

**COMHAIRLE CHONTAE NA GAILLIMHE**

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETINGS OF GALWAY COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT  
THE ARD RÍ HOTEL, TUAM, ON MONDAY 29 SEPTEMBER, 2014  
COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM**

**CATHAOIRLEACH:** Cllr. M. Hoade, Cathaoirleach of the County of Galway

**I LATHAIR FREISIN:**

**Baill:** Cllrs. T. Broderick, D. Burke, J. Byrne, N. Byrne, S. Canney, J. Charity, D. Connolly, M. Connolly & G. Cronnelly, Comh. S. Ó Cualáin, Cllrs. J. Cuddy & S. Cunniffe, Comh. T. Ó Curraoin, Cllrs. S. Donnellan, M. Fahy, P. Feeney, G. Finnerty, M. Finnerty, M. Fitzmaurice, T. Healy, P. Hynes, F. Kearney, P. Keaveney, D. Killilea, M. Kinane, M. Maher, E. Mannion, J. McClearn, K. McHugh, T. McHugh, M. Noone, A. Rabbitte, P. Roche, N. Thomas, Comh. S. Ó Tuairisg, Cllrs. S. Walsh & T. Welby

**Oifigigh:** Mr. K. Kelly, A/Chief Executive; Messrs. J. Cullen & L. Gavin, Directors of Services; Ms. C. McConnell A/Director of Services; G. Mullarkey, Head of Finance; M. Owens, County Secretary & Meetings Administrator; P. Ó Neachtain, Oifigeach Gaeilge, Ms. S. Kennedy, Senior Executive Planner, Mr. B. Dunne, Assistant Planner, Ms. G. Kavnagh, Assistant Planner, Ms. M. Doddy, Architectural Conservation Officer & Ms. M. Donohue, Senior Staff Officer.

Thosnaigh an cruinniú leis an paidir.

**To consider, under Section 12 of the Planning & Development Act 2000 (as amended), the Chief Executive Officer's Report on the submissions received on the Draft Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021, the Appendices (including the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures), the accompanying Environmental Reports/Supporting Documents and the Stage 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report, following the public display period of 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014 – 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014.**

*(Report already circulated)*

1880

**The Cathaoirleach stated that Cllr. A. Donohue extended his apologies at not being in a position to attend the Meeting of the 29<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.**

The Cathaoirleach thanked Cllr. T. McHugh for making the Árd Rí House Hotel available for the Meeting.

She advised that this Meeting was a Special Meeting to discuss the Draft County Development Plan and any Motions arising from the September Monthly Council Meeting would be dealt with at the next main Monthly Council Meeting.

The Cathaoirleach invited Ms. McConnell to present the Chief Executive Officer's Report on the submissions received to the Draft County Development Plan for Galway 2015-2021.

Ms. McConnell advised that she would provide a general introduction on the making of a County Development Plan for new Elected Members or those Elected Members who may have missed out on the initial Draft County Development Plan meeting and Ms. S. Kennedy would outline the main points of the Chief Executive Officer's (CEO's) Report.

Ms. McConnell sought from the Elected Members their proposed amendments to the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures so the Architectural Conservation Officer would consider them and address the Meeting at a later stage.

Ms. McConnell advised that the adoption of the Draft County Development Plan is a Reserved function. In preparing the Draft County Development Plan, she advised that the Executive worked within a fairly structured system having due regard to legislative context, National, Ministerial and Environmental Guidelines and a Draft Plan was prepared which was presented to the Elected Members in February 2014. She explained that prior to this, the Elected Members were advised on a range of pre-draft Plan issues and the Executive took instructions from the Elected Members to prepare the Draft Plan. She advised that the Draft Plan was agreed by the Elected Members of the Council in February 2014 and following their mandate, the Draft Plan was put on display for the public to make submissions.

