, perhaps, having to live there until they die, you do know, do you understand?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think section 47 would take care of, that where you would have to own the house for ten years.

CLLR FERRIS: Yeah.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. That would be taken care of in planning anyway.

CLLR FERRIS: Can I ask Sorcha to comment on that, please?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. The three criteria now proposed by Cllr Bourke don't include a provision that it has to be restricted to family members only. Four houses, two acres and the land close to the developed area. Where the members want to consider restrictions for family, they would have to put another caveat on that, that it would be family members only, such as through a section 47. We would have concerns given it is Rathrum and you are effectively zoning land in a town, a normal residential zone in a town, just a low-density zone but there is no other sites in that zone where there is a restriction to a particular group or person or people. That generally only happens in small villages and rural areas, so we would have concerns in that regard but it is really in the members hands whether they want to include that as an extra caveat on this proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kavanagh, first.

CLLR KAVANAGH: CLLR KAVANAGH: Can we add it as a caveat? I'm only supporting new zoning on the basis that it was for family, and I would not be inclined to support it if it didn't include a family-only section 47.

>> That should be no problem.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins, I come back to you.

CLLR TIMMINS: It shows us Howard we've got to in planning. Trying to put restrictions on a small site. Do members realise, in a small village, people who lived and worked in Wicklow can get planning, open to anyone, if you do an extension to a small village boundary, it's free for anyone living and working in Wicklow for three years building in it, and even have a house, and still get it. Now we have a medium sized town, a Level 4 growth town, and we're talking about putting a more onerous restriction on it than with small villages. People understand the planning rules they're trying to put in place. This is absolutely ridiculous. Extend a small Level 4 town for four houses, end of story. Putting restrictions on it is daft.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr?

>> Put it have to to a vote pen.? So I'm clear, you're putting it to a vote based on the wording of the Chief Executive, but not exclusive for family members? Is that what we are saying?

>> Not exclusively.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Not exclusively for family members.

CLLR ANN FERRIS: That makes a huge difference, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You happy with that?

>> Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Going for a vote.

HELEN PURCELL: It is EM43, four houses, two acres only, and (c) lands closest to the existing developed area. [Votes taken].

22 in favour, six against, and four not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. So we're moving on to the Chief Executive's recommendation s for Level 4 plans, and we're on to page 36 of your draft plan. It is amendment number 63, economic development and employment. There are two - sorry, there is an extra paragraph being put in on this, on page 37. Are we all in agreement? Could I have a proposer and a seconder.

CLLR WINTERS: I will propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Paul O'Brien. Are we all agreed? Agreed. Okay. Amendment number 64, on page 37, again, another paragraph, risk assessment. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please?

CLLR WINTERS: I propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by Cllr [Inaudible]. Number [inaudible]. Amendment number 65, this is strategic land bank. It is an extra

paragraph put in. You can see it yourselves on page 38. Could I have a proposer and a seconder, please? Posed by Cllr Paul O'Brien. Sorry, Cllr Kennedy, go ahead.

CLLR SCOTT: Would you read out to the members piece in red?

CATHAOIRLEACH: In order to ensure that the lands are obtained for future development, no development proposals including single housing will be considered until after the lifetime of the plan.

CLLR SCOTT: Can you explain to me what that means?

CLLR SCOTT: This is a request from the Officers' Planning Regulator that strategic land banks land should be reserved exactly as that, reserved for strategic land for the next phase of development and no development such as single rural houses or other development should be allowed because it's being reserved for strategic purposes. Is that the land clout the zone.

>> It's a land in the zone. Any zone in the strategic land bank, this provision would ally to it.

CLLR SCOTT: If one 1,000 the lands in one of the towns and designated as a strategic land bank, that a family member couldn't build a house on it because it has to be retained?

CATHAOIRLEACH: That seems like what it is saying, yes.

>> Either the land is being reserved for strategic purposes or it's not. If you're zoning it as a strategic land bank, you have to follow through on what the zoning means, you're reserving it for future development, keeping it in abeyance, keeping it back for a future phase of development.

CLLR SCOTT: I wouldn't be able to support that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You're sterilising the land for the length of the plan. In the event of a family member, or the child of an owner of the land wanted to build a house on that, they're effectively barred from doing so, so it is a very difficult situation.

CLLR MULLEN: I have a difficult problem with this and it affects the ... can I ask what the difference is, we've been asked to replace the following lines, "Any development proposals within the lifetime of the plan will be considered under the County Development Plan rural objectives". So that is what it being taken out. Correct? And being put in with basically nothing can be done in the lifetime of the plan. So the objective is restrictive as is. It's not as if we are being flaithiúlacht here. I would have a problem with that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Miriam Murphy.

>> Other than that, I could have skipped through, and I certainly couldn't support this as we were after on the previous submission agreed to a family having four houses, and this is kind of contradicting it, so I certainly wouldn't be supporting this. I think I thank Cllr Kennedy for highlighting it. I didn't understand it otherwise. Sorry, I have to leave the meeting for a while as well.

>> Thanks, Cathaoirleach, I will be proposing we reject the Chief Executive's wording and revert back to what was there. I don't see the logic behind it. We are after putting significant land in Newtownmountkennedy into strategic land bank. The councillors don't agree with it being developed for the lifetime of this plan, but this is a totally separate thing. This is a one-off house that a family member - land will change ownership over the course of time as well. We still have to accommodate individual one-off housing, and I think this is a step too far. Cllr Mullen's made a good point in there is already restrictive legislation there for people who want to come forward for a one-off house, and I would be proposing that we revert back to the blue text and not accept what is being proposed today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: Maybe it is a point of clarity for myself. I had assumed that if we were putting land into a land bank that it wasn't going to be used in the next plan. I assumed that is we're doing. The Chief Executive's proposal here seems to be confirming what I thought we were actually doing, so I'm not sure I'm misinterpreting it. My assumption was if the land was put into land bank, it wouldn't be touched then until the next plan. Which is the case of this proposal? Am I right?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR KENNEDY: That's where I'm not understanding from the other speakers, that if land is in a land bank and someone comes in with a proposal to build a development, surely that would be stopped then?

CATHAOIRLEACH: It would. The point that members are making is more on an individual basis. If you land bank land, it is basically you can do nothing for the lifetime of the plan, so if a member of that particular family wanted to come in to build a one-off house on that land, that wouldn't be permitted either. If I'm right in saying that is the general concern over the wording that has been put in front of us.

CLLR KENNEDY: That was my assumption that would be the case anyway. Thank you for the clarification.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will go to a vote. Cllr Winters?

CLLR WINTERS: Thanks, Cath Democrat. I agree with Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy. That would be my understanding what a strategic land bank was, that once we placed it in the strategic land bank, that once development was to be considered again, that lands would be considered, and obviously if you're going to use it as a strategic land bank, you wouldn't be allowed any development, piecemeal development on it in the meantime. So, yes, that is what I would have thought, yes. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy, be brief.

CLLR KENNEDY: My understanding of a strategic land bank that the land would be developed around that first, and the strategic land bank would be land identified as the next land to be developed. But it was never designed to penalise rural people, or people who might have a son or dot who wants to build a house. The RPR needs to stop penalising rural Wicklow. They have the same rights as people in the Greater Dublin Area and the urban metropolitan areas, and Serbs needs to get that message up to them. We can't be continually penalising rural people for sons and daughters wanting to build on their own land. It must stop. We were begging a few minutes ago to put a few pieces on a hand for family and now going to penalise them in another way. I will be supporting what Cllr Snell said a minute ago reverting back to the blue text instead of the red.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: My understanding was there would be no development whatsoever until the plan was changed.

CLLR TIMMINS: Briefly, I agree completely with Cllr Kennedy - thanks for bringing it to our attention. Like, strategic land bank, you mightily maybe in a very, very urban area, maybe there is some merit in having it, but like in small rural towns, to have strategic land bank s, the reality is that most never get developed. Then the land owner could be living beside it, and their child might want to build a house next door and restrict it. That doesn't make sense.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR WALSH: My understanding of the term "strategic land bank" would be in conjunction with large-scale developments. We spoke about that in relation to Newtown what we're calling large stash scale developments for 50-plus House. The blue text already has the restrictive reference there to the rural plan, and the restrictions there.

CLLR FORTUNE: I live I live on the border of the situation, the urban Ural. I've listened to Cllr Kennedy and Snell and they're spot on. I think it is unclear and should be rejected.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going for a vote. Cllr Winters? You're okay, thank you. It's been proposed by Cllr Kennedy, seconded by Cllr Snell, that we reject the Chief Executive wording in red. Am I right in saying that? We're going for a vote. So you're voting, if you're rejecting the red, you're voting against. I hope I have that right.

>> No, no! [Laughter].

CATHAOIRLEACH: I did ask that by the way a minute ago.

HELEN PURCELL: Rejecting the CE proposal in red and reverting to the blue, that is the proposal put forward. If you're in favour of rejecting the red and reverting to the blue, you vote for. If you want the Chief Executive's, you vote against.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will get all these clarified, I think.

[Votes taken].

26 in favour, two against, and four not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Thank you. Moving on to number amendment number 66, the Chief Executive's recommendations. Number 66 Cllr Timmins?

CLLR TIMMINS: I'm not sure, are you taking this now?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes, we will take it.

CLLR TIMMINS: Related to Cllr O'Neill's proposal. You're taking it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

CLLR TIMMINS: It relates to family land. I have to absent myself from the meeting, but I will be back for the next one, and go for the two after that as well. Because they're all linked to this one.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr O'Neill? Do you want to speak?

GERRY O'NEILL: I have it now there, yes. Taking this motion now, chair, yes?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

GERRY WALSH: What I'm doing is asking for no change from the CEO. The - we've already talked on this issue before, and we've already supported the plan to bring low-cost shopping into Baltinglass. So, I would be proposing again that, you know, while - Baltinglass is a part of Wicklow that is lagging behind in a big, big way. This is an opportunity here for the people to get the same crack of the whip as others. Hundreds of people every week leave the town to shop in Thurlow, Carlow, and parts of Kildare, and this facility is needed badly, not only for Baltinglass,

but the surrounding areas. People in the low-cost investment, and they would be from, they would be from Baltinglass. And we talked about the site and the situation in Baltinglass before, and, again, this was something that I talked to the people of Baltinglass maybe ten years ago for a facility of this sort, and I've - we've looked at several different sites in the town, and whatever, and we've talked about these for a long, long time. We got nowhere, and we never got anywhere unless we move on and support to get this - the low-cost outlet just on the M81 there. So, I would urge people - I would urge councillors to support this. In Baltinglass again with the old bridge there, and the traffic congestion, and the types of trucks, and whatever you have in providing this area, and as anyone would know, you have 30 or 40 containers and trucks would use this drop-off facility. So, I would urge - I would really urge - it is a chance anyway to put Baltinglass out there a little bit. We've been lagging behind in Baltinglass we - *we need to put the people in the town. There will be shopping in the town if we get the facility in. There is a footpath right in the facility, save the use of cars, whatever, and it's an ideal location, I think. I would urge - I've considered this long and hard. We've looked at other sites in the town of whatever. I talked to the planners on this before, but I think this is once and for all, it's a site that will move on and give Baltinglass the same chance as any other town or village in the county of Wicklow. I would urge people to vote for this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Again, this was discussed at length before Cllr O'Neill and his colleagues, and I know it went for a long debate, and it was supported - I supported it then, and I will be supporting it again, Cathaoirleach. In regards to supermarkets in general, the reality is that there is a disconnect between planners and what is actually happening on the ground, because most supermarkets and the bigger retail supermarkets that are out there are on the verge of towns and villages for the very reason that people can drive to them. There is an ample amount of car parking and that. Yet everything seems to be that we want to push it straight into the middle of towns, like what was discussed earlier in regards to what Cllr Kennedy was making the point. That's not what people want. Cllr Peir Leonard made a very good point in regards to that debate as well that the people of Rathdrum were having to go many, many miles to Arklow; the people of Baltinglass weren't even shopping in County Wicklow. They weren't shopping in County Wicklow. Some were going into Carlow because they're on the border. People in Blessington, until they got their supermarkets there, and competition, and fair competition. They were having to go into Kildare. Some were going into Dublin. We have the luxury in Eastwick low here, thank God, touch wood, that we now have a situation where we have a lot of these multi-

national supermarkets on the outskirts of our towns and villages. And I genuinely think that families now more than ever struggle and will struggle if they hadn't got these supermarkets. I think it's time we supported the people of Baltinglass and like what Cllr O'Neill is saying, it's, in the meantime, that people realised you have to give fair competition to everybody, and you have to be fair in balanced in your decision-making, so I will be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

PAUL O'BRIEN: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. I will support the people of Baltinglass. I have no hesitation with this. And if they need a low-cost supermarket, granted, I'll go and shop in it if I have to. Some of us are not fully au fait with planning permissions. How can we guarantee that it will be a low-cost supermarket? We've been told before we can't put conditions on planning when it came to the houses in Rathdrum for family members, so, look, it is a low-cost supermarket in Baltinglass, no problem. I will fully support that. But I would like to know how we can guarantee that will be a low-cost supermarket. My information is there are two supermarkets there, and I'm sure competition would be healthy for everybody, so if I can get a reassurance that it is a low-cost supermarket, I have no issues.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring in Sorcha. We are looking at 66 and 68 here. I will get Sorcha to explain.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. We're really on number 68 here, to be straight, Cathaoirleach. Number 68 relates to action area one in Baltinglass on the west side of Baltinglass. In the draft plan, which you discussed and adopted last May, this action area, you agreed that part of this action area should be zoned for a supermarket. So that is what is published in the draft plan. A number of agencies, including the OPR, have come back to us with concerns about the possible location of supermarket in this area that it would be damaging to the town centre, it would be too far out of the centre, it wouldn't follow the sequential test. So as part of number 68, Chief Executive's amendment number 68, what we are recommending is that supermarket zoning is removed. However, we are also recommending a number of other changes to action area one - that is not the only one. To be clear, if we are discussing Chief Executive's amendment number 68, it's not just the supermarket that you will be ... we are recommending that a new objective be added to the Baltinglass plan which is number 66, to facilitate and support the development of supermarket on land zoned town centre, so particularly to promote and support the development of a supermarket which we accept is needed in Baltinglass, within the town centre, not out of the edge of the town. And we believe, having walked the town many times, and look at

the zoning plans and so on, there is adequate land in the town centre on the East side of the bridge where the majority of the population live to develop a supermarket, and these those who are familiar with the area will know that the bridge is narrow, so the supermarket should be where the people are living on the east side of the town, and not having to cross the bridge. They can't cross it by foot, it will be car dependent. It's probably better that we take 68 first. 66 stands alone anyway, regardless whether the members choose to designate part of - it is still a positive objective to promote the development of a supermarket in the town centre. I mean, I don't think anyone could argue with that, that it is a good place for supermarkets generally. If you wanted to jump ahead and do 68 first, it might come back to 66 and 67.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're taking 68 first and obviously page 40, it's clearly outlined there, so, you know, maybe just wanted to make sure that we know what we are voting on, and while we are doing that, I'm going to bring in Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Thank you, I can't believe, I'm more in agreement with Sorcha on this one. The only time I'm going to say that today! [Laughter]. I do think the town centre of Baltinglass has to be focused on. First, we have a major problem with the bridge. We need a pedestrian bridge across it anyway. We are investing 3.5 million in the town centre with - we have two supermarkets in Baltinglass, and the yes, there is a requirement for a low-cost supermarket. We do have to have a debate about the low-cost supermarket. We have existing traders, family businesses, who in villages up and down country are being put out of business because of low-cost supermarkets, in some cases, competition from low-cost supermarkets, some multi-nationals. We have to have an honest conversation about that, but I do think it should be town centre. Our town centre should be shopping, social, and residential, and that is all I want to say.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard, and then I'm going for a vote.

CLLR LEONARD: Briefly, I wanted to come in and make people aware that Arklow built a shopping centre on the far side of the river from the town centre. It proved to be catastrophic. The town centre really suffered. Maybe Arklow could be used as an example. Being led by the local community. The local councillors in the area know what is best for the area, so thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we're going for a vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're going for a vote. Proposed by Cllr O'Neill and seconded by Cllr Snell. Sorry Cllr Blake?

>> As Cllr O'Neill has alluded to, this is part of the last meeting, with regards to this development, in terms - and there was planned development granted recently for a number of houses on it, that we'll facilitate the need for shopping in the area there. There's a huge proportion of houses there. There's housing estates in that location of Baltinglass. People who live there who don't have other supermarkets on that side of the town whatsoever. I don't think there's a shop on that side of town. So, this is badly needed in this particular location. I just support it, as Cllr O'Neill has said was passed at the last meeting here.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I have to Bring It On in to explain the proposals.

>> The proposal is to omit the retail zoning, it's to make amendments to action area one including splitting action area one into two action areas effectively, because an issue was raised in the submission from one of the land owners that they felt it was unfair that they were being tied to another separate land owner in the development of their land. So, if you were to accept Cllr O'Neill's proposal to not accept the chief executive's recommendation, you'd be losing that change as well. So, there's a couple of elements to this. So just to be careful on which elements you're accepted and which you're rejecting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we taking the vote on SLO1 and 2 together?