Ms. McConnell explained that the Draft County Development Plan sets out the overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the functional area of Galway County Council but it does not include land use zoning. She said it sets out the longer term vision for the development of the County, while protecting and enhancing its environment through employing the principles of sustainable development in the policies and objectives set out in the Plan. She advised that the Plan builds on the strategies, policies and objectives of the Galway County Development Plan 2009-2015, taking into account recent key development trends and national, regional and local policy developments, including the increased emphasis on flooding, climate change, renewable energy and the need to support economic development and it also takes account of European Union (EU) requirements

including the application of Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Directive Assessment to the Plan.

Ms. McConnell advised that 75 submissions were made on the Draft Plan and the Council is statutorily obliged to consider the submissions received and decide whether they will or will not accept the Chief Executive Recommendations on each Submissions received. Ms. McConnell suggested to the Elected Members that the submissions are dealt with first as this is a statutory obligation as everyone is entitled to have their submission considered and following this any other items the Elected Member wish to raise for inclusion /deletion can be raised.

Cllr. Kearney said that it was difficult for the new Elected Members to accept a Draft Plan that they were not involved in at the start.

In reply to Cllr. Killilea, Ms. McConnell said that it is a legal requirement that each submission is considered by the Full Council, despite them being previously considered at Municipal District level. She said that the Municipal District meetings were information sessions which allowed for local discussion.

Cllr. McClearn clarified to the Meeting that the Draft Plan was put on public display earlier in the year and Submissions were received and the purpose of this Meeting is to deal with the Submissions.

Ms. McConnell advised that the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 was prepared in accordance the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) and taking into consideration all other relevant Irish and European planning and environmental legislation as outlined in the legislative context section of the Draft Plan. She said consideration was also given to the issues raised by the public through the publication of the Pre-Draft Issues Paper, the facilitation of pre-draft public consultations throughout the County and written submissions on the Pre-Draft Plan.

Ms. McConnell invited Ms. Kennedy to commence the presentation of the Submissions received on the Draft County Development Plan as outlined in the Chief Executive Officer's Report.

Ms. Kennedy advised the Meeting that 75 submissions were received on the Draft Plan. She said that the structure to the Chief Executive Officer's (CEO's) Report and each Submission received was as already outlined to the Elected Members at the Municipal District Meetings.

Ms. Kennedy referred the Meeting to Section 3.0 of the Chief Executive Officer's report (Guidance to the Elected Member) and read to the Meeting that *"Responsibility for making a Development Plan, including the various policies and objectives contained within it, in accordance with the various provisions of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) rests with the Elected Members of the Planning Authority, as a reserved function under Section 12 of the Act. In making and adopting the Development Plan, the Elected Members, in accordance with Section 12 (11) of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 (as amended) are restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to which the Development Plan relates, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and any relevant policies and objectives of the Government or Minister of the Government. The Members must act in the interests of the common good and the proper*

*planning and sustainable development of the area and in accordance with the “Code of Conduct for Councillors” prepared under the Local Government Act 2001. They must carry out their duties in this regard in a transparent manner, must follow due process and must make their decisions based on relevant considerations, while ignoring that which is irrelevant within the requirements of the statutory planning framework.”*

Ms. Kennedy stated that she would present the Submission raised by the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government first, as per the Chief Executive Officer’s report, followed by the submission from the West Regional Authority, with the remaining prescribed authorities thereafter and then the general public submissions.

**Submission CDP 1 – Department of Environment, Heritage & Local Government**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Department of Environment, Heritage & Local Government** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. J. Byrne expressed his concern with the statutory obligation on Galway County Council to adhere to the Habitats Directive. He explained the serious flooding problem in South Galway and asked that Galway County Council seek, at national level, derogation from the Habitats Directive in order to solve the flooding issue in South Galway. In reply, Ms. McConnell explained that the County Development Plan must adhere to National and Environmental Guidelines.

Cllr. Fahy concurred with Cllr. Byrne and said that something needs to be put in place to over-ride the Habitats Directive to accommodate flood works in South Galway.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice said that many people have been affected by ‘poor legislation’ including environmental designations under European legislation. He said that it was his understanding that there were no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC’s) in Ireland at the moment. He said that he would not tolerate the demise of rural Ireland by European Directives.