>> The proposal is to break action area one into two SLOs which are like action areas. So, breaking the two land owners apart, so you see map one, where it says change from on number 69, page 41? You see action area one is a big block that has the green zone along the river, purple zone, employment, yellow is residential, the light green is active open space and the dark orange is the retail. The proposal from the chief executive is to break that into two areas. You can see the two outlines in blue there. SLO1 and 2. SLO2 would be employment and open space and SLO1 would be residential and open space. I think if the members are minded to maintaining the retail zoning on that, that the positive aspect of splitting those two action areas they should consider whether they want to continue with that proposal as well. So, there's really those two key elements the retail and split offing the action area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So, we're going to go for two votes on this on area one and then a separately area two?

>> No, it's not that it's area one and two. It's two concepts. One is whether there's retail included or not. And one is splitting the action area into two.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, can I just double check for clarity then, the orange zone that's retail on the map on page 69, so under the amendment 68, we're voting whether or not to change that to residential and open space, but has that got any relation then to amendment 66? Is that residential zone town centre outside that map area actually in the town centre? I'm getting slightly confused?

>> Sorry, I'm confused.

>> I'm just wondering the relationship between amendment 68 here and amendment 66. The retail zone in 66 ... the supermarket on the land zone town centre, that's not being shown on the map on page 69 here, is that correct?

CATHAOIRLEACH: 66 is really just to facilitate the support of development of the supermarket on land zone and town centre. That's just ...

>> Yes, it's an objective not site-specific objective. It's to support supermarkets on London zone town centre. The reason we recommended that was well it's a good objective any way, in light of our suggestion that the objective be removed from the action area one lands, we thought it was important to maintain positive support for supermarkets generally in the town.

>> Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to finish with 68 because we've been - sorry, yeah ... sorry chief executive, go ahead.

>> It might be the question Cllr Scott was asking about, the decision made in 68 won't impact on 66. It's a stand-alone. OK?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake go ahead.

>> I am totally confused by what this is. I'm totally confused, to be honest with you. I didn't intend getting involved in ball tin glass. Are we deleting it? It says change from map one to map two. Right? The supermarket is marked in map one, as I understand it. It's taken out in map two. Is that what we're talking about doing with it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Let's conclude here.

>> That is the chief executive's recommendation. To remove the retail zoning from this block of land. But there is a second recommendation which is to split the block of land action area one into two action areas, on a submission made on that issue, the stand-alone issue of the tying of two land owners together and forcing them to work together on a master plan. There's two changes in one that are independent, but both relate to action area one. They're not presented as two stand-alone amendments. They relate to the same piece of text and land in the plan.

>> I didn't know there were two land owners involved in this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Corrigan.

CLLR CORRIGAN: Sorry I'm totally lost. Are we voting, taken one vote on both? Or are they broken down into two separate votes?

>> I'm asking that this area stays commercial. It's as simple as that. I think it's very confusing. I don't know whether there's any real need for the confusion. I've been clear in what I proposed the last time some months ago. I'm reiterating that here today that this area stays commercial. And that we reject the county managers opinions. Like any other motion here today or yesterday, it's very clear in my book, you know, I don't like to see it being - it's turned into a very, you know we're going to confuse everyone with this. I'm clearly saying that the commercial stays in, as it did before, six months ago or whatever. And that we reject the county managers input on it. That's what I come in here to vote for today any way.

>> This is on number 68. You're saying we vote to keep it in the blueprint.

>> So, page 39 ... (all talk at once)

>> Through no fault of anybody at the top table, unfortunately it's led to a bit of confusion. I think if the members set aside 66 for the time being. That's an objective. That's there, I assume everybody in the chamber will support that objective. That goes without saying. What we're dealing with here is 69 and if the members look at page 41, the two maps, what was passed here of May 2021, by this chambers, is what's this map, the top map. The chief executive, for whatever reason, has decided that they want to change from that map to the

second map. To take the retail out of it. I think that's a little bit wrong, to put it mild. I think that to produce this map and say that the chief executive is going against the wishes of the members of the Baltinglass municipal district and the full Council chambers and produced the map to say now we need to change it to that. 66 shouldn't have come up before this. That's what's led to the confusion. We've a choice here. Then obviously, the two action areas that's a separate vote that will take place. I have no issue with separating the two. But the reality is what the members passed here last year, like what's gone all before today's amendments, a lot of these amendments shouldn't be in front of us. Members are having to come here and make amendments to what was agreed in the chambers. Map one should be supported. The chief executive's recommendation should be rejected. Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you cllr O'Brien.

CLLR O'BRIEN: In the interim between the decision made before and now there were submissions or a submission that has influenced the new text. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. There still seems to be confusion. We're going to try to vote on number 69. You're either supporting - sorry. Go on.

>> Cathaoirleach, could we suggest that 68 and 69 are the same matter, one is the text, one is the map. But there's two principles or two concepts to be decided. One is whether you're for or against including a retail zoning in this area at all. So that could be one vote for or against retail at this location. The second vote do you agree or not agree with splitting this area into two blocks? Keep it simple and then we'll work it out afterwards.

CATHAOIRLEACH: First vote is for or against -

>> Are we voting on map one, 69?

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK and this is proposed ...

>> That's what I'm proposing. I don't want any other confusion.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will hand it over to Helen. I'm not even going to suggest what's for and against here. Sorry Helen. Yeah, just say that.

HELEN PURCELL: Just to clarify, what you're voting for in this first vote is whether or not you're in favour of

retaining the retail zoning, if you want to retain the retail zoning, you're voting for. And if you want to exclude and remove the retail zoning, you're voting against. Is that, OK?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Perfect.

>> Is that the town centre, retail or the out-of-town retail?

HELEN PURCELL: It's on the map.

>> I see it on the map but I don't know what part of Baltinglass it is. Is it ... the town centre retail? Is

>> No, it's out of town.

HELEN PURCELL: Proposed by Jerry O'Neill and seconded by Cllr John Snell. OK. Right. (Votes taken).

24 for, two against, five not present and one abstaining.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring back in Sorcha on the second vote so everybody is clear on what they're voting on.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Vote two would be to split this action area into two areas, calling them SLOs, special local objectives, which require less master planning and agreement with other land owners than a normal action area. The boundaries of these SLOs generally follow the land ownership boundaries. So, you can see on the second map there, on page 41, the boundaries of the two SLOs. SL 02 an employment and open space zone. SLO one is a residential open space zone now including retail as the members have just passed.

>> I just want to ask a question. We didn't hear from the local members about that aspect really. I'd be interested to know, like ... have they discussed that and are they in favour of that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Don't want to put any of them on the spot. But if any of the west members want to contribute? Cllr Blake first of all ... Cllr Owe Neill go ahead.

>> I've had no discussion whatsoever with anyone on this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will ask you to explain it again, please.

>> As one action area it means that all the land owners have to work together to deliver the public elements to it, let's say the access roads that are going to serve all the lands, the park zone, along the river, and the active open space zone, which is the light green. So, it

requires a number of land owners to work together, have a phasing plan and do a master plan together. Without - the other option, breaking them into two SLOs there's less requirements for land owners to cooperate and work together. If you're very concerned that you don't want to see one element of the site going ahead without the other, you know the public - the parks, you don't want to see residential going ahead without employment, you'd like them to be tied together so they're delivered together, you keep it as one action area. If you prefer to see them working together to deliver all aspects of this block of land, then you keep it as one action area.

>> where does this come from?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mullen can I bring you in?

>> I'm listening carefully there. I'm trying to just put into layman's language. By splitting it, it makes it easier to develop the retail side because you don't have to take the entire context of the entire area into it when you're developing it, is that a reasonable assumption here?

CATHAOIRLEACH: That's what I'm taking out of it, Cllr Mullen, yes. We're going to go for a vote. Cllr Blake?

>> Is it more beneficial for the whole thing to break it in two, then?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I believe so, yeah. I believe so. OK we go to a vote - Cllr Snell. Briefly.

CLLR SNELL: Like previous speakers that will be my reading on it as well. And if there's agreement you mightn't have to go to a vote. I haven't heard anyone speaking against what the chief executive is recommending in the second drawing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cronin?

CLLR CRONIN: Yeah, I wanted to clarify, are we voting to keep it to, divided into two? Is that what the vote is on? I just want a clarification what we're voting on?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I have a proposer and seconder to basically split what we're talking about here, so proposed by Cllr Mullen, seconded by Cllr Snell. Are we all in agreement to that? Or do we need to go for a vote?

>> Agreement.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed? OK. Thank God, moving on. Amendment number 66, I know we're going backwards, again,

I think this is just an extra paragraph to facilitate the development of a new supermarket on zone lands in town centre. Are we all agreed? Could I have a proposer and seconder. Cllr Blake?

>> This is the proposal from the management yeah?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, it is.

>> This is proposal from the management for a supermarket in the middle of the town that they themselves refused planning permission for houses on, is that true?

CATHAOIRLEACH: It's not specific.

>> That's what happened on it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'll bring in Sorcha.

>> It doesn't relate to any site. It's the objective to support the development of a supermarket in the town centre. We have no site in mind.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I have a proposer and seconder, please? Proposed by Cllr Burke, and seconded by Cllr O'Brien. Are we all agreed? OK. agreed. Item 67 to support multipurpose sports campus proposed by Cllr Mullen and seconded by Cllr Timins.

>> Just to say I'm back into the meeting. I excused myself for item number 66.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, 66 is done. Yeah.

>> 68 and 69 done as well?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, they're completed.

>> Just in relation to 67, I'd like to speak in support of that. The local basketball club have been campaigning for that. And wording I agreed with the planners to support that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: It's proposed by Cllr Mullen and seconded by Cllr Timins. All agreed?

>> Cathaoirleach, just so ... could you go back there to the management proposal for a town centre supermarket. Does that ... does that conflict with what we already decided?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No, it's just another objective.

>> OK.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Moving on to amendment 70. That is completed. Amendment number 71. It's completed.

Correct. Put on your microphone there. Can you Can you clarify that?

>> Number 70 when the Cathaoirleach said it was done, that was dealt with under Cllr's EM33. Number 7, is 72 and 73 were dealt with by EM38 and EM39. From Cllr Mitchell and Cllr Fortune.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 74, it's to do with Kennedy. Can you explain?

>> These are lands that in the draft plan were proposed for open space zoning, they are immediately to the west of the new distributor road and to the west of the park under development there. There's been a request that part of these lands could be zoned for a nursing home. And the chief executive is actually in support of that in principle. I think there is an application already been lodged, but this is just support in principle. But we're suggesting that along with that, we ensure that the remainder of the land be developed as a park. These lands suggested for nursing home zoning aren't in the flood zone and we're happy there isn't any environmental impacts that couldn't be addressed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm happy to propose that. Seconded by Cllr Snell. Are we all in agreement? OK. Thank you. Number 76. Dealt with. Grand. OK so we're moving onto level five plans, Ashford, Dunleavey and Tinahely. Going to the members proposed amendment number 44. In the name of proposed by Cllr Dunn, seconded by Cllr O'Brien.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Yeah, I suppose we've been talking about providing housing and the problem with people living within the county, the price of housing, this is a proposal that the land is already zoned. We have services. There's a live planning application on it. And there is community gain in it as well. I feel this application sorry this proposal is well worth keeping in the plan and I'm proposing that we keep it in the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr O'Brien.

CLLR O'BRIEN: Thank you. I agree with Cllr Dunn, this is why I second this. The reason why I'm seconding it when I spoke to Cllr Dunn about it was the need for housing in Ashford. Ashford like Newtown has been forgotten in the past in terms of schooling and infrastructure. I hope we work with the national government with relation to the information within the community, certainly the need for housing in Ashford is great. That's why I support the proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cavanaugh.

>> I'm just mindful of the section that states from the chief executive response there on page v288 should the members be minded to consider this proposal favourably it is recommended that these lands be made an SLO, a special local objective area, which allows the plan to set a clear requirement that the residential portion may only be developed in conjunction with delivery of a sports ground, to ensure the delivery of this element given this is a key reason for the proposal. So, I would only accept it with that agreed to.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, I will bring you in to clarify.

>> Thank you. Yes, just as Cllr Cavanaugh said the proposal is for a piece of land residential and open space, the reason that is given the delivery of the open space land. We strongly recommend that ashen sure that one goes with the other. As that is the base is for the proposed amendment. The green text set out on page 88 sets out a manner in which you could zone this land if you're minded to. With ensuring that the open space lands comes with any housing that might be delivered.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. I think that's the intention of Cllr Dunn any way. I will bring you back in. Sorry, Cllr Winters first.

CLLR WINTERS: Yeah, I'd like to say that I agree with Cllr Cavanaugh.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: I wanted to add my comments that I support the SLO designation. I want clarification before a vote as to what Cllr Dunn intends?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can you clarify that?

>> Yes, sorry Cathaoirleach. That is the intention. I'm in agreement with that. It's all about open space. That's what we're talking about here, community gain. So yeah. That's the intention.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So, amendment 44 proposed by Cllr Dunn seconded by Cllr O'Brien with the text of the SLO included. Are we all in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. OK. Amendment 45 proposed by Cllr Dunn seconded by myself.

>> Yeah, very much like the first proposal, the housing need you know. But also, a huge community gain, bigger even than the first one. You know, I think that's needed, open space, pitches, maybe community centres, things like that. And building houses, we have to have the services, you know for people to go, you know, what to do after 6pm and things like that. This is absolutely huge. So, I propose this amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I want to show my support for this. We put a lot of effort and thought as municipal councillors into this. On page 91, of the amendment, I think it clearly outlines the benefit of this to Ashford. And Ashford like Newtown, but maybe we might have a chance to rectify maybe what hasn't happened in other areas by making this part of the proposal. So, it's very much, in my view, part of any proposal in terms of the objective of residential zoning. Cllr John Snell.

CLLR SNELL: Thanks. Again, Ashford is a place with a municipal district, we had a lot of debate. A lot of meetings to discuss the pros and cons of this county development plan. Because it shapes the future of Ashford. To give the members an insight into the frustration that we as six selected members for Wicklow east have had - we had two strategic housing developments in Ashford.

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Ashford is a municipal district, we had a lot of debates and meeting to discuss the pros and cons of this County Development Plan. It shapes the future of Ashford. Just to give the members an insight into the frustration that we as six elected members of Wicklow East have had, we had two strategic housing developments in Ashford which basically any concerns we had through our Chief Executive that went to ... was ignored. We had concerns in regards to both of those developments - simple things - but very important things, such as pedestrian access, and vehicular access, and everything was ignored. Not only that, that both developments actually, there was very little community gain from both of those developments. So we are trying to rebalance and make sure that the community don't lose out. Just to give you an insight into the zoning in Ashford - and we know that Ashford has had its issues in regards to people saying it's over zoned - like the members, and I want to commend them, of Wicklow East have actually refused to put forward 45 hectares - 45 hectares - of land which would equate to 35 units, on the basis of 50 units per hectare, so, the reality is 2,250 units has

been taken out. A lot of that is there in front of you, C110, C292, C21173, C2211, C2222, C2301, all the hectares, 1.25 hectares, 8.8 hectares, 5.42 hectares, and the individuals' names are put forward. These are people who were looking for lands to be zoned for Ashford. I think that we reserved what we are doing. This is zoned land, and no member has said until now that actually there's a current application in front of it like the county council on these lands for 97, I think, houses. And again on further information request, it was actually the land that's been under utilised in regards to the density. The feedback from this is almost 50% of the lands here will be going back to the community gain. People have a heritage centre but not a community centre. They have nowhere to play bingo, we have an athletics club in Ashford that has nowhere to carry on sporting activities; the sporting clubs would benefit from this. ... is a very important place to the trees, the wildlife. All that has been safeguarded. By having these meetings between the six councillors, I fully endorse this, and commend the activity that has happened today with the planners of Wicklow County Council in preserving the future of Ashford, and I think the six councillors should be commended for what they're putting in front of the chamber today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks. Cllr Neary.

>> Seeking clarification if this proposal will affect the river and gardens. I know there are concerns about providing a buffer along the river, but it's just unclear to me on the map if that proposal will impact on that and Mount Usher Gardens, so some that is right clarity on that will be appreciated.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I can clarify that myself. We will be dealing with that very shortly in terms of a different zoning request in the centre of Ashford which is what you're talking about in terms of Mount Usher, and we will be coming back to that later but this doesn't have any impact on Mount Usher.

PAUL O'BRIEN: I can concur with that because I wouldn't have looked at it otherwise. I want to concur with everything my fellow councillors have said. This is my first County Development Plan and I want to thank you for all your assistance. It might come across here today that I'm all for housing with no regard for anything else, but that couldn't be further from the truth. Community gain has to be part of the process as well. But yes I'm all for houses, and yes I want housing in the right area but

not at any cost, and that's why I support this application. Simply because ... thank you.

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I wanted a bit of clarification maybe from Sorcha, just in terms of I know here in Greystones when we have large planning applications and there's been an attempt to have community gain piece in them, that they've never quite delivered what we needed or expected as community, and while I support the intent of what is put in here in the green text and I see where the councillors in the area are coming from, and I recognise that, and support that, I'm just wondering in reality when there is a live planning application there on those lands, in reality, is the want for the community sports area and the community gain, is that achievable, I suppose, that's what I'm trying to get at, and while I support it all written down, how achievable is it when there is live planning application on the lands. I just appreciate your comments on that. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Mitchell?

CLLR MITCHELL: I was concerned about how this would affect Mount Usher Gardens. I received a letter. Somebody was concerned. It seems to be a major thing. I don't know where this is compared to Mount Usher.

CATHAOIRLEACH: This does not impact on Mount Usher in my view.

CLLR MITCHELL: I'm not in favour of something that would. I accept that though.

SORCHA: The current application wouldn't be bound by any new provisions that are included in the plan, but the current applications is only for part of the lands, so effectively if these new provisions were adopted in the final plan, there would be no final further residential permission possible without the delivery of the public goods. You're right to identify that the current application wouldn't be bound by this but further development would be. Just in relationship with Mount Usher, if you look at the map there in front of you, you can see the word "Mount Usher", and that is in white is a road, just above that word, and, if you follow that road along, it brings you back to the old Garda station. It is separated from Mount Usher by a road.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we all in agreement, amendment 45 proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by myself?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 46 in the name of proposed by Annesley.

>> This is a piece of land now down to be dezoned. This man has family, and they have expressed an interest in coming back, and coming to build a house on the land, so I would be proposing this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

CLLR FITZGERALD: I fully support the proposal, and family members have expressed their wish to come back to ... so in that case, I fully support it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 47, proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke, seconded by Cllr Pat Kennedy.

CLLR BOURKE: Cathaoirleach, yes. This is also similar to the manager has I think this as well to come up as well. There is on the manager's report. Yes, I'm proposing that we would - we voted on these in the draft plan stage. They were accepted into the plan. They were previously zoned residential use, and I believe we should be consistent. We've made a democratic decision on this already, and that we should retain them, and I don't see why they have to be singled out again and taken out. I do know that the officers of the public regulator keeps saying no to everything, but I think this should be put back in. It was decided by members previously.

CLLR KENNEDY: I'm seconding this, Cathaoirleach. I fully support it. I think I want to thank my Arklow members for supporting this as well. The same as previous ones.

CLLR BOURKE: Sorcha reminded us yesterday in Arklow when we're doing a local area plan next year, I can answer to the point that I made about not having enough balance in zoning around the town that it is important that it is not all concentrated in one or two specific sites, and I believe the same principle should apply here that we should be offering a variety of sites for local people because it's very hard [inaudible]. Land owners own everything, so the more diversity we can offer, the better.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Councillor amendment 47 proposed by Sylvester Bourke second by Pat Kennedy. All in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Amendment 48: proposed by Cllr Vincent Blake. Do you have a seconder for this? Cllr Mullen. Okay.

CLLR BLAKE: The panel has concerns about it, look at in terms of where the fact that it is - I propose in terms of the fact that it is close to existing residential area, and in terms of the fact that they're proposing a lot of whether a was based for it, but I think that can be addressed in a planning application anyway. Thanks, Chair.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Mitchell?

CLLR MITCHELL: Thank you, yes. There have been quite a number of zonings for a small number of houses in a number of areas which are just next to towns immediately. There are six proposals here for Carnew. I have a concern about the totality of voting for six. It seems to be a significant increase in population of Carnew. Just having six, would the increase in population be significant?

CLLR MULLEN: I understand what what Cllr Mullen is saying. In the context of Wicklow, I mean there is a world of different - different planets - between North Wicklow and as far south-west as Carnew. We have rural depopulation, or people being asked to move into towns or villages, and moving into towns or villages where there is no housing growth allowed because all the boundaries have been squeezed because of the daft decisions of the office of the planning regulator. Cllr Blake, many of these decisions we did a couple of months ago we are having to revisit now. The town of Carnew appropriate social and water infrastructure. It's a town that requires housing growth in order to develop the town, keep the town viable. There's not one community group in Carnew has opposed any housing development. When we did the consultation as you know, we had to endure public consultation during the Covid lockdown. I was having meetings while cleaning up the streets in Carnew, explaining how Level 5 plans were affecting their town. It's device evident from the people I was talking to in Carnew that the whole community ... [inaudible] we're not giving out planning permissions today, we are allowing the development of lands to be considered with all the due respect that goes with the planning permission. So I think there is a world of difference between what is happening in the north of the county and the pressures that are under with nearly the most extremely southwestern town right on the Wexford border.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Yes, thanks, Cathaoirleach. I have a couple of concerns about this amendment. First of all, I'm not clear how much of that blue hatched piece is supposed to be for open space or residential purposes. My second concern is the location in flood zones A and B, and noting the Chief Executive's response that there is sufficient zoning provision for Carnew. I presume the rest of the zoning permission for Carnew is outside of the flood zone area. I want a comment from the Chief Executive or Sorcha in relation to the flood zones. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorcha, can I bring you in on this one?

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. There is a technical issue with this proposal because the proposal to zone 1.2 hectares of land as part residential, part open space, there we have no such zoning that is part 1 or part the other. It's either residential or open space, so it is unclear what it is that the proposed amendment you want us to prepare and publish for the public to see, because it is either one or the other. They're completely different zone types with different objectives. So it hasn't been specified how much land zone is residential and how much open space and where on the site is each. So we would not know what drawing to prepare to publish for the public to see and comment on, so I think there is a technical issue with this that it does require clarification before it can be passed. Bernie is showing you there the flood map, so you can see the area that she is hovering over with her cursor there, it is the area that is at risk of flooding, so that is the northern part of that land. The curved line you see is a water course. That land would not be possible to zone for residential or for any other use. That's a vulnerable use. So, Cathaoirleach, with respect to the members who put this forward, I think there's a technical issue with it they need to refine this and tell it exactly which piece of land is proposed for zoning or which use, otherwise we don't know which map to prepare or publish for you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake, can I bring you back in?

CLLR BLAKE: Put it to a vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: What are we voting on? I mean, we don't have a map for it to be clear on this.

CLLR BLAKE: It can be addressed in a planning application. If it comes in a planning application. I just ask you to vote.

SORCHA: You haven't given us clear instructions you want us to publish when we do the proposed amendments. We have to prepare a map for you that the public get to see and comment on, and you haven't indicated what land you're proposing for residential and what land you're proposing for open space.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can I suggest that Cllr Blake and Cllr Mullen have a look at a map and maybe converse with Bernie if possible and we take it at the end? Is that agreed? Yes. Obviously 49 is the same amendment. Moving on to amendment number 50 in the name of Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen. Cllr Blake, I let you on again.

CLLR MULLEN: These lands were zoned in Carnew. So zone land, it is almost town centre, so it is. I'm proposing they be reinstated for residential use. Thank you, Chairman.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All right. Are we agreed on amendment number 50 proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen? Agreed?

>> No.

CLLR SCOTT: No.

>> Dissent.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Connor. Did you want to come in on that?

>> I wanted to say there is a dissenter on this end. I wanted to put it to a vote.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott, I'm going for for a vote.

CLLR SCOTT: No, I was looking for a vote. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Going for a vote. So it is amendment number 50 in the name - proposed by Cllr Vincent Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen.

HELEN PURCELL: [Votes taken].

24 for, five against, and three not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Amendment 51 is dealt with. The same amendment as we've just voted on. Amendment number 52 in the name of Cllr Vincent Blake, seconded by Mullen.

CLLR BLAKE: The land owner here has put in a huge amount of finance into servicing the land there over the last number of years. Granted planning permission for 59 houses back in 2006, so the planning has lapsed in the meantime. Obviously, due to a lot of planning

applications over the years, finance wasn't there to be able to develop these particular sites, but look - times have hopefully changed, we are in dire need of housing as well, and as Cllr Mullen said Carnew and other towns are completely different to North Wicklow and this is an area of land adjacent to the town centre and with previous planning permission on it, and service, I propose that it is zoned as residential.

CLLR MULLEN: Yes, I won't be long. Again, it's an example of how daft this policy is of taking out a service site in a town centre in a housing crisis when rural Ireland is being depopulated. That sums up we're living into two local authorities here.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we agreed on amendment 52, seconded by Cllr Mullen? Agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry. ... are you okay Cllr O'Neill? Okay, moving on. Amendment number 53 in the name of Cllr Mullen, seconded by Cllr Vincent Blake. Cllr Mullen, when you're ready.

CLLR MULLEN: Again just on this one, actually, I'm conscious of the DSLO aspect of this, so I am willing to put it into DSLO if that would be okay with Sorcha? Let's be honest?

CATHAOIRLEACH: You're asking her very nicely!

CLLR MULLEN: Very nicely.

SORCHA: The Chief Executive isn't supportive of supporting that land for residential development. If the members are minded to do, we would suggest that they hock it into an SLO where you get community gain out of it, but we're not supportive of it in principle. It's not up to me, Cllr Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: I'm conscious of the need on ... and I think if we could reformulate as an SLO and defer it to the end.

CATHAOIRLEACH: The SLO is already on it on page 109.

CLLR MULLEN: Okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So it is all part of the same amendment, including the SLO, if Sorcha might confirm that?

SORCHA: If Cllr Mullen is prepared to modify his proposal so it is the SLO proposal which is lifted from the current development plan, so retaining what you have

already, rather than just zoning it residential and community being more specific about how much residential and how much community, and how they work together.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Blake?

CLLR BLAKE: As Cllr Mullen said there, a lot of what we're trying to do here is in relation to the fact of the issues we have with the schools there, and parking, extension to the schools as well. And we are trying to address that issue with this planning application, and as Cllr Mullen said there, if we run with the SLO on it, as Sorcha said there, kind of already, we will go with that, John?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Amendment 53 proposed by Mullen, seconded by Blake? In agreement?

CLLR SCOTT: I had the question about the SLO. I see the part of that is that community lands have developed as a car park with drop-off points for the primary school. All the kind of proposed rezonings going on for Carnew, how easy is it for people to walk or cycle to school? How essential is that car park, or are we adding to the need for car access to school?

SORCHA: Schools and towns like Carnew have a wide rural catchment, there has to be provision for people coming in from the countryside because not everyone can walk to school.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Do you want this to go to a vote or happy to accept?

CLLR SCOTT: I can accept the SLO, I can accept it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All in agreement? Great. Thank you. Amendment 54, proposed by Cllr Mullen, seconded by Cllr Blake.

CLLR MULLEN: Yes, again, this was just in response to a community organisation who sent in that proposal, it just explains the difference between Carnew and other areas of the county that they wanted to retain their zoned lands in previous plans. I think we've gone through most of them now.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Have you happy to withdraw?

CLLR MULLEN: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment 55 in the name of Cllr Edward Timmins, seconded by Cllr Glennon.

CLLR TIMMINS: This relates to Dunlavin. This zoning is in the existing plan, the existing development plan. All the yellow zoning around Dunlavin was removed. A small piece was put back in last May by Cllr Cronin, and I'm putting in to put in another piece, nine acres [inaudible]. It is - its water has been currently upgraded, so it is a town with services, very good services, and also, this land is quite close to the town centre. So given - if this goes through the outcome to Dunlavin will still be zoned a lot less than it is in the current plan, and it just is an opportunity to build some private housing in Dunlavin which hasn't been done in about 25 years. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Cronin?

AVRIL CRONIN: I just want to support this amendment by my colleague, Cllr Timmins. As Cllr Timmins said, this will give an opportunity for private development in Dunlavin. The land in question is actually right behind the local clinic, the fire station, so it is very much in the centre of the town. At the moment, people in my age group and my category don't have many opportunities to buy houses in Dunlavin. We're lucky to have a number of social houses and council houses, but unfortunately if you're looking to buy houses, people are moving out of the town, and not even moving out of the town, they're moving out of the county, into Kildare, because that's the only option at the moment. People in my age group and my criteria are able to do because we don't have any private development, so, look, I think this would be much needed in the town to allow for private development in the future. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, Cllr Glennon?

>> I seconded that motion there with Cllr Timmins, and that here Cllr Cronin and Cllr Timmins speaking the favour of it. It was a piece of land which should never have been taken out, in my view. It's serviced, it's close to the centre of the town, and it is ideal, as Cllr Cronin said, for people to get much-needed housing for people who fall into the middle category who are squeezed everywhere they go. I would be urging my colleagues to support this motion and reinstate that. We did speak to Sorcha about this at length previously, and was somewhat in agreement, I won't put it further than that, but I'm sure she will have a view to express it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You have a lovely way with words, Cllr Glennon. Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. I wanted clarification there. I see the logic behind the councillors wanting to rezone this. I'm wondering could somebody from the executive comment what effect would have this on the proposed growth targets? I'm not sure how many houses can fit on nine acres, and will that exceed the growth targets for Dunlavin? It does seem like a relatively service site close to the town centre. I'm worrying about the significance of approving this amendment. Thank you.

SORCHA: Just to respond to Cllr Glennon, the executive is opposed to this amendment. I don't know where you got the idea that I was in favour of it. I may have said I understood where you're coming from, but with regard to the figures, the figures are all gone, like I will be straight up with you. None of the zoning plans match the core strategy any more, as of yesterday and today. How that's going to be dealt with will be in the hands of the OPR. You will have a development plan riddled with inconsistencies, because nothing will be matching. I can't tell you where that is going.

>> Sorcha, I don't know, plans memory is failing you but you talked about it at length at Blessington and were amenable to it being reintroduced for low-density housing, just to refresh your memory on that, thank you!

>> I will accept it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 56 in the name of Cllr Blake. Can I have a seconder, please. Cllr Mullen. Tinahely.

CLLR BLAKE: Only proposed on an SLB, it's dezoning land that was on reason - zoned residential to be re-instated as SLB, that's what we're doing with regards to it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. 57 is the same. OK. 58. Proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen.

>> This is the same, it's an SLB as well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed. 59 is the last one on this section. Proposed by Cllr John Mullen, seconded by Cllr Vincent Blake. Cllr Mullen?

CLLR MULLEN: Yeah, again, this is for four houses only. The town boundaries in level five towns, like I said, have been shrunk which shrinks the potential for growth and outside of the north Wicklow situation, our level five towns in the south and west do not have a potential for growth -- need a potential for growth. It's a reasonable objective. I think it needs to be supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are we all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. OK we're going back to the draft plan (inaudible) number 77. Page 48 of the draft plan, flood risk assessment, there's an extra paragraph put in there. Can I have a proposer and seconder, please? Page 48 of your draft development plan. it's amendment number 77. Proposer? Proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. OK. Agreed, all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Number 78. We've really done that through our vote on the last one. Do I need a proposer and second or?

>> I think it's dealt with.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, grand. Number 79, proposed amendment town centre and retail, there's an extra paragraph. If you just want to read it.

>> It's 78 on the screen?

>> Sorry, this is what people are confusing, would I be correct in saying that this is the one that would affect Mount Usher?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yes.

>> Sorry, yeah if you can put it on the screen. What's on the screen at the moment was 78. Oh, yeah, sorry chairman, can I speak on that?

CATHAOIRLEACH: You can. Cllr O'Brien first.

CLLR O'BRIEN: Sorry Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'll manage who speaks by the way. Cllr O'Brien first.

CLLR O'BRIEN: Cathaoirleach, as I stated earlier on, I'm for housing but not at all costs. Mount Usher was saved by a private individual and described as a jewel in the crown in Ashford with 70,000 visitors a year. To put that at risk for the sake of some town houses, it's an abomination to be quite honest with you, I will not support any risk to Mount Usher gardens whatsoever. Thank you very much.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Winters?

CLLR WINTERS: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Most of the time when the county development plan comes up, all I get are phone calls and letters from people who want zoning and it's really only in the case of the case of this particular development here, and this proposal that I've had phone calls, letters and e-mails from people saying please do not do this. My understanding from members of the community is that actual land is prone to flooding. And has flooded in the last 30 years on several occasions, but also, the density proposed would be completely not in keeping with what is currently there other than what's at the centre, the other high rise in the town has been an absolute eyesore. The impact on Mount Usher gardens could be like, we don't really know how bad think would impact there. Certainly, the owners are very concerned. It is one of our main tourist attractions within the east district. So no, I would be completely opposed to this and would ask the other members from the other areas to oppose it on those grounds as well. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kavanagh.

>> I would like to propose that we reject this, that we keep those two paddocks zoned, active open space, which is what they have been all along. As other people have mentioned, it's between 50,000 and 70,000 visitors a year to Mount Usher. It was flooded as recently as 1987 in hurricane Charlie. The damage that was done took two years to repair in that time the gardens weren't open to the public. They couldn't be because the whole area was absolutely destroyed and washed away. By putting more concrete into an area that's already prone to flooding you may get even more of a flood plain. So, it's also quite a rare thing, it's a Robinsonian garden. So, it was designed not in a formal way, but in a - allowed to grow freely. That's why it's such an attractive place. It's not a formal garden. It's an absolutely beautiful garden with rare plants. It's so important that we can't risk it. I want to propose that we reject this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, Cllr Dunne?