Cllr. Rabbitte concurred with Cllr. Byrne, Cllr. Fahy and Cllr. Fitzmaurice with regard to the SAC designations. She asked what could be done regarding the flooding crisis in Portumna. She said while there has been good planning in the past there has also been poor planning and poor legislation passed.

Cllr. McClearn explained to the Meeting that the SAC designations were adopted at European level and are now in Irish law and cannot be ignored. He said while he supports the concept of removal of the designations, he said that if the designations could be easily removed, it would have been undertaken long ago.

Cllr. J. Byrne reiterated his concern regarding the Habitats Directive and asked that Galway County Council would communicate with the Government to seek a derogation from Europe with regard to SAC designations, in order to solve the flooding issue in South Galway.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the Habitats Directive has been discussed on numerous occasions but advised that it was not an option to decide whether to accept it or not as the Council is obliged to take on board the environmental designations and ensure that every Policy or Objective in the Plan would not impact adversely the status of these sites. She advised that as part of the Development Plan process an Strategic Environmental Assessment

(SEA) and an Appropriate Assessment (AA) was undertaken to examine its impact on the European sites.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice said that he has undertaken much research on SACs and advised that candidate SAC's are sites designated by Europe and Member States have a 6 year timeframe to determine these sites as full SAC's. He said this process has not been undertaken in Ireland. He advised the Meeting that adhering to Policy does not make this correct. He proposed that the County Development Plan be completed leaving out reference to SAC's and SPA's (Special Protection Areas).

Cllr. McClearn said that he agreed with Cllr. Fitzmaurice's sentiments but advised that excluding reference to the Habitat's Directive would affect the Plan status and said until the Habitats Directive case is adjudicated on in the High Court, then the Council must adhere to the legislation as it stands.

Cllr. Broderick questioned if Cllr. J. Byrne's proposal was supported by the Council would this be in contrast to the status outlined by Cllr. Fitzmaurice who has advised that there is a pending court course in relation to the Habitats Directive.

The Chief Executive informed the Meeting that considerable debate has taken place over the years in relation to designations and the impact these designations have had on the Council and the complexities and costs incurred on projects as a result. He said that a substantial portion of the County is designated and the percentage for the West was much higher. He said while he appreciated Cllr. Fitzmaurice's views on designations, he explained that the Elected Members can only work with the information currently available and the current legislative position.

The Chief Executive said that various legal cases regarding infrastructural projects have proceeded to the European courts where it has not been determined that SAC's do not exist or have no standing in European Law. The Chief Executive advised the Elected Members that it is not open to the Elected Members to leave out reference to SPA's and SAC's as the Council would fail in their statutory duty to take account of statutory requirements. He explained if they were omitted from the Plan there could be a legal challenge to the Plan and /or a Direction from the Minister of the Environment, Community and Local Government. He said that if in due course, there is an outcome to the legal proceedings, which is different to the Planning Authorities understanding; the Planning Authority could re-examine the situation at that time.

The Chief Executive advised the Elected Members that the Draft Plan as it currently stands complies with the law regarding environmental designations and he strongly advised that the Elected Members continue with that approach and not effectively ignore the statutory position.

The Chief Executive advised that while the Planning Authority does not expect a positive outcome from the Proposals regarding derogations, they do not impact on the Draft Plan and, therefore, do not have the same effect.

In reply to Cllr. Cuniffe, Ms. McConnell advised that if Cllr. Fitzmaurice's proposal was passed the Draft Plan would be illegible as so many policies and text make reference to European designations.

Cllr. Cunniffe said that if the SAC designations' are not in law in Ireland and then this may be the Council's opportunity to deal with them. He said that there might be more interaction with the DoECLG if a Ministerial Direction was issued by them. He said while it may require additional work on the Plan, it may be a better Plan.