>> Thank you, like all the other members, I've serious concerns over this as well. There's 60,000 advise interpreters there a year. It's a major attraction for tourism within the county N fairness, we've been asking people to think of proper planning and the way to do it and I know just people, you know, but I'm against this one. I don't think it's the way we should be dog things. I'd hate to think what's going to go in there. I feel this is - I know it sounds - I understand it sounds - it's the way things are done that matters to me. Probably to have high rise apartments in there, in the middle of Ashford, I'm not sure about that. I'm against this proposal, thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Neary.

CLLR NEARY: Thank you, I agree with previous speakers as well, particularly with regards to our climate action obligations, which the Council have been very forceful on. I'm wondering if this is the executive or Sorcha could explain why this amendment is being introduced considering the Climate action obligations and what they have done to consider the impact this would have on Mount Usher gardens. I for one won't be supporting this amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Basically, in agreement with the previous speakers. I won't take up any more time, but just I wouldn't be supportive of this amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Irrespective of what's being proposed to come in there, you know, unless you're putting it on stilts, it doesn't make any sense whatsoever. It's ludicrous. You know, that this is being presented to us and it needs to be rejected and I will be seconding Cllr Cavanaugh's proposal. It isn't potentially going to flood, it has flooded. The people in the area have documentary evidence of that, low lying ground there. I thought that, you know, flood risk assessment would be carried out on all of these lands. The reality is that the river has to be protected. I don't know how many applications that's came in front of us that we've rejected because of the impact it would have on the river. It's very, very important to the people of the community of Ashford and further afield. It comes down to the lands out to the lakes and on out into the sea. Unfortunately, this is just bad planning. The baffling thing about it, it's not being brought to the chambers here by people who don't understand planning, i.e. us, the councillors. It's being brought here by the chief executive and the planning team. They're recommending this. It should be rejected and rejected out of order straight away. I will not support this under any heading. There's a buffer zone there for the river. It's there for a reason. It's protecting the people and the houses and this just can't be supported.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Just briefly to talk on a general point that's probably relevant here. In the last number of years, the last couple of decades, there has been a tendency from the executive to support apartment block type buildings in small towns, level four and level five towns. Squash everyone into the town centre. Like a lot of our level four and five towns are small, rural towns, with lots of space, lots of green space, low rise. There is a tendency, I've seen it in my own town, where urban blocks have been put in and have been very, very unsuitable. On that basis, I don't think this is good planning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. I know there's a number of people who wanted to propose this. I'm going to go back to the original two speakers, which was Cllr O'Brien and Cllr Winters, who both indicated that they wanted to propose and second it. I don't think there's a need to go to a vote. Sorry Cllr Fortune?

>> Just curious, Cllr Snell commented that this came from the executive. I'd like to understand.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Let's bring in Sorcha first.

SORCHA: Thank you. First of all, we would have to make it clear that the flood risk assessment was carried out and we had expert consultants assisting us with the flood risk assessment who, as I mentioned yesterday, are in the top consultants in the country, who wrote the flood risk guidelines. The lands that the chief executive suggested could be zoned are not in a flood risk zone coring to the OPW map in particular. When they prepared the maps carried out extensive public consultation, carried out site visits, sit walks, gathered all data from local people, from flood events and so on. They don't indicate these two particular fields, well, they're small fields, I suppose, parcels, as being at risk of flooding. I'd remind the members, particularly those of you who have been longer on the Council, this land was previously zoned. It was zoned residential. This isn't something new that's being suggested out of the blue. It was zoned for residential use, I was just opening up the 2008 development plan and other development plans, it was zoned residential. In the draft plan it was shown as zoned open space simply a belts and braces zoning. It was along the river, though it wasn't at risk of flooding, but no other environmental designations on it. In light of submission that's have come in and general submissions that have come in from bodies like the OPR and others, not picking at the OPR saying we should look carefully at our towns and make sure we maximise the amount of land we indicate for development in our towns to limit sprawl. Because that essentially a key element of meeting our climate change goals, which were mentioned by Cllr Neary, rather than densifying and building up in the towns, the other option is sprawl, which is worse for the environment than intensifying in the town centres. There's no suggestion from the proposed zoning of apartments, I don't know where that idea came from, but the idea is to zone the town centre and any application that would come in, would have to fit with its surroundings and included in the chief executive's recommendation specifically says the area to the rear of the existing dwellings, the area marked in the red circle on your chief executive's report, which should be reserved for residential or residential compatible uses and not be permitted for commercial purposes. It would be uses that would be compatible with that area. Mount Usher gardens is on the far side from this site. There's a 25-metre buffer either zone of the river set out in this proposed zoning

change. That's quite a considerable gap that could be on these lands and the river. It's in the members' hands. I just felt it was important that I point out to you that this isn't flying in the face, as someone might have mentioned, with previous advice and previous decisions. The land has no environmental designations, is not at risk of flooding and is in the town centre. These are the type of lands we'd normally and across the board in town accessible we recommend you zone for development.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thanks, well explained.

>> Just to add to what Sorcha had to say, in terms of the principles of compact growth. And I know from representations from collected members in relation to planning application and that young people don't have access to the towns and therefore that's where they're forced to go outside and look for rural housing. This was in an attempt to try to address that, to allow, in terms of compact growth that the settlement areas would provide for residential development. Plain and simple as that. As Sorcha said, it's already been subject to flood risk assessment. So that's the only reason behind it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. So, we have a proposed by Cllr O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Winters to reject the amendment in front of you. Are we all in agreement?

>> Agreed.

(Cheering)

Amendment number 80, just get Sorcha to give an explanation. This is in Ashford again, isn't it?

SORCHA: Yes. This is somewhat related to the discussion we had about Baltinglass and action areas. This is a recommendation made by the chief executive to disentangle some of these land blocks from each other that are currently in action area one. There's a number of land owners there and by splitting it apart into an SLO area and changing the objectives it might make it easier for it to be developed. So, the recommendation is - and there's also one area of land that we recommend be omitted, a piece of employment land on the west side of the land. That's because it's a different land owner again. So, the suggestion is to reduce the amount of land zoned employment and to make the SLO area a smaller area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we in agreement with that? Could I have a proposer, Cllr O'Brien, seconded by?

>> Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're in agreement? All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. Onto 81. We're proposing a zoning outlined from an SL 02 to an SLB, if that's correct?

>> Did we not just do this in an earlier one?

CATHAOIRLEACH: No, this is separate.

>> This is separate? The previous one we discussed is the land just in the dark green, immediately below this (inaudible)? So, the SLO, the lands are zoned in the draft plan for residential use with a special local objective. Unfortunately, the request that there's a surplus of zoned land in ash today, the chief executive is recommending that the land is strategic land banked rather than being zoned residential.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK a proposer and seconder, if anybody has any issues? No issues? Proposer? Cllr O'Brien. Cllr, did you want to come in on this?

>> Just on a point of clarification, this strategic land bank, does it affect the Cllr Dunne proposed in regards to the lands that 50% is to go to community gain. Just need to get the amendment here, Cathaoirleach. The land in Ashford is beyond that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, the two green sections below it?

>> To be clear for the rest of the collected members, amendment 44, that was passed and agreed, I'm just fearful and looking for a clarification that, will this strategic land bank application affect this? Could you advise in with regards to the access of that land, the traffic movement, is that dependent on coming through this land?

>> Sorcha, can I bring you in on this?

SORCHA: Thank you. Unless there was alternative access to Cllr Dunn's proposal from a few minutes ago, by changing this from residential to strategic land bank if that was the only way to access the site, yes, there may be an issue. Unless there is local access.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dunne, I don't want to put you on the spot, but do you know if there is other access?

>> Can we justify this to the end of the meeting and just go through this?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can we do that? Yeah, all right. 81, 82 is Aughrim, we've dealt with this, haven't we? Yeah, 82 is done. 83 is Tinahely architectural conservation area. It's a change from pound lane to Barton Street. Could I have a proposer? Cllr Mullen. And Cllr Blake. We all agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, do you mind if we take a ten-minute break? Is that OK?

>> No, I'd be delighted.

(Laughter)

[Break]

HELEN PURCELL: [Roll-call].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving on to Level 6 plans of - the elected proposed amendments so we're on to amendment number 60, on page 123, and it's proposed by Cllr Sylvester Bourke. Seconded by Tommy Anslie.

CLLR BOURKE: This proposal that has come before us now, I would like to withdraw it, regretfully, because I believe there is not enough support from the members discussing with it members. I believe it should be withdrawn. The man who was proposing it had been proposing a park for - so on some of the site, two houses on the rest of it, but I believe now he will probably just apply under rural housing guidelines. I withdraw that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Withdrawn. Okay. Moving on to amendment number 61, proposed for Cllr Sylvester Bourke seconded by Tommy Anslie.

CLLR BOURKE: In view of the previous withdrawal and the fact that the Chief Executive has highlighted that there is a serious traffic hazard ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 62, proposed by myself. Seconded by Cllr Snell. This is basically for two family dwellings on an area that is in the draft plan for tourism but again for two family dwellings on that basis, on 1.5 acres. So, look, there's more to say on it. It is fairly straightforward. Cllr Snell, do you want to come in on that?

CLLR SNELL: Briefly to support this amendment whole-heartedly. It's only two units on a small parcel of land for local needs.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are we all agreed? Agreed. Thank you.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendment number 63, proposed by myself, seconded by Cllr Snell, again. This is effectively a piece of land that has a live planning application. It has been zoned residential and continues to be zoned residential, but there is a live planning application for went to 26 dwellings on further information. The further information is due into the council in the next week or two. On that basis, I want to look for the support of the members to retain the current zoning on this land.

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, unfortunately for years, Roundwood was stagnated. Now we're in a position where some units can be built locally. As you've outlined, there is already a current application on this, and the reality is that it will probably have all been done and dusted by the time this plan is eventually finished. So I support this, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are we all in agreement?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you very much. And the final one for Roundwood is amendment number 64, again proposed by myself, and seconded by Cllr Snell. This is a piece of land again that has been zoned residential, and I'm looking for the land to be considered for retaining the zoning as is. It is former ly lands that was a golf course. It is right as you can see in the village centre, and I would ask for the support of the members again on this.

>> Just to say this should be supported and it is bringing back a bit of life and vitality in the village around of Roundwood.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed? Thank you. Amendment number 65 proposed by Cllr Vincent Blake. Could I have a seconder.

>> This particular area of land in Shillelagh has been zoned for a number of years. It's opposite a private housing estate, adjacent, another private housing estate. Back in the blue area in the corner of it is the council housing estate, and the council presently are proposing to build another 20 houses, just off the map as we look behind their existing council houses. Well, they're in negotiation with their land owner, that is marked in the shaded area, presently for a new storage line to connect down into the bottom right-hand corner in Shillelagh. They're telling the land owner, they want the - they want the proposal to reinstate, when you agreed to the pipeline through your land, it will also salvage your land for future development as well. So it is a kind of killing two bird with the one stone, where the council will be facilitated with a storage line through farmland, and possibly a housing estate as well, rather than having to dig up a whole roadway as you can see by the roadway runs right down to the middle of the village in Shillelagh. A street that has only been reinstated, Tarmacadam in the last few years as well. We give out about councils putting down new Tarmacadam and digging it up later. This is one instance where we don't have to do that. This will be beneficial to the council, beneficial to land owners, and certainly give the opportunity to provide a number of badly needed private housing in Shillelagh as well somebody and hopefully maybe affordable houses on this particular estate, this particular zoned land as well, so reinstating the zoning of it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen. In agreement?

>> Yes in

CATHAOIRLEACH: Agreed, thank you. That concludes the elected members' amendments. I'm moving on to the Chief Executive's recommendations, so it is amendment number 84 on page 54 of your draft development plan. Again, it's an trying to plan of

Avoca specific development objectives. Can I have a proposer and a seconder, please. Cllr Dermot O'Brien? Proposed by Dermot O'Brien, seconded by Tommy Anslie.

>> We are lodging a planning application for the sewage treatment plant in a flood risk zone. The location is a flood zone, that's why we are building it, could be in flood zone A or B. Could that be clarified? I don't want to see it delayed as a result of [inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will have to get clarification from water services. Will I come back to this one? Yes. Okay. Moving on to 85. 85 is a Level 6 plan for - do you want to come in?

SORCHA: It is a very small change to the boundary of the plan, and the primary zone boundary to reflect planning permission actually granted for development in that area. So it is just a straightening up of one field boundary, literally. Very small amount of land, because planning permission already granted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by Cllr Fortune. All agreed? Thank you. 86, this is covered.

SORCHA: If I could just draw your attention to this one. This is related to one we just dealt with wherein you agreed to amend the zoning of this from just tourism to tourism plus two family homes. I just draw to your attention that the OPR are actually requested that this zone be omitted completely from the plan, and if you're going to reject the OPR's recommendation, we would need a little bit more on the reasons, because we haven't kind of fleshed out fully the reasons. We had your reasons for the two extra houses but not the reasons for maintaining the tourism zoning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will have to do those reasons up for you at a later stage.

SORCHA: You can put them on the record now and we will write it up for you, or if anyone else wants to put it on the record now about supporting the tourism zone in Roundwood.

CLLR SNELL: It is obvious that Roundwood needs an economic boost from anywhere else from a tourism point of view. It is on the Glendalough [inaudible]. A lot of our own discretionary spend into Roundwood to help people who are commuting. And that ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Trails which basically [inaudible]. [Sound cut].

>> I don't know if the chamber can hear us, but we've lost you guys.

>> Breaking up all the time.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Better get IT because I haven't done anything. Do I need a proposer and a seconder for this? Already dealt with it.

SORCHA: Just to be clear there might be no harm because last proposal was about changing to add on two family homes, so to be clear you're rejecting the Chief Executive's recommendation ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: So that is proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by myself. Okay. To reject the Chief Executive's ... okay.

>> [Inaudible].

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can any of the remote, members remote, can you hear us?

>> We can hear you.

>> I can hear well.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can you just indicate Cllr O'Brien?

>> [Inaudible].

>> I can't hear you now in

CATHAOIRLEACH: You can hear me now?

CLLR GLENNON: Even it he poor part of the county, we can hear you.

>> It was Cllr Snell who was breaking up if that is any help.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm after turning the volume up on this, so we should be okay. I will try it from here on. Let me know if you're struggling with the sound. Just to go back, did you get number 86, were you - you were? You got that, okay. That's fine. So that is all agreed on number 86? It is proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by myself. To reject the Chief Executive. Recommendations. All agreed? Great, okay. Moving on to number 87. Shillelagh. That is done. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Moving on to Level 7, plans for Laragh, Glendalough. There is a Chief Executive amendment here, number 88 on page 58 of your draft development plan, which basically incorporates extra text. Through transportation and infrastructure. Could I have a proposer and a seconder if you're happy with what is in front of you? Proposed by Cllr Fortune. Seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. Moving on to development and design standards, so we're on to Elected Members' Proposals, 66 in the name of Cllr Mary Kavanagh, second ed by Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR KAVANAGH: I just note the Chief Executive's wording that it is unenforceable, so on that basis, I do not mind withdrawing it if it is unenforceable.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Withdrawn, amendment number 67 is proposed by Cllr Scott. Do you have a seconder, Cllr Scott?

>> I'm happy to second.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott, do you want to speak on this?

CLLR SCOTT: It is self-explanatory what is there. It is just typing up a line or two on the waste and construction management, and particularly just the issue with site clearance. It has happened before on sites where it's been flagged by members of the community where trees with tree protection orders - we were talking about this at length yesterday - are still being - site clearance is starting take place before there is a plan in effect to manage, say, protected trees, or hedgerows, et cetera. And it is only from action of community groups actually going into sites and speaking with the foremen that they actually stop which isn't really satisfactory. So it is just to try and prevent that from happening to maintain and protect the natural heritage there as much as possible, and just the second line is specifying with construction manager that they should liaise if and when we do appoint a biodiversity officer within the council, that it is important that they liaise with that person, again just to prevent any damage to habitats, mature trees, hedgerows, et cetera.

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

SORCHA: With regards to the first sentence proposed, site clearance should not take place until the management plan is in place. Unfortunately that would not be enforceable because it's not possible for the council to enforce the conditions of a permission before the permission is actually initiated, so a developer could go in before they submitted their commencement notice and carry out site clearance, and there's nothing that can be done through the planning permission to prevent that. We don't allow the commencement of development until the construction management plan is in place. We wouldn't have the power to step in if a development hasn't actually commenced when site clearance is taking place, so it is just unenforceable. That's why we would have a difficulty with it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Cllr Scott, are you happy with that? It is basically unenforceable.

CLLR SCOTT: I'm happy to delete the site clearance line. I understand what Sorcha is saying there. I'm happy to delete that line, but just leaving in the specification of liaising with the biodiversity officer should we have one appointed, if that is okay.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Just while we are checking that, Cllr Fortune? Okay?

CLLR FORTUNE: I think it is a good amendment that is in there, and I fully support it. But what I hear Sorcha saying about the site clearance, I would have thought if somebody moves on to a site before they've applied for the planning, it should be a rationale, a rationale for the planning to be questioned in a particular way. I'm aware of somebody who has done

something like that recently, and we are told they had to stop, so, I'm a bit confused, the really, with the response.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead Sorcha.