Cllr. McClearn advised that the proposals regarding the derogations have been accepted by the Elected Members but advised the Meeting that the Habitats Directive was adopted in Europe and transec into Irish law and explained that whether this was legal or not would be decided by the Courts in due course but it was not up to Galway County Council to decide. He said that he would respectfully suggest that the proposals regarding the derogations be pursued and if success was reached on those from the Minister of Environment, then it would provide the Council with a framework and advised that the Council should await the Courts outcome on the Habitats Directive.

Cllr. M. Connolly said that all law is based on justice which in this case is unjust and unworkable. He said that it is very hard to accept the designations and said the Habitats Directive was an unjust law.

Cllr. Charity queried how the Habitats Directive came into Irish law. He said that the legal case should have been circulated to the Elected Members prior to the Meeting as he said that the Elected Members were voting in the dark without having the necessary information.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice reiterated that following considerable research he has undertaken, he advised that he cannot find a cSAC (candidate Special Area of Conservation) or a SAC in Ireland as each SAC must have an individual Statutory Instrument and a complete Management Plan which must be undertaken within a 6 year timescale of the sites being designated by Europe.

Cllr. Feeney concurred and said the designations do pose difficulties but explained that the European Court of Justice ruling in respect of the Galway City Outer Bypass determined in favour of cSACs. He asked if the Court determines at a future date that the current legal position is flawed, is there an opportunity to review the County Development Plan.

The Cathaoirleach replied that if the County Development Plan is not adopted within two years from the adoption date of the current Plan, it becomes an Executive function.

Cllr. Mannion said that all the Elected Members agree that the designations should not be there but the Chief Executive Officer has advised the Members on the current position.

Cllr. Kearney said while he concurs with Cllr. Fitzmaurice that the SAC's affects the vast majority of the County, he said that this situation can only be agreed in a court of law and if it is determined that the SAC's are no longer valid, he said that the Planning Authority could re-examine the County Development Plan at that time but said that the issue is too serious for the Elected Members to vote on and asked Cllr. Fitzmaurice to withdraw his Motion.

Cllr. Fahy concurred with Cllr. Fitzmaurice and requested that legal advice is sought from the Council's Law Agent so the Elected Members are informed before any vote is taken on the motion. He expressed his concern that if a Plan was adopted without adhering to the Habitats Directive and a Ministerial Direction was issued by the Minister of Environment, Community

and Local Government regarding the Draft County Development Plan, then it would reflect poorly on the Council.

Comh. O'Tuairisg concurred with Cllr. Fitzmaurice as he lives in a SAC, but advised that the Members cannot preempt a court decision. He said that if the Courts rule against the Habitats Directive, the Minister of the DoECLG will have to re-examine the national position but currently, the Council must adopt a County Development Plan.

Cllr. McHugh advised the Meeting that it would pose great difficulty to the planning system if no County Development Plan was in place. He explained while he concurred with Cllr. Fitzmaurice's views, he said that the Habitats Directive can only be decided by a Court of Law and the Council could not adequately function without a County Development Plan.

Cllr. Noone said that the Clare River Drainage Scheme is being held up by a Statutory Instrument from Europe and said the Elected Members cannot remove the designations; we must await any court decision. He explained that the Motion proposed has no grounds and cannot be agreed.

The Chief Executive confirmed to the Meeting the County Development review process and advised that it must be complete within a 2 year period. He explained that if the Elected Members have not concluded the Plan process within 2 years, the Executive then finalise the Plan, taking as far as possible the Elected Members views into consideration. He said that there is a general consensus among the Elected Members regarding the effect of environmental designations on development in Galway and on individual people's lives and of their wish to have it addressed with a better methodology to deal with environmental designations.

The Chief Executive advised the Members that the adoption of the County Development Plan is one of the Elected Members most important statutory functions. He explained that ultimately the outcome will be that the Council will end up with a Development Plan that will reflect the current environmental designations and if this achieved within the 2 years timeframe, the Elected Members will adopt the Plan but if this is not achieved, it will fall to the Executive to finalise the Plan.