SORCHA: Permission or planning permission is not needed from the local authority for someone who owns a piece of land to go out, to go and clear hedges and trees that aren't protected as long as they're in the right season. There's nothing we can do to stop sight clearance. If there's planning permission and pre-development conditions, they have to be agreed in advance of the development commencing, some of them relate to how they're going to clear the site and so on. We can certainly implement them. If it's prior to the moment of a commencement notice or if they don't have planning permission, there's no role for the local authority to step in other than if necessity are removing hedge rows out of season, removing protected trees that type of thing. That would be stepping into farmers - stopping farmers carrying out clearance works on agricultural fields. We don't have that power to step in until the planning permission is commenced.

>> Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott are you happy proceed without the line site clearance should not take place until construction management and plan are in place. Are we taking that out?

CLLR SCOTT: I'm happy to proceed without that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So, are we in agreement, sorry Cllr Jerry O'Neill.

CLLR NEILL: I would be inclined to agree. If land is owns residentially, surely, you know, it's wrong for a lot of mature trees to be taken out and then for the permission to go in. I see it here, you know, in west Wicklow, where the site is cleared of very mature trees and then, maybe a couple of months later, the application for planning goes in. Surely, there should be some clause there where the land is already zoned residential, I'm not talking like what Sorcha mentioned agricultural. If a land is zoned residential, it's obvious it's going to be residential. To see, I mean, housing estate is going to be built around mature trees without, you know, clearing the sites. Then you know, some months later going for planning.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Look, we're going to go, are we happy to support Cllr Scott's amendment number 67 proposed by Cllr Scott, seconded by Cllr O'Connor, site clearance should not take place ... that line to be taken out. Are we in agreement? Agreed? Thank you.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 68. Amendment number 68 in the name of Cllr Mary Kavanagh, seconded by Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Yeah, I'm happy enough for the chief executive's response. I wanted the word "environmental" in there, which he's put in. And the CEMP. All development to - sorry. Yeah, no, just happy enough with that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Are we in agreement ...

CLLR KAVANAGH: It says the chief executive has no issue with the insertion of the word environmental. So, I'd like that included any way.

(Cheering)

We have a problem with the second sentence. I'm going to bring in Sorcha.

SORCHA: The only issue we have with the second sentence is there's an obligation on everyone to comply with the waste management act and regulations any way. It doesn't need to be reinstated in the development plan.

>> We can take that out.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're taking out the second sentence, all development will be required to comply with the waste management acts and regulations. So, are we agreed on amendment number 68 proposed by Cllr Kavanagh and seconded by Cllr Leonard, agreed? Thank you. 68, back to the chief executive's recommendations, amendment number 89 on page 59 of your draft plan, 89. Again, it's just text. Sorcha, there's nothing, could I have a proposer and seconder for 89? Proposed by Cllr Kennedy and seconded by ... anyone online?

CLLR CORRIGAN: I second it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Are we all agreed? OK. Number 90. Again, it's just extra wording put in. Protecting nature and biodiversity. Could I have a proposer and second or please. Proposed by Cllr Walsh and seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? 91 noise pollution, extra text, could I have a proposer and seconder, please. Proposed by Cllr Dunne, seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? 82, light pollution. It's extra text, extra line basically. Could I have a proposer and seconder for 92?

CLLR WINTERS: I propose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Kennedy second. All agreed? Number 93. Waste construction management, again, extra text. Amendment 67 and 68.

>> Yes, this overlaps.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. So, we need to a proposer and seconder for this? Proposer and seconder for this please?

CLLR WINTERS: I'll propose it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Dermot O'Brien seconds it. Are we all agreed on that? Just before I continue, are we all OK on hearing us remotely?

>> Yeah.

>> Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Number 94. Amendment number 94 is basically gone from two to five units cycle parking standards. Could I have a proposer and seconder please? Proposed by Cllr Snell. Seconded by Cllr Kennedy. All agreed? 95, the in storage and residential developments, there's an extra paragraph. Could I have a proposer and seconder? Cllr Dunne. Seconded by Cllr Paul O'Brien. All agreed? One second before we continue, Cllr Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Just to get a clarification of what is, you know, the preferred option or what Sorcha's opinion is when bins have to be put out the front in a safe environment? The wording here is obviously, it's quite clear. But I just want to hear from the planners on how they would deal with an application where bins can't be put to the side or the back. And what is acceptable bin storage?

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. (inaudible) development and design standards, this would be implemented in the development management process. So, where a planning application comes in that includes terraced houses or other houses that can't access their bins with no side alleyways, the developer, the designer will have to propose a suitable area and you see them in numerous developments around the county already. Some of them are built into brick walls just inside the front doors. Some are stand-alone Tim per structures, where you can fit three wheelie bins in, and they're built by the developer generally so that there's a consistent design across the development. We've been doing it in some of our local authority developments over the years, depending on the design of houses, so there's a number of different solutions, it will be up to the designers in each scenario to see what would be best fit.

>> Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: A general comment. Like all these extra requirements that we're putting on people building houses, they're all fine and good and I don't disagree with any of them. But I just think we should be aware that all these moves are adding costs to building houses. There's already a massive amount of bureaucracy on anyone trying to build houses, and just to be aware that all these extra niceties and as I said, I don't disagree with them, but to be aware that they will add cost and ultimately to the buyer of these houses. At some stage I think something should be,

information should be given to us about what all these measures add to the costs of people buying a house.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Are we all agreed on 95? I had a proposer and seconder, didn't I? Cllr Dunne and Cllr O'Brien. All agreed? Number 96, literally aviation. (inaudible) it's a new paragraph.

SORCHA: This is a proposed new section that comes, the proposed new paragraph on submissions we received from the Department of Defense and actually a number of other county Councils where there are Department of Defense training areas or airfields have included something similar. We're unusual that we haven't had in our plan already. Essentially, it's just to ensure that any developments located within the zones shown on the map, which is about two pages on from this actual text, will have regard to the fact that there's a military base in the vicinity. There won't be that many of them given where the military base is. It's just to ensure that there's no adverse impacts on the military installations.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could I have a proposer please? Cllr Fortune followed by Cllr Mitchell. All agreed? 97. To do with density, taking out paragraph, again I think it's straightforward. Could I have a proposer and seconder? Anybody online want to propose this?

CLLR CORRIGAN: I propose it.

CLLR SCOTT: I can second it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed? Thank you. 98 open space, we're adding in a few extra words into this. Could I have a proposer and seconder? Anyone online, Cllr O'Connor has proposed. Cllr Winters seconded. Thank you all agreed? 99, employment density. Again, we're just changing a couple of lines on this to make best use of zone service land ensuring the highest quality of development residential amenities. OK a proposer and seconder?

CLLR CORRIGAN: I propose it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Seconded by? Cllr Fitzgerald. All agreed? And amendment number 100, community gardens, there's an extra paragraph been put in at the end, just if you want to read it. Proposer and seconder please. Cllr Mullen and seconded by Cllr Kennedy. All agreed? Great, thank you. OK. We're going on to appendix three housing strategy. The chief executive's recommendations, so we're going to page 875 of your draft plan.

OK so, yeah, just bring Sorcha in first to explain this.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. The housing strategy as you know is a strategy that sets out the justification principally for seeking 10% or 20% part five housing from developers. It's a data exercise that looks at the demand for housing, house prices, affordability and so on in order to justify

seeking that 10% or 20%. On foot of all the changes that the chief executive has proposed and you have in the main accepted earlier on, chapter three, a number of knock-on changes are needed to the housing strategy. The first half of the strategy sets out the core strategy and the housing growth targets. That forms the basis of what remains. A lot of these are changes as consequence to the core strategy changes already made. Any changes that the chief executive made to the core strategy that you didn't approve yesterday they need to be carried forward into this as well. So that will be considered a change consequent. But I felt it was important that the members went through the elements of this document to ensure that there wasn't anything in addition to that, that they had any concerns with. You can see from the document, the table of contents, I've tried to break, again, it is like chapter three, there's numerous changes required to the housing strategy. One change has multiple knock-on changes. I've tried to break it into key elements. Can you see from the list, the first, maybe, three clarifications of styles, updated to reflect increase to part five? New housing and population targets and new settlements strategy. That's HS A-C. Those are elements that we dealt with yesterday. The remaining elements, D-I are things we haven't discussed yet. They're related to the data that we've used on income, income projections, data on affordability, on house prices. That's all been updated to the latest data in so far as we could. So, it's quite a technical exercise. So, I'm happy take questions on it or ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Members, how do you want to proceed? HS A, B and C that we have pretty much already covered. I know it's a lot to have, to go through all of this document in a few minutes. We need to keep moving forward. How do you want to proceed? Are you happy to accept voting on HS A, B and C as is in front of you? Going to bring in Cllr Fortune. (inaudible).

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, go ahead.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks. There's an awful lot in this. I think we need to understand it rather than, you know, I'm looking at this now, I'd have to be honest I don't totally understand what's before me. I just have a question, Sorcha, I think when she was doing the overview, she mentioned house prices and it seemed to be connected back to the part five and maybe I picked it up wrong, I thought, my interpretation was that acquiring the part five was subject to the price of the house. If that's the case, then my question is, does that mean then, certain areas because houses are at a certain price, get excluded from this process, therefore the part fives all have to be more focussed in a reduced area or region, simply because of the price of houses? If that's the case I have problems with that.

SORCHA: No, that's not what this is about. When I mentioned house prices, they are factored into the data analysis.

That's used to justify seeking 10% or 20% in certain cases of part five housing from land owners. So, the exercise goes as follows that you project the number of new houses that are needed in the county and that comes from the core strategy. Then we use national data and localised data to establish the likely disposable income of future residents of the county and the affordability in terms of how much they could spend on a mortgage. So how much mortgage they could afford. Then on the other hand, we look at house prices, as in how is the housing market going? And what are house prices looking at? You're looking at the mismatch between the current market price for houses and the disposable income likely to be available for residents of the county over the next six years. If there's a mismatch and there's more, there's - people can't afford the houses in the market, when we work out what percentage of people won't be able to afford even the cheapest house on the market in the county. If that percentage goes up to so% (inaudible) as long as it's higher than 10%, we can seek 10% part five housing off developers. If it's higher than 20%, we can seek 20% in certain circumstances. So that's where house prices come in. We compare house prices, but it's not about how much we purchase houses for when we are entitled to get part five houses.

>> If it's only 5%, does that mean ...

SORCHA: If the data showed in any given year during the lifetime of the development plan, say 2023, that only 5% of people in County Wicklow couldn't afford even the cheapest house on the market, we would only be eligible to seek 5% part five off developers. That's what this exercise is for to show that we were entitled to seek 10% or entitled to seek 20%, whichever the case may be. For every future year of the development plan, we're predicting that more than 20% of people will not be able to afford houses on the market. So, it will be more than 20% in all scenarios. We'll be entitled to take the full allowance of part five.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I just bring in ...

>> Just to explain to the members, it's related to what we were talking about yesterday. Basically, the housing strategy is let's say our belt and braces approach to the housing needs demand assessment. It's the back up for all the figures that would have developed the core strategy and the hierarchy of the settlement hierarchy. So basically, as I understand this, is that all the changes and all the recommendations or let's say the agreed ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Amendments.

>> That were put forward yesterday, effectively what is happening now we need to update the housing strategy to reflect that, OK? would that be a good explanation? Really, there is a lot of data here, basically what the team have organised is that they've tried to capture all those changes

within this document now, so that it reflects your proposed, your accepted amendments.

>> One question then chair, if I may. Does that mean then, to give me comfort to what I'm trying to query, does that mean that every housing estate that's built we get 20% of the housing, is that what we're saying?

SORCHA: At the moment, part five is 10%.

>> I understand that.

SORCHA: In certain circumstances 20% that. Was a change only before Christmas this year.

>> But it applies to every housing estate that's built?

SORCHA: That fulfils the criteria for part five.

>> That's where I'm confused.

SORCHA: It never did.

>> I know that. Where it's over the threshold that part five kicks in, it's every housing estate, is that right?

>> Basically, within Wicklow, part five applies with the legislation, there's no area - essentially the forward planning team has justified the application of part five for all development. Within County Wicklow.

>> OK.

CATHAOIRLEACH: If we vote for H S A, B and C and we've agreed a lot of amendments in the last two days, this will come back to us in, at the next stage for us to obviously clarify the figures that you would have worked on after the amendments are included?

SORCHA: The proposed amendments now are on the basis of the chief executive's proposed amendments that he had made earlier in the report, in chapter three, chapter four, chapter six. Any modifications that the members made yesterday to that or anything they didn't accept, we will now have to carry that forward into this amended housing strategy. So, the document that we publish for the public to view won't look exactly like this, because we'll have to integrate the changes that you made yesterday.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think that's clear. Cllr Walsh.

CLLR WALSH: Thanks for the explanation there. Just quickly, the HNSA assessment I understood that has to be done by each local authority. It should be done in due course, you say. Just when it is done, when is it likely to be done, we'd be looking at a variation of the plan, also we'll have new census data as well to be incorporated into, you know, into it, into data that's existing. And the point that Cllr Fortune was making there in relation to the new part five arrangements with the additional 10%, a recent presentation there from the

housing, the department there indicated that it will be 2026 before those new arrangements actually kick in. So, is that consistent with your planning?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Dermot O'Brien.

CLLR O'BRIEN: Similar to Cllr Walsh, in terms of the broad importance of data within the document, is there scope for that to be updated as the process unfolds, in terms of decisions from yesterday and today and the next time we see it, will it include up to date data?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: In relation to the affordability thing that Sorcha spoke about there, that results in the 20% claim, are all the figures, all the data just county-wide. Is there any regionisation in Wicklow, given the massive house price differences in the different parts of the county?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will get clarity from Sorcha now.

SORCHA: Just to be clear, the housing strategy in the HNDA aren't that different. I think it's really a housing strategy by a different name. A more impressive name. The HNDA won't do much more than the housing strategy already done. When a HNDA is done, the only items that might potentially, and I can't confirm this, but potentially change would be two, the first is when the Council is developing affordable or social housing schemes, the type of housing that they develop as in one bed, two bed apartments. They will have more data on the needs. It will drill down deeper into the actual needs. But that said, our housing section does a lot of work on that, and already gathers lots and lots of data on that. And you know, the data from the actual housing list itself is obviously a gold mine for that type of information. So, they know who is looking for houses and what their familial make up is. The only aspect that it might affect is in private developments when we seek a mix of house types, which we already do, it might give us more guidance and actually more support when we're asking developers to do more one beds or two beds. Because a lot of developers want to build three bed semis, even though there is a big demand for one and two beds. It will give extra data, extra back up for asking for that. Other than that, it's not fully clear to me what other significant changes the HNDA could give rise to for a development plan. Until we do it, then we won't know. Variations to the development plan is needed. But the HNDA won't vary the corps strategy. Those figures are set to us by the national planning framework and the minister. They can't throw up something different in terms of population targets and so on. It's really just about the people who live here and who are going to live here, what their actual housing needs are going to be. With regard to the 20%, I wouldn't be an expert on the change in the law with regard to the 10% and 20%, I understand there's lots of caveats on when one can seek

the 20% rather than 10%. And a lot of it is to do with when the land owner acquired the land. So, a lot of this type of legislation that affects property rights is often very cognisant of not being retrospective. So, if someone bought land when the regime was 10% was required, that they would assert them an allowance of time that 10% would continue to be the norm and the 20% won't kick in. David Porter in the housing section is a better person to answer those questions for you. With regard to up-to-date data, the housing strategy an extremely complex exercise. And even to do the updates took us four months. It would be extremely difficult to update it again. If there's more data, released, say next month or the month after, from the CSO on incomes and so on. So, we're hoping this is the last amendment that's made to the housing strategy. We acknowledge that the data is clear that the, say the income data is up to 2020. Because at the time we were writing this we wouldn't have had the 2021 data. To integrate 2021 data would be a rewriting of this. I don't think the stages of plan making and the timing that we're afforded at this stage would allow a whole rewrite with fully updated data. The bottom line is as long as the housing strategy gives us justification for getting part five housing, to the maximum that's justified, maximum allowable, that's the key purpose of this document.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That's grand. You've well explained it. I'm looking for proposer and seconder for HSA. Could I have a proposed Cllr Fortune? Sorry. One second. (Mobile phone rings).

>> We're trying to understand the concepts and the small print and the wherewithal around all this. Can a developer in all these circumstances, can they buy themselves out of their obligation to the local authority?

>> Just as Sorcha outlined there, the whole work that's gone into that has demonstrated and it plies to all applications within Wicklow.

>> Basically, as Sorcha outlined there, the whole work has gone into that has demonstrated that the part 5 applies to all applications.

>> That's what I'm trying really to get clear.

>> This document had to be done, as Sorcha said, a huge amount of it is the same time of data that would be required for an HNDA and all of that comes together to say ...

>> So the answer to my question is no, then?

HELEN PURCELL: If you wouldn't refresh me on what your question was?

>> Can the developer buy themselves out of their obligation in part 5?

HELEN PURCELL: This, they have to - they're obliged to comply with part 5.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, thank you. I'm going to move on. Could I have a proposer and a seconder for has, please?

CLLR WINTERS: Happy to.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Winters. All agree? Okay. HSB, new housing population and targets so on, housing supply target. Could I have a proposer and a seconder for that? Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy proposed. Seconded by Cllr Rory O'Connor. Say. HSE, new settlement strategy. That stated 10 in terms of the tiers, so that is dealt with. Do we need a proposer on that? No, okay. HSD update on income. A proposer and seconder, please. Proposed anyone online. Cllr Dermot O'Brien. Second ed by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy. All agreed? Agreed. Cllr Snell, did you want to come in? Sorry.

CLLR SNELL: HSD and B and C, and I genuinely don't see them here in front of me. I see HS1, 2, 3, 4.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Sorry, I have this ...

>> I have the letters ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: What is it different.

>> They're related to the numbers ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: It is appendix 3, housing strategy. Page 9 of the contents. Sorry.

>> It is related here. Then it had page numbers here.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So back to this one?

>> What page is it in the big book, Aoife?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay, sorry. Yes. Are we all clear it is on the table of contents in your small book, yes?

>> Thanks, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: No problem. We were agreed on HSD. We've agreed on that. HSE? Updated data on affordability? Again, could I have a proposer and a seconder? Posed by Cllr Fitzgerald. Seconded by ... anyone in line?

CLLR WINTERS: Cllr Winters.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. HSF. Sorry, all agreed on that? Yes.

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: HSF? Proposed. Cllr Paul O'Brien, executive Councillor Gerry Walsh. HSE, all agreed. Updated on the affordability analysis again, Cllr Paul O'Brien, seconded by Cllr Online. Who is there? Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Yes.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: HSH updated data on housing output and targets. I think Sorcha has covered that. Can I have a proposer. Cllr Fortune, seconded by Cllr Winters. Thank you. All agreed again. And the final one, his, it is enhanced data and objectives on traveller housing. I propose Cllr Paul O'Brien. Cllr Dermot O'Brien. All agreed? Thank you. Okay. So we are moving on to appendix 4.1 in your table of contents. It's the recording of protected structures. Chief Executive's recommendations, and it's in your draft plan on page 1,025. 1,025 on the draft plan. I will bring Sorcha in on this.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. As you recall, as part of the publication of the draft plan, it included a number of proposals for additional amendments and deletions of the record. At this stage, you're restricted to considering those proposals that have already been published and set out in the draft plan, and you may make amendments to the ones that are already proposed, but we can't add any further proposals for new additional structures or new deletions, or something new that wasn't already in the draft plan. We had a number of recommendations for additions and deletions from the protected structure. What we've set out here for you on the table of contents are only those we are recommending that you make any sort of modification to, and they're essentially to amend the description of a few of them, because when we published them, some people came back, quite a few conservation and architecture experts are interested in this type of thing, and even if they have no interest in the structure, and come back and say, you know, you didn't fully or accurately describe that protected structure. It will give you suggested improved texts, let's say. So, I don't know if you want to go through each one of them one by one. You can see some of the changes are fairly minor in terms of wording, so, if you take the first one, for example, the wording, you know, changing the word pillars to piers, and it is just to make them more accurate. I wouldn't say any of these are significant or material changes, but I mean, that's really up to the members, I suppose.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Can we take these all in one section? Members be happy with that? Cllr Snell? Individually.

CLLR SNELL: Yes. I think just to be safe now at for everybody, it is important that you take them one at a time. It's only eight proposals.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Page 1,025, protected structure, ADD, one six, viewings tower. A proposer and a seconder. Proposed by Cllr Snell and seconded by Cllr Fortune. 17 Three Arch Bridge, page 1,026, proposed by Cllr O'Connor, seconded by Cllr Dermot O'Brien. All agreed? Number three, AD D21 overview weir, page 1,027. Proposed by Dunne and seconded by Cllr Walsh. All

agreed. Structure 03-3 23 Enniskerry Bridge. All agreed?
Structure 17-01 lead mines, page 103, all of your plan,
proposed by Cllr Snell, seconded by Cllr Aoife Flynn Kennedy.
All agreed? Protected structure 2307 Derrybawn Bridge. Page
1341, proposed, seconded, Cllr O'Brien, Paul O'Brien. All
agreed? Another one for Derrybawn Bridge. Proposed by Cllr
Snell, seconded by Paul O'Brien. Protected structure 23-11,
Glendalough Mines, page 1,033 of your draft development plan.
All agreed?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. We are back on to wind energy strategy.
It is amendment 69 in your proposed amendments, council
amendments, proposed by Cllr John Mullen, seconded by Cllr
Vincent Blake.

CLLR MULLEN: The scale of windfarms have changed dramatically
over the past few years, where our own officials have said
they've changed a rural landscape into an industrialised
landscape. I would like to repeat that: they're changing a
rural landscape to an industrialised landscape, which means
that we have to be protective of our environment. The
Department of Defence area which we actually put - we
discussed a little bit earlier, it's unclear from the map that
I see on screen, or in front of me at the moment, does it even
comply with the aerial exclusion zone that is there at the
moment? The department of defence have issued other
clarifications in relation to areas favoured on this current
map. On the green areas on the east coast of Wicklow, which
you can see there on the map, in the previous map, there was a
protected area for the Condor in the east and west. I don't
know what happened to the Condors, maybe they got scared away
with the fact that these windfarms are coming, but at the same
time, it is completely unacceptable that there's been no
clarification of where this on shore windfarm policy is coming
from. I accept what the officials are saying that they are
obliged to put it in, and they're using the guidelines, and
they've tried to tweak the guidelines, but in effect, this has
been written from the department. It's not smart at all. I
come from an area that does have these turbines in my own
area. It's not nimbysism. I'm warning the rest of you, that the
development of these industrial-sized turbines is not a
protective fit for the landscape, the rural archaeology, the
biodiversity, and the communities of Wicklow, and I think we
as public representatives, if this is to be our plan, we need
to clarify that. I accept where the officials are coming from
that they are obliged to do this, and that we have had it in
previous development plans, but you can see the map has
changed significantly in this plan than it was previous, and
in particular to the east coast, and the west part of the
county, there are actually more green areas now which are
areas most favoured than there was in the previous one, from
my understanding. So, I would just like to know where we are
on this, because I would like what my text says there is that

this is not a way to go for rural Wicklow, as Cllr Mitchell said yesterday, the offshore component of this whereby we are going to have development servicing one point four million households seems to be disregarded, we don't seem to be promoting other renewable forms of energy like solar. I would like to see a vote on this.

SORCHA: The first thing I seek clarification from Cllr Mullen is that the wind energy strategy in the draft plan as published last June is the same wind energy strategy in the 2016 development plan, so there's been no change proposed to the wind energy strategy this plan round. Just to clarify, put up two masts, is he talking about the wind energy strategy from the 2010 development plan? Because there's been a number of versions of the wind energy strategy over the years, so, if he could maybe clarify that, we can get the maps up that he asked for when he started speaking. The other thing I would just set out just so that the members are clear, we do have quite a lot of newer members on the council. We have had wind energy strategy for some time, and the first one was drawn up in compliance with the ministerial guidelines as they were at the time which haven't been updated and adopted by the members, and integrated into the County Development Plan. Subsequently, when a number of applications came forward, the members felt that the wind energy strategy I think was possibly in the 2004 development plan, or maybe a bit later, they felt it wasn't calibrated sufficiently to Wicklow conditions, and a working group was set up at some stage in the late 2000s, I think it might have been, and so some of the older councillors might remember that, and we had representatives from each of the districts, and we went through the wind energy strategy, and agreed that it would be amended so that it aligned fully with the landscape categories, even though landscape is one of the criteria that is supposed to be taken into consideration in developing a wind energy strategy. That proposal was brought back from that working group, back again to the full chamber for the members to agree, so we have had three versions, then it was carried forward into subsequent development plan with minor changes, related to landscape categories, so wherever the landscape categories were proposed for amendment, the wind energy strategy would follow those amendments. So it has been through, I would say, at least four or five cycles of public consultation being passed by the members and so on, and it doesn't fully accord with the guidelines because we have tallied it completely to landscape which doesn't comply with the guidelines. So we haven't proposed any changes to it this time round, and that was on foot of ministerial guidance that until new guidelines come out that we should hold our hand and certainly that the members should not do anything that would reduce the capacity of the county in terms of providing wind energy. You could certainly change the wind energy strategy that would enhance the capacity of the county to deliver wind energy but not reduce, and so we advised that we felt that the

best strategy therefore was to do nothing for the moment, not increase capacity or reduce - do nothing until the new guidelines were actually finalised. So that is the history of how the wind energy strategy was developed over the years. We are happy when the new guidelines come out to undertake another review, to work with an interested group across the county and tease it all out again, and, if we need to do variation mid-plan or as soon as the plan is adopted, whenever that might happen, we're happy to do that with the members and work with the members on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are you happy with that? That is a reasonable ...

CLLR MULLEN: I think a review, because the scale of the developments since the late 1990s to now 2022 is just completely as you know yourself, Cathaoirleach, completely different. So we do need to have a landscape strategy that is clever and smart, make sure that we contribute to the renewable energy that doesn't destroy our own biodiversity.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are you happy to ...

CLLR MULLEN: If you want me to withdraw it on a basis of a commitment to review it?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think that commitment is clear. Cllr Scott, do you want to come in?

CLLR SCOTT: I'm happy if this is being withdrawn. I'm happy.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That is reasonable. Thanks for your amendment to Cllr Mullen on that. Okay. We're moving back to the chief's appendix 8, strategic flood risk assessment. It's page 982 on your draft plan. 982.

SORCHA: The strategic assessment is an appendix of the development plan, so at each plan of the - any changes made to plan or proposed changes that are put forward have to be run through a flood risk assessment, and as you recall over the last two days, if any of the members came forward with any proposals, that we felt might be at risk of flooding, we flagged that for you. But this, one of the proposals that would have to actually be published as part of publishing the amendments is to publish an addendum to the strategic flood risk assessment which sets out that assessment of each and every of the proposed new zonings, so up until yesterday and today, the only zonings proposed - the proposed new zonings that could be assessed were those recommended by the Chief Executive because they were the only ones we were aware of. Every additional zoning now will have to add to this document.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So all amendments we have passed over the past two days have to be included?

SORCHA: Exactly. In addition, some people who made submissions felt that the maps that were in the original flood risk assessment that were published last June weren't sufficiently

clear, is it part of this stage, what we are proposing is to include more maps that are more distinct, the colours are more distinct so it is more understandable. So I don't think the members need to go through this one by one. I suppose it is to accept that this is one of the amendments, and they're happy with what has been drawn up so far. They're happy with the further amendments to be assessed and for it to be published.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. I think that's clear cut. Are we happy with that? A proposer and a seconder. Cllr Snell proposed, Cllr Dunne seconded. All agreed? Appendix number 9, page 952 of your plan. As Chief Executive recommendations again.

SORCHA: Again this is not dissimilar to the strategic flood risk assessment, it's an appendix to the development plan, and it has to provide information on services, because as you know, there is a requirement on you now to ensure that any land that you zone is serviced, and so this appendix sets out the infrastructure available in each town and settlement that has a zoning plan in the county. The only amendments that are really proposed are updates particularly from Irish water that they provided to us through the public consultation process to give us clarity on the capacity in some of the water systems in a number of places. So that in the main, you will see that from page 960 on, extra text under, proposed under each, most of the towns, just to bring a bit of clarity about the services. But again we are also proposing a new set of maps that go with that, which you will see from page 969 onwards, which are actually, although water main and sewer main maps for all the towns where we are proposing zoning, because the OPR did actually draw to our attention that it should be clear to the members, or the members should have sufficient information that any land they propose for zoning is serviced. And we thought these would be helpful maps to show where the water mains and sewers are. We have some concerns that some of these aren't fully accurate, that they're not fully up to date, but I suppose it gives a good picture of most of the services available to the town, and I think it's probably useful for the public and land owners as well to see where the services are located. I don't think we need to go through.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I want a proposer and a seconder please, again. Call agreed again?

>> Agreed.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Moving it on to the elected members' proposed amendment number 70. We do have to go back on a few amendments that we missed, but this one is in the name of Cllr Behan. Just one second.

CLLR BEHAN: I would love this could be passed without a discussion, but I don't think it's going to happen. This is an attempt to rectify a serious injustice that was done to a farming family in Enniskerry at the last time of the drawing up of the Bray municipal plan. This is a working farm, and it

has been for 300 years. The owners of the farm are elderly. They were not aware that in the Bray municipal district plan process, that the zoning of their farm was changed from agricultural use to open space. And what that has resulted this is effectively people coming to visit the woods, making their way across the farm to get to the wood, because in local maps, in local facilities, like garages and so on, there is not a distinction made between their farm. They have the constant difficulty while trying to manage a working farm of having basically trespassers coming up the driveway, walking across their land, and unfortunately, and in some cases, being quite abusive to the farm family themselves. I do recognise we're not dealing with the Bray municipal district land before, and [inaudible] because I know that's going to be their response. But, actually, during this whole process, we've done things like tree preservation orders. We've included trees in my own estate in Richmond Park. We talked about a bridge in Enniskerry here today. What I'm asking is very simple request that the designation of that site is changed to what it has always been, and continues to be, a working farm, an agricultural zoning and the residences, there are a couple of houses belonging to the family and the farm, that they are changed to what would be acknowledge the fact they're residents, and that they have a residential zoning. And I'm just asking and proposing it, and I know Cllr O'Connor wants to come in on this. He's seconding this. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Connor.

>> I wanted to mention about the Leddy family the injustice they've been through on the land, and the stress it's caused for the elderly family. I know it's very unusual to have this in the Bray municipal district plan, but I just hope members can see. They can see this and pass it through. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr O'Brien.

>> Thank you, Cathaoirleach, and my sincere thanks to bringing this to our attention. We've heard in the past that our powers are being depleted, but if we can give a family a peace of mind, we should do it and do it now. That's the why I support Cllr Behan and this motion.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Lourda Scott.

CLLR SCOTT: Often sympathy for the family, why the Cllr Behan brought the motion, I'm looking at the Chief Executive's response wondering from a legal point of view, you know, are we able to make this amendment here today, or is it actually, does it have to wait for the LAPs? I know I have had people locally requesting changes within my own district and I know I had to let them wait until it came to our local area plan so I'm confused as to why this amendment is in the CDP process. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Direction Mitchell.

CLLR MITCHELL: Like Cllr Scott I would have a concern: this seems to me something appropriate for the Bray plan, and in all our towns, which we have yet to get plans, there are quite a lot of things which we could be doing here, but, on the other hand, they're more appropriate for the local people to deal with, and the local area, so, or could this not be done as a special amendment to the Bray plan, maybe? Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Tom Fortune.

CLLR FORTUNE: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Based on what Cllr Behan and Cllr O'Connor outlined, and I had a look at this myself and what we were given, it seems to me that it is an injustice that has happened, and maybe no-one's fault but to me it sound like an injustice. I think we should kind of repair that injustice. I think it's way overdue.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr John Mullen.

CLLR MULLEN: Cathaoirleach, I would be again tempted to support this because we have as a full council, we value the impact of our land owners when it comes to recreational walking and infrastructure in Wicklow, but on the flip side, we have to protect land owners as well from trespassers, and I think we were very unique product in Wicklow when it comes to access of agreed walking trails and stuff like that. It would be important signal to send out as a council that we support the rights of those land owners to have their own property. Thanks.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Before bringing in anyone else, I don't think there's any doubt on the merit of Cllr Behan's amendment or proposal here, it's whether or not it's at the right time, or should it be at the Bray area plan which we feel it should be, but, I just want to put on record from my point of view, I'm not against what Cllr Behan, the essence of what he has put forward. Cllr O'Brien, Dermot O'Brien?

CLLR O'BRIEN: I think it is important take into consideration as well that the Bray area plan is fifth in priority, so we are going to be waiting, and waiting, and waiting, and in the meantime, these people will be suffering, suffering, and suffering, and I think there's an opportunity now to right a wrong and to do that in the now I think is far more important than navigating through a technicality, so I would really support this, to be passed today. Thank you.

CLLR KAVANAGH: I just want to ask was it in the county development plan that the last zoning was removed? Because it was originally zoned agricultural, and then it was changed to open space.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We will get an answer to that question. Thank you.

CLLR KAVANAGH: I just wanted to say if the wrong was created in a Draft County Development Plan, then that's where it should be corrected.

CLLR BOURKE:

CLLR BOURKE: I have sympathy in this case here. I think we should support this. I know it's leapfrogging the process as envisaged by the Chief Executive, but I do believe that in fairness, it should be granted to the applicant, and I do know as well from my own experience of open space zoning, it's quite a handicap to have it on your property because, for example, if this particular land owner wanted to put in an acre of solar panels, depending on the wording, he would be prohibited, and given that the climate we live in at the moment with energy security, I think we should be doing all we can to encourage renewable energy type projects but I've no idea what the owner is envisaging that he can do, but his options would be greatly enhanced by having it revert back to agriculture.

CLLR DUNNE: I'll be supporting Cllr Behan providing we can legally take the amendment.