The Chief Executive explained that there may be other opportunities or methods to raise this issue but the only certainty is that currently the environmental designations are in place and must be reflected in the Plan and if at a future date they are removed or reshaped in any way, the Elected Members can restart the County Development Plan process or can do a Variation to take account of the new scenario.

In reply to Cllr. Fahy, the Chief Executive advised that the Planning Authority does not have any documentation in relation to the issue and the legal advice would be that the Elected Members should exercise their Reserved function in accordance with statutory requirements and having regard to the law as it currently stands and the environmental designations as they currently exist.

The Chief Executive advised that the Elected Members are required by law to have regard to Statute and Government policy and in his view, by agreeing the Motion would disregard national law and policy.

The County Secretary/Meetings Administrator advised the Meeting that in accordance with Standing Orders, if there is a Motion proposed with one Proposer and one Seconder, then the Motion must be voted on and said that the status of the Motion can be determined at a later date.

The Chief Executive advised that the legislation (Planning & Development Act 2000 as amended) states that the Elected Members in the Plan *‘shall also include a separate statement which shows that the development objectives in the development plan are consistent, as far as practicable, with the conservation and protection of the environment’* (Section 10 (1) (d)) and *“the conservation and protection of the environment including, in particular, the archaeological and natural heritage and the conservation and protection of European sites and any other sites .....”* (Section 10 (2) (c))

The Chief Executive advised that the proposals is in direct contrast to the statutory requirement on the Elected Members when adopting the Plan. He explained if the Resolution was passed, it will not carry any certainty as the Council will not have a Plan if those references are removed.

Cllr. McHugh advised the Meeting that the Council will not adhere to legislation if the proposal is passed so the proposal must be withdrawn or else a vote taken.

Cllr. Broderick concurred with Cllr. Fitzmaurice and said if there is a loophole there then perhaps the Council should be requesting the Government to make a decision on it.

Cllr. D. Connolly welcomed Cllr. Fitzmaurice’s research and knowledge and said he had huge merit in this argument. He said it relates to a question of interpretation and this may be a method of testing the validity of the interpretation as it may focus the DoECLG to bring this issue to finality.

Cllr. Charity asked for legal clarification on the issue before any decision is made by the Elected Members.

Cllr. Hynes said that while he was supportive of the proposal and was conscious of the grievances of the people and landowners re SAC designations, this is a legal matter which is open to legal interpretation.

Cllr. Welby concurred with Cllr. Fitzmaurice and said that the designations need to be examined and said that the Draft Plan with the amendments referring to the Habitats Directive should go on display as it may finalise this matter.

Ms. McConnell clarified to the Meeting that if the Plan is amended to remove reference to SAC/SPA’s then there will be unfinished sentences and sentences that make no sense in the Plan and the Executive would be unable to interpret the Elected Members intention.

Ms. McConnell explained that in the case of proposed amendments which would be a Material Alteration of the Draft Plan, the Planning Authority must determine if a Strategic Environmental Assessment or an Appropriate Assessment or both is/are required to be carried out on the proposed Material Alterations to the Draft Plan. She said that the Chief Executive, not later than 2 weeks after determination of whether an SEA or AA is required, shall specify such period as considered necessary, to facilitate these assessments, following the passing of



the Resolution to amend the Draft Plan. She said that the Material Alterations and the SEA/AA Reports are then put on public display.

Ms. McConnell explained that it would be very clear following the SEA assessment that the Plan could not proceed if the SPA/SAC's were removed as the Plan would not comply with the Habitats Directive. She said the Council would be back at the same position again but after using considerable time and resources. She said that the Elected Members cannot remove just text references to SAC/SPA's alone, as a SEA assessment of the proposed amendments must be undertaken and she clarified that she has no doubt the Plan could not be adopted as it would be contrary to legislation.

Cllr. Cuddy said that while he was conscious of the impact SAC designations have made and said an appeal of the law is required nationally, he advised that the Council must currently work within the confines of Irish, European and planning law until an outcome on the Habitats Directive is received.