CLLR WALSH: Similar to Cllr Dunne, once it's legal, it was Cllr Scott who made the inquiry should it be an LA process. You look at the prey LAP, it is last on the list, it is some time before it will be addressed on that level. How did this happen in the first instance? Was it an error during the LAP process in Bray? Does anybody have an idea how it came about? If we can deal with it here today legally ...

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Melanie Corrigan.

1730

CLLR CORRIGAN: Thank you. Just as Cllr Bourke has said, there is quite a difference between open space zoning and agricultural zoning. I know this farm well. It is a working farm, with a full equine business on it. This you know, buildings that they might want to put on, extra sheds and work that they want to do on the land. It is impinging on the way they can work the farm.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Timmins.

CLLR TIMMINS: Hopefully we can amend it through to the process today. If we can't, can we do it through a material contravention of the Bray plan?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in Sorcha now.

SORCHA: Thank you, Cathaoirleach. Just to be absolutely clear on the factual position, the land is zoned open space 2, which is not an open space zoning that encourages use of any kind, it's active open space is the zoning that provides for playing pitches, tennis courts and so on. Open space 1 then is for parks and walking and recreation. Open space 2 is a designation that is essentially the same as null. It's the space left over where there is no objective for any development whatsoever. The Bray local plan and this is used in many local plans the objective is protect, enhance existing, open undeveloped lands that comprise flood plains, buffer zones, water courses and rivers, steep banks, green breaks between built areas, green corridors and other areas of biodiversity. These are not designated for park use, active use. It sounds unusual that a walker in the wood would have a copy of the local area plan in their hand, which as far as I know is not up on display in many places I've been or handed out to walkers for use and here's the land you can roam freely on. Most people don't know what a local plan is and have never seen one. It is not utilised as a guide book for walkers. It's never intended to be. I would find it unusual to think that a walking group would hand the local area plan map to someone and say, "This is what you should use to walk and trail around the county." The open space 2 zoning is used to reflect the undeveloped lands in a town that aren't identified for any use. So, it's eventually, essentially, it's the same as agricultural in terms of what uses are considered and permissible in them. A change from agricultural to open space in the 2016 plan for the area, because of actually it's very - it's almost - there's been legal questions been asked in other councils about the zoning of land for agriculture in a town, when it's surrounded by zoned land for housing and other uses around it. Because there have been cases, there was win in Fingal, that the farmer was able to sue the Council for effectively making their agricultural land unusable because it was encroached on all sides by built development. There's been the movement away in all planning authorities from zoning land for agricultural in the middle of a town, even if that's what it's being used for. We actually spent a lot of time working on what would be a best fit or best words to describe this replacement zoning and OS2 was what we came up with. It could be have been called something completely different. It could have been called green break, green buffer. It just happens to be called OS2. So that's the history of how it changed from agricultural zoning to open space zoning. To be honest, I don't see how any change of this from OS2 to agricultural would prevent people from trespassing in they are trespassing. Nothing that would be done in LAP would stop someone who is intent on doing that or is making the mistake constantly of walking onto the wrong land. You would be doing something that might not solve the problem that you see before you. So that's all I have to say on that.

CATHAOIRLEACH: There was one other question that I'd like an answer to. Is this legal to take this today? Is there a legal implication? I think that question was asked by a couple of members.

SORCHA: The county development plan supersedes any local plan. It would be a stand-alone page in the county development plan sitting there on its own unrelated to the LAP. It would be very unusual. We've never done it before. I don't see it in development plans regularly. It's not our normal way of doing things. We normally do things through our local area plans. There would be quite a lot of people who might not be aware of this, because they're not conscious of a local area plan or reviewing the plan.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead Brian.

>> Thanks. I suppose while we sympathise with the situation, the appropriate process to address this matter is through the Bray local area development plan, without question. Our fear is, and it's outlined in the report that by allowing this proposal it would disenfranchise members of the public who may have wanted or were interested in making submissions in relation to their own local area development plan or were advised to wait until that process took place. So that's the fear where we're coming from. We're setting a precedent here as Sorcha was saying, it hasn't been done before. As I said, we are similar pathetic of the situation. It's the precedent that we're setting here in relation to disenfranchising other members of the public. Inadvertently.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you.

>> We've established a couple of things. First of all, it is legal. It can be put in as a stand-alone page. So, if anyone has worries about having legal implications it clearly doesn't. The county plan supersedes all the municipal district plans. I would seriously take issue with the statement that, you know, it's an open space zone, therefore basically that's all right. It's not open space. It's an agriculturally working farm. It's a working environment. It's a working farm. And it was always a working farm. When you talk about disenfranchising the local people, there's two points about that. As we've already heard, and we mightn't have been happy hear it, every amendment that's made is going back on public display. The public who have a problem with this, if they have, can comment on it. Secondly the family themselves, there were elderly parents, who were disenfranchised because this change was made to their 300-year-old farm without their knowledge. Nobody from the Council had the courtesy to knock on the door and say listen, we're thinking of changing your farm to open space. And while I accept and no-one has said that people are arriving up the driveway with a copy of the local area plan, I have also said there's a plan, a general plan at the local garage shows the wood and the farm beside it are all one. People are getting

access or trying to get access to the wood up the driveway of this farm, which means they're constantly dealing with people walking past. In fact, one day, apparently, a number of tourists arrived into the kitchen, looking for coffee. Because they thought they were on their way to Knox sink, coffee and buns. The family are a decent family but they're a working farm family. We have the capacity just once, can we just kind of say right, OK, just because it has never been done before, can we just reach out to this elderly family, elderly couple, and say right, let's do what should not have been done in the past, and let's protect their agricultural working environment, Cathaoirleach. I'm going to press ahead with the proposal.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Kennedy.

CLLR KENNEDY: Just wanted to get clarity because Sorcha mention today was changed in the 2016 local area plan. Does that mean that the councillors at the time voted to have the change done? Or how did the change occur? I'm just trying to understand was there a rationale for the decision at this time?

SORCHA: Yes, the change was made in the 2016 county development plan (inaudible) formed part of the county plan at that time. It was taken out of the county plan and put in the Bray local plan in 2018. On the 2016 plan and 2018 plan the members would have voted to accept that alternative zoning OS2 rather than AG. It's been two rounds of agreement and adoption.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. We're going to have to go for a vote. It's on amendment number 70. Proposed by Cllr (inaudible) seconded by Cllr O'Connor. (Votes taken).

HELEN PURCELL: 31 for, one not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK thank you. We have still a few amendments that we have to go back over but before that, I want to bring you in here.

>> Thanks very much. I may have to go and there's just a couple of things I wanted to say before I had to go. The first thing is that I just really would like to thank the forward planning team for the huge amount of work that they have put into the preparation for both today and yesterday's meeting. And their unrelenting positive poach to both, you know, to present and to address all the submissions and proposed amendments put forward by the members. I think you will all agree that the volume of work involved in the county development plan process is immense, but despite this, the team left no stone unturned to give both the time and the consideration of all the elected members and their individual queries and concerns. And then to present the information in the standard that you have before you, so that the information

was as clear and suggestion sing as possible and capture all the detail of the proposed amendments, so that these meetings could occur in as efficient a manner as possible. I would particularly like to single out Sorcha, Bernie Harvey, and Helen Flynn, who has since moved to a different section, but still came down to assist with the mapping. But also, other colleagues, like Lindsay Blackmore, Rosemary Denison and Adean Russel. In terms of the efficiency, I would like to thank the Cathaoirleach and his stewardship of this meeting. I think you would all agree that he's played a blinder. Thank you very much members.

(Applause)

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. We'll just move on to amendment number 15 in the name of Cllr Joe Behan. Have you a seconder for your amendment? Cllr Fortune, yeah OK. I will bring you in there.

>> Sorry, I simplified it to address particularly the issue that's were raised with Cllr Flynn Kennedy and other councillors were worried about was this going to include housing bodies so, it would exclude them. What it said is the sale of all developments of residential units, whether houses, geo complexes or apartments to or investment bodies shall be prohibited. So basically, that should explain what I'm at here. It's to prevent investment bodies buying these developments and denying our young people the opportunity to buy a house themselves or an apartment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, I think you've got good support on that yesterday. So, it's amendment 15 proposed by Cllr Joe Behan, seconded by Cllr Fortune. Are we all in agreement? Agreed? OK. Helen, what other ones have we? EM17 in your book. This is in the name of Grace McManus, seconded by Cllr O'Brien. Do you want to speak on this?

CLLR MCMANUS: Yeah, I circulated a reward, I think I would like to withdraw, because while I obviously agree with the intention of it, there might be unintended consequences. I'm happy to withdraw it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, thanks for your time on it. EM28.

EM28 is in the proposed by Cllr Erika Doyle, seconded by Cllr Kavanagh. I'm not sure that Cllr Doyle is with us? Before we about further. I need a seconder. The seconder is Cllr Fortune. Okay.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Cllr Doyle wasn't able to make it so I'm proposing it instead. I've circulated two maps, and a photograph of the area. I was caught short taking it yesterday because I didn't have a map yesterday so I panicked a little bit. Basically, in a nutshell, this is a request to send a small woodland up in Season Park, a,

because ant to Season Park to approve it for forwarded for assessment for a TPO. It's not saying that a Tree Protection Order will necessarily apply - it has to satisfy a lot of criteria. I wanted to say a couple of words about it. First and foremost, it is 2.3 acres of densely wooded area, which is very close to Season Park in Newtown. It has mainly native species of trees, such as yew, mountain ash, birch, oak, and it a habitat for various wildlife. That is as well as the common birds, it has birds such as yellowhammer, kites, and red kites, and buzzards, and then the variety of mammals that have been seen there include pine martens, bats, a squirrel, and a badger sett. There is an otter family in the small river that flows through the woodland area. At a time when we are in a biodiversity crisis, and at a time when there is so much land being taken for housing, especially in villages like Newtown, it's really, really important to have an area where the public can use as a green area, a green corridor, if you like, so as well as satisfying a natural habitat, and an ecosystem that is developed there, it also satisfies an awful lot of needs of people in modern life, the need to be surrounded by nature, by biodiversity, to get out into green spaces, to breathe clean air. It also acts as a buffer, a noise buffer, barrier, for all the traffic that is built up in the area there because of all the extra houses. The period between - I had a read of the submission, and one of the things that has struck me was that in the period of 1970 to 2000, there has been which is a 50-year period, the climate temperature has risen more in that 50-year period than at any other period in history. Therefore, climate change is a fact, and it is here with us. Now, I'm not asking for these trees to be protected, I'm asking that we allow it to be sent forward for assessment. At the end of the day, an arborist will decide whether it has amenity value, heritage value, whether the trees that are in it are actually worth keeping or not. In the event that the land needed ever to be developed, planning law takes precedence over environmental law. It is a shame, but that's the way it is when it comes to planning. Therefore, I'm not asking for these trees to be saved in perpetuity, I'm asking that we give them a chance that maybe down the line, a developer may very well see the importance of keeping an area like this in an area that has so much housing already in it. So,.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you Cllr Kavanagh. Before I bring in Cllr Scott, a couple of questions on this being from the area. I have a concern about being selective in sites. I'm all for protecting the environment. We are after

dealing with an issue five minutes ago where a farmer land was put into open space without the land owner's approval. Has the land owner given approval for what you're proposing here, or is he even aware? I don't know he, or she, whoever owns this land, are they aware of what you're proposing? We are after dealing with something that an injustice was done to a family, and I'm not entirely sure is the family or whoever the owner of this land, are they aware of what you're proposing? Those are my concerns in this. I will open it up. Cllr Scott?

CLLR SCOTT: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. Thanks, Cllr Kavanagh, there. I wanted to speak in support of this proposal, and as Cllr Kavanagh was saying it's proposing that this group of trees go forward for the Tree Protection Order process. As we touched on yesterday, even when a group of trees are nominated for that process, it is a process, and part of that is open to public consultation, the land owner is informed, et cetera. It is not a case of waving a magic wand and protecting those trees in perpetuity. So it is a transparent and open process. I would support that these trees go ahead for that. We discussed at length yesterday how the TPO application process, if you like, you know, it has been slow, it is passed many members of the public over through the process that happened this time as part of the CDP process where people had wanted to submit groups of trees like this, but just weren't aware that the TPO process was happening, and I think it is really important that we allow communities the chance to put forward groups of trees like this for TPOs at more regular intervals, as we discussed and supported in my amendment yesterday. I will support this, and as we said again yesterday, I'm sure Sorcha will speak to it again, it is a process, and a transparent process. We are not deciding here today to protect these trees. We are asking that they are put forward into that process which is laid down in statute. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: I just want to commend Cllr Mary Kavanagh for putting this forward. It is a process, like Lourda Scott said. Hopefully it is a process that can be done democratically, and I will be fully support of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I will bring in the Chief Executive from this one.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Look, I suppose as we have not response, our concern would be the amount of time it will take to actually undertake the process. We don't want to hold up

the County Development Plan process in relation to this, so maybe if we can address it outside of the County Development Plan process, and maybe commit to a TPO?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I was under the impression we were collating a number of submissions for a TPO, and this is just to be included that, not to be included in the County Development Plan. I had discussion with Sorcha about this.

SORCHA: We're not in the process of ... recommended to TPO were published in the draft plan. We're not at the stage of putting together a fresh list at the moment, and procuring expertise to assess these, so it is the only one that is on the list at the moment at the moment. We can certainly procure that expertise in due course, and it will take a number of months before we can get to that given we have to deal with the county plan, run a consultation process, prepare the next report. I would suggest with respect, Cathaoirleach, that if we could commit to Cllr Kavanagh that we will initiate this process of having the trees assessed as soon as the County Development Plan is adopted.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are you happy with that?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I'm happy it goes on the list. I'm sure by the time you're sending TPO to get value for money, you will want to have a fairly substantial list. I'm happy enough.

CATHAOIRLEACH: So we're withdrawing the amendment on the basis of what you've been told?

CLLR KAVANAGH: I'm not withdrawing the amendment. It's a TPO.

CATHAOIRLEACH: It's not an amendment for the members to vote on.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE: We've committed we will go through the process but outside of the County Development Plan process.

CLLR KAVANAGH: But part of the TPO process so it go on the list.

SORCHA: There is no list at the moment. There is no amendment proposed or needed to the County Development Plan for a list to be started with this on it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Okay. Are you happy with that, Cllr Kavanagh?

CLLR KAVANAGH: Um ... could I ...

CLLR SCOTT: Could ski a point of clarification?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Go ahead.

CLLR SCOTT: I think I'm understanding what Sorcha as saying, if this amendment was withdrawn, at the same time you are committing that if after this County Development Plan is passed, you're committing that another round of TPO orders will go in process, and, if they're passed, including this amendment, including in group of trees in Newtown, that they would then be added as an amendment to the current plan. Am I correct in saying that? That we wouldn't be committed to waiting until the next CDP process in five years' time when we're starting another TPO process?

CLLR KAVANAGH:

SORCHA: The TPO process is separate to the county plan and can be done at any time. What the Chief Executive has committed to is when this plan is adopted, if there are a number of groups of trees ...

>> I can't hear, Sorcha.

SORCHA: What the Chief Executive has committed to is once this County Development Plan is adopted, if there is a list that has developed of trees that are worthy of assessment, this being the first one on the list, I'm not sure where the rest would germinate from, but, when we have a list - a batch of them - that is next assessed, this will be on that list, and will be assessed.

But it doesn't require any amendment to the County Development Plan for an assessment to be carried out or for a TPO process to be initiated; it's a separate process.

CLLR SNELL: I think to be fair to Cllr Kavanagh, you know, she is fulfilling her role, because there are 11 submissions at draft stage for members of the - from members of the public, 11 submissions for TPOs, one of which is what she is discussing today. I just had a look at the 11 submissions. If you're looking for a list, there is a list in front of us. Actually, the five districts are covered, north, east, south, and west. Members of the public have submitted it. I know the Chief Executive, you've given a response to that, but I think it merits justification that we go and look at the 11 sites, or at least, you know, if you're looking to compile a list, surely the 11 that have went to the hassle of engaging with this local authority at this draft development stage, that they're the 11 that should

be looked at? And one of which is what Cllr Kavanagh has suggested today.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Great. Thank you.

CLLR SNELL: On page 526 and 527.

CLLR KAVANAGH: As Cllr Snell said, if there are 11 other submissions for TPOs, I don't know why this one wouldn't be added to the list.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I think there's been a commitment that we will add it to the list. That's not an issue.

CLLR KAVANAGH: Well, no, but they were saying that there is nothing on the list. This would be the first, but Cllr Snell has already pointed out there's another ten or 11 submissions for TPOs, so can this be added to that existing list?

SORCHA: The 11 Cllr Snell has mentioned will 11 submissions. There is no list created, in someone's computer or office, trees due for assessment. If the members would like all of the submissions that have mentioned TPOs or requested them through this process to be considered when we next do a batch of assessments, that's absolutely fine, and that is where we go and get our list from. When we are doing our list this time last year, for assessment, we gathered all the data from all the previous submissions on county plan, the Bray plan, the Arklow plan - any plan that had been over the previous years. It's on the list.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That's a clear commitment.

CLLR KAVANAGH:

SORCHA: So this will be on that list.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're happy. We're withdrawing the amendment as is?

CLLR KAVANAGH: On that basis, I think it has to be withdrawn because it is not actually - it doesn't constitute a proposal in relation to the CDP, but it will be added to the TPO list of submissions.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you, that's grand. Helen, the next number? EM48. This is in the name of Cllr Vincent Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen. I think you've all been given a map of the revised proposal which is this map. Okay? So, on the basis of what is front of you, it is an OS of 0.66 hectares, and an RN residential of 0.51 hectares. Are we all in agreement?

You OK? All agreed? Amendment 48, Cllr Vincent Blake, seconded by Cllr Mullen. 49, that was withdrawn, wasn't it?

>> It's the same thing.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Yeah, same thing.

That's on page in your draft development plan, what page is that on, do we know?

SORCHA: Page 51 of the main big report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We're on page 51 of the draft plan. This is back to Ashford. Cllr I'll bring you back in on this. Sorry. Go ahead.

>> Yes, I won't be agreeing to this. Earlier in the day, we unanimously agreed to put, keep land in development plan and this would be one of his accesses. I will be, I won't be supporting this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Cllr Snell?

CLLR SNELL: Thanks, Cathaoirleach, yeah, I think that it should refer back to the blue text as was. It's a special local objective rather than strategic land bank. It's land that is vital to opening up other parts of the land that have already been zoned and permissions on. So, I think Cllr Dunne's right that would be difficult for us to support this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Thank you. And I want to make the point, I want to compliment Cllr Snell on this. He copped this before a vote took place, that none of the rest of us were aware of. I want to commend him on that. And to say that I fully agree with Cllr Dunne and Cllr Snell. Proposed by Cllr Dunne and seconded by Cllr Snell.

>> Sorry we have a proposer and seconder to accept the chief executive submission on this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We didn't vote on it.

>> We didn't. It was Cllr O'Brien. Withdrawn?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Withdrawn, OK. We have a new proposer and seconder, Cllr Dunne followed by Cllr Snell to second it. To not accept the chief executive's recommendation. Are we all agreed on that? Agreed. Thank you. OK. Amendment 84 from the chief executive. It's on page 54, is it? I'm going to bring in Sorcha on this. We are looking for clarification on this.

SORCHA: I haven't got that clarification, I'm afraid, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. So, I'm looking for a proposer and seconder on what is in front of you? Proposed by Cllr O'Brien.

>> Seconded by Cllr Annesley.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Are we all agreed? Agreed.

>> with the 100-year flood in mind, so it's probably OK.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. All agreed? Agreed. Thank you. OK. We have two more amendments here that aren't in your book. I think have been circulated. The first one is, well both proposed by Cllr Bourke and the seconder by Cllr Pat Kennedy, this relates to employment zoning and Rathdrum, you should have it circulated here. There's three maps on this. On the second page. Cllr Bourke when you're ready.

CLLR BOURKE: Yes, this is in relation to - first of all I want to apologise to the management team for coming in late with a couple of amendments one was from Vincent Pearce who came to me about a week before the reading. The second was one that I had forgotten that I thought I had made the submission but I noticed it wasn't in the manager's report. I have to say that's my fault, I didn't attach to my e-mail directly. This is an existing business with regards to Vincent Pearce, it's been buying and processing wool from farmers for generations in County Wicklow. It's going well for him. It's a wool insulation business. I think it will continue to expand as more and more people are using wool as a preference for insulating their houses. He's in a position now to be able to buy the field next door to him. He wants to expand his business. It is a sloping field. I've looked at the site. It's not all suitable for a warehouse, the top end, say one third of the field, would be suitable with some site levelling. I believe we should be supporting this local businessman. He's giving employment, will probably be giving more employment. I think it's worthy of support. The alternative would probably be very difficult to have to move a business to a different location. To split a business. If he wants to expand. So, this is an obvious add on for him. I think we should support it.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Cllr Kennedy?

CLLR KENNEDY: Yeah, thanks Cathaoirleach. I'm just supporting, seconding this for Cllr Bourke as well. Most people will know Lawrence Pearce wool merchants. They've been based there for 75 years. This land was originally zoned commercial before the last plan. It was taken out in the last plan. I supported that. I think that was the right thing to do at that given time. But thankfully that we do have a plan every five years and now is the time to change the zoning back on that. The Pearce family are historically linked to sheep farming in Wicklow. I think there's only two or three wool merchants left in Ireland. If you went to the RDA haul and look at that, it was set up as a place for trading well and buying wool. That's why it was built in the first place. It was a couple of hundred of years. The English used to come over here to buy wool. To be fair to Lawrence Pearce and

them, they do have a substantial business there. They employ nine full-time staff in it. They do have a warehouse in it measuring 100 metres by 60 metres, which is 18,000 square feet. They employ nine full-time staff, five seasonal staff, and they employ eight staff in Galway as well. I know we could make the argument here to say there's an industrial site up the road, and it's only half a mile up the road. But it doesn't make economic sense to try and move this business further up the road, because for starters, there's two fork lifts required in this. There is a 70-ton weighbridge there. There's a wool press. To buy a wool press nowadays would cost you almost 100,000. Two fork lifts cost about 75,000. And the lorry weighbridge would cost 50,000. It's all in the one area any way. It's all in the one yard. This yard that Cllr Bourke has mentioned already, there's all historic buildings in that yard that have been brought into use over the last, I suppose, 20, 25 years. And there are nine people working in that and five businesses. This same piece of ground that Cllr Bourke outlined a minute ago is in that yard. It is zoned agricultural at the moment. Agriculture and sheep and sheep farming are synonymous with Wicklow. I think it's the right fit. I think it's the right time to change the zoning back on that. I did agree with the change of zoning the last time, but now is the time to change it back and that's the good thing about having a county development plan, that we can change things as the economic situation changes in the county. I know they're going to increase the, those five seasonal staff, I believe, from talking to the wool merchants will become five full-time jobs. I would ask people to change this and support employment. We don't have much employment in Rathdrum. As I said earlier on in relation to the industrial site, I've done a lot of work on that site and that industrial land. I hope in the next couple of months we will see - I'm not finished.

CATHAOIRLEACH: You've given ...

>> This is important.

CATHAOIRLEACH: I know it's important. We've given you a good hearing.

>> I've never held up a good meeting here. Never once. I have never once, Cathaoirleach.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Come on, finish your point.

>> I do support employment and this is worth supporting.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Snell.

CLLR SNELL: It felt a bit like the Oscars there. I thought he was going to do a Will Smith on you and give you a slap!

(Laughter)

The reality is that anything to do with employment and as the councillors have said, I've spoken to the owners of this

facility and it makes perfect sense. I know the number five was mentioned in regards to jobs, but I believe it could be six or more. Six jobs in Rathdrum is the equivalent of 60 jobs in Bray. It makes perfect sense. I will be supporting it, and I urge all councillors to support this. This is employment. It's job for County Wicklow and for a rural town like Rathdrum it's vital.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Thank you. Cllr Peir Leonard.

CLLR LEONARD: Yeah, I just want to support it as well. I think it ticks all the boxes for sustainability and diversification of agricultural land as well, into more sustainable practices. 100% in support of this.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Murphy.

CLLR MURPHY: Yeah, I better be short or else I could get a box as well. I support it as well. I think it's great to see small business in a rural area development and truly deserved. Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr McManus.

CLLR MCMANUS: Looking for clarification, is there a CE response to this? Or what is Sorcha's response to this?

CATHAOIRLEACH: I'm going to bring in Sorcha in now as soon as the members are finish. OK.

SORCHA: Thanks, Cathaoirleach. We're at a bit a loss to respond because we don't have a map in front of us. We don't know what area of land exactly. We did assess the submission in its totality in the chief executive's report and indicated concerns about the impact on the landscape, impact on the river corridor, between the built-up part of Rathdrum and the river. We haven't been provided with a map to allow us to assess that more care any and give you more detailed feedback. Cllr Bourke did indicate it was the top third of the field or something, but ... (inaudible).

CATHAOIRLEACH: Hold on Cllr Bourke. Go ahead.

CLLR BOURKE: Yeah, page 620 in your manager's report, the map is there. It indicates one acre is being sought to be zoned for employment use.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK so the map on page 620 is the map that has been used, is that correct?

CLLR BOURKE: Correct. It reflects sufficient space to build a warehouse that he needs. It's on the most level - that's a sloping field. That slopes down to the river. It's on the top section, which is the most level. There is a slope on part of that, which will have to be levelled.

>> Can we get confirmation of the area.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Did you say one acre Cllr Bourke?

CLLR BOURKE: Yeah, in blue on the map.

>> That's the one acre. We don't draw up the wrong map. That's 0.47 hectares which is more than an acre.

CLLR BOURKE: 0.4 of a hectare is an acre.

CATHAOIRLEACH: That's what we're voting on, the blue in on the map. Do we need to take a vote or are we all in agreement with the map on page 620, the outlined area in blue, that is attached? Are we happy with that? Or do we need to go for a vote? Are we all happy? The proposer is Cllr Bourke and seconded by Cllr Kennedy. Is all agreed.

>> Sorry. Can I ask a question?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Scott go ahead.

CLLR SCOTT: Is there any comment, I see under the submission it had an ecological appraisal of the proposal. I wonder how close that land would be to the river. I wonder if the executive had any concerns over any environmental impact? I'm just not clear from the map if it's close to ... to the river.

>> All the amendments have to go through the SEA process once passed, as this only came in late in the day, we haven't been able to do a preliminary SEA or AA on it. That will have to be published with the amendment.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK, so are we all in agreement? Agreed. Thank you. The next amendment again is for proposed by Cllr Bourke and seconded by Cllr Kennedy. It's Johnstown and a settlement boundary.

CLLR BOURKE: Thank you. I thought I had sent this in and I apologise it didn't appear in the manager's report, but it was on my computer, it was filed. I didn't attach it correctly or at all, perhaps, to my original e-mail of submissions. Basically, what I'm asking to do is extend the boundary north and west in Johnstown to encompass the developed areas and to link up what is an infield site, about one acre, to facilitate local need. The person that owns that has many, many people who don't qualify for rural housing, but would qualify under the small village category of applicant. I think it makes sense to link up all those areas. We did something similar yesterday for the county manager for the chief executive there in Willow Grove, I proposed it. It was linking up existing development. So that's my proposal. I put it to the members.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK. Members, are we in agreement with the proposal in front of you from Cllr Bourke, seconded by Cllr Kennedy? All agreed? Cllr Fitzgerald do you want to come in?

CLLR FITZGERALD: No.

CATHAOIRLEACH: All agreed?

>> Can I ask a question.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Colour McManus go ahead.

CLLR MCMANUS: Can I ask for Sorcha's response to this as well.

SORCHA: Yeah, we haven't had a chance to evaluate this in any detail because it came in late. We would have concerns that the extension is more than what would be needed for one infill house, there's maybe capacity for five. There is undeveloped land already in that village.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Bourke do you know in terms of what the proposal is in the number of houses?

CLLR BOURKE: I think it's enough for one or two at the very most. I did reduce the area on the map that I sent in to Sorcha there. The one before you is a reduced area. It doesn't show all the houses. There's four at the top end of that and another three or four - there's only enough space - actually it's on page - I have the page a second ago. It's more obvious in the manager's report here. The map is more up to date, which shows basically there's just enough room for one or two houses at the most. Page 352. Submission C2A2.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 352, OK.

>> Can I come in here?

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr Murphy?

CLLR MURPHY: I actually support this. My home place is beside this. And there is only a space of one or two dwellings there on that certainly.

CLLR BOURKE: I have reduced the map to the one in front of you there now on the handout. It's reduced it, it excludes the extra area that Sorcha was concerned about. It just includes now about, I'd say at the most one acre. Some of that is access to farmland. Probably just reduces it to one acre, maybe less.

CATHAOIRLEACH: We have a proposal from Cllr Bourke seconded by Cllr Kennedy. Are we all in agreement with what's in front of you on the map? Agreed? Done. Thank you. What else do we have?

>> That's done.

CATHAOIRLEACH: OK I'm going to bring Sorcha back in. There are three small items that we missed, I will ask her to go through them.

SORCHA: Thank you.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Not intentionally.

SORCHA: No, I missed them. I'm not perfect. Well ...

(Laughter)

Thank you. You'll recall yesterday when we were dealing with chapter three, four and six, and we outlined that there were quite a significant number of changes proposed to each of those chapters. What we had tried to do is break them into blocks and we passed them by blocks. But one of our TDs who must be monitoring the meeting got in touch with me last night and felt that one of the elements of chapter 6 didn't appear to be explicitly passed by the members in those blocks. He was absolutely right in that regard. So, I've gone back through chapter 3 and 4 and 6 to make sure that there was nothing that you didn't explicitly approve that we had recommended to you. And there's two things I just want to bring to your attention and make sure you're happy with them, even though we did it yesterday to make sure you're absolutely happy with them. The first is on page 858 of the big report.

CATHAOIRLEACH: 858 of your draft plan.

SORCHA: You'll see at the top of that page, new text in red. And this is a proposed addition to this chapter. This is simply setting out in relation to density standards, that there is actually a ministerial circular letter that allows for lower density development to be considered around the edges of towns. And density, you know, needs to be responsive to the location it's in. I know concerns have been expressed over the years and more recently that high density is required absolutely everywhere. So, we felt it was important that we include a paragraph that there is flexibility in density, particularly in peripheral and less urban locations and on the urban rural fringe. This is generally something that you would be agreeable with, because you like flexibility in those areas. I wanted to get the members to be sure that they agreed with that amendment. Because we didn't explicitly discuss it yesterday.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Could I have a proposer and seconder for that please, proposed by Cllr Mullen and seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald. All agreed? OK.

SORCHA: On page 866. It's at the very bottom of the page. It's an amendment to an objective. There was an objective in the draft plan that said support the change of vacant commercial premises to residential purposes outside the retail core areas. This was meant to say the change of use of vacant commercial premises in towns and villages outside the retail core, otherwise it suggested that any commercial premises could change to a residential unit anywhere, by passing the normal housing policies. The intent was that this related to town and village centres. I just wanted to be sure that the members are happy with that? This is all about our trust, trying to make it easier for commercial premises to change to residential in towns and villages where there's no use, where there's vacant properties for example in town centres. We don't want properties sitting idle. It has been about maintaining ground floors for shopping, retail and commercial uses. That has meant that the entirety of the

property stayed vacant. This was a support to allow commercial premises to change to residential use in towns and villages.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Proposer please. Cllr Annesley seconded by Cllr Fitzgerald. All agreed?

SORCHA: The final thing is just at the end of all of these processes, what we generally do is we ask the members to do one final vote. The final vote would be - I think I have it printed out for you, Cathaoirleach. Essentially it would be to consider the (inaudible) and to consider adopting making amendments to draft county plan as appropriate. The proposal is that the second chief executive report as per the amendments proposed and agreed bit members, the recommended amendments of the chief executive as agreed by the members and any changes consequent be made and put on public display as per the statutory requirements. So, wraps up everything we've agreed over the last two days and you're agreeing that they now all go on public display.

CATHAOIRLEACH: For the final vote, I'd like a proposer and seconder please. Cllr Kennedy and Cllr Tom fortune. Go for a vote. (Votes taken).

HELEN PURCELL: Are you voting for the plan?

>> Absolutely. Absolutely. Sorry about that. (Votes continue to be taken)

HELEN PURCELL: 28 for and four not present.

CATHAOIRLEACH: Before we conclude, I just want to thank you all for your interaction and participation over the last two days. I think we got through an awful lot of work, because of the way you dealt with it, I just want to thank Sorcha in particular. I think you know, you'd have to admit that the information that Sorcha has is just incredible. She made the whole process very easy for us all to follow. I want to thank Bernie and Helen in front here. And Lindsay, Adie and Rosemary for their involvement. Theresa, the other Theresa here, holding the fort in front of me and Helen beside me. I couldn't function without Helen's involvement and participation here. Everybody that was involved, I don't think it could have really went any better. Thank you.

>> Sorry Cathaoirleach, before we finish off, I would like to take the opportunity as well I won't name all the name that you have done, it's not the Oscars, we don't want to keep everyone here all night. Look, a big thanks and acknowledgement and all the work of the planning team even the documentation that you got for the meetings, you know, it was fantastic. And it helped us through the process. It was very clear. In the sequence, it made, I'd say it saved half a day easy, the way it was put together was fantastic. In

particular, mentioned Sorcha, I suppose she was the star of the show the last two days. Her knowledge and expertise is quite phenomenal. So, a big thanks to her. I'll just mention our Cathaoirleach, I think he did a great job managing the process. It's not an easy couple of days. I know he's just coming back from a tough week. So, kudos to you in relation to that. Obviously, Helen, Theresa, and keeping us all on the straight and narrow, God knows where we would have ended up without Helen and Lorraine putting us straight on a few things. And I suppose just a big thanks to all the members, yourselves, I think all the contributions made here over the last couple of days are very informed, very valuable. And we didn't have too many fights, which is a good thing. Look, onto the next step, you know. All right, thanks very much everyone.

(Applause)

HELEN PURCELL: There's tea, coffee, sandwiches and scones ...

(End of meeting)