Comh. Ó'Curaroin expressed his concern that the landowners were never engaged with regarding these designations and said that the law is flawed.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice clarified that there is no specific court case pending in relation to the Habitats Directive but that there are court cases pending in relation to different projects. He said that he did not wish to waste Council resources but that he has an obligation to stand up for his constituents.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that legal advice would be sought from the Council's Law Agent to determine if it is legally possible for Elected Members to take a vote on the Proposal.

Following legal advice, the Chief Executive said that the Council's Law Agent agreed that the position outlined to the Elected Members was clear. He said that the advice was that such a Motion would be contrary to the legislation outlined in the Planning & Development Acts and environmental legislation and contrary to the requirements of legislative provisions regarding the planning and sustainable development of an area in the preparation of the Development Plan. He said that notwithstanding that the Elected Members can consider the resolution and make a determination on it. He clarified that he would request further legal advice if the Resolution was carried to determine if the Planning Authority could carry into effect the Resolution as passed.

The Chief Executive advised that he has already outlined his clear view to the Elected Members and his advice that the Motion should not be passed. He said that the ultimate outcome is that the Council must have a County Development Plan that has regard to environmental designations as we have no choice under legislative requirements.

The Chief Executive read the Motion proposed by Cllr. Fitzmaurice. Cllr. Fitzmaurice said that he would remove the last line from the Motion.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. Canney, the following motion was proposed:***

***"that the County Development Plan to be completed and leaving out reference to SAC, SPA"***

*A vote was taken and the result was as follows;*

**AR SON:** Cllrs. Canney, D. Connolly, M. Connolly, Cronnelly, Comh. Ó'Curraoin, Cllrs. Fitzmaurice, Healy & Welby.

**[8]**

**AGHAIDH:** Cllrs. Burke, J. Byrne, Charity, Comh. Ó Cualáin, Cllrs. Cuddy, Cunniffe, Donnellan, Fahy, Feeney, G. Finnerty, M. Finnerty, Hoade, Kearney, Killilea, Kinane, Maher, Mannion, McClearn, K. Mc Hugh,, Rabbitte, Roche ,Thomas, Comh. Ó'Tuairisg & Walsh..

**[24]**

**GAN VOTÁIL:** Cllrs. Hynes & Keaveney **[2]**

**AS LÁTHAIR:** Cllrs. Broderick, N. Byrne, Donohue, T McHugh, & Noone **[5]**

*The Cathaoirleach declared the proposal not carried.*

*On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. Fahy, it was agreed:*

***“that Galway County Council request the Irish Government to seek an EU derogation on the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) so that the technical solutions to the flooding in South Galway be implemented”***

*A vote was taken and the result was as follows;*

**AR SON:** Cllrs. Broderick, Burke, J. Byrne, N. Byrne, Canney, Charity, D. Connolly, M. Connolly, Cronnelly, Comh. Ó Cualáin, Cllrs. Cuddy, Cunniffe, Comh. Ó'Curraoin, Cllrs. Donnellan, Fahy, Feeney, G. Finnerty, M. Finnerty, Fitzmaurice, Healy, Hoade, Hynes, Kearney, Killilea, Kinane, Maher, Mannion, McClearn, K. Mc Hugh, T McHugh, Noone, Rabbitte, Roche, Thomas, Comh. Ó'Tuairisg & Cllrs. Walsh & Welby.

**[37]**

**AGHAIDH:** **[0]**

**GAN VOTÁIL:** **[0]**

**AS LÁTHAIR:** Cllrs. Donohue & Keaveney **[2]**

*The Cathaoirleach declared the proposal carried.*

*On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. Donnellan, it was agreed:*

***“that Galway County Council request the Irish Government to seek an EU derogation on the EU Habitats Directive so that technical solution to Shannon Bank at Emerald Star Portumna (Portumna Bridge) be implemented”***

Cllr. Welby referred to the insertion of new Objective UH10 – Sequential Development and said that this should not apply to a person with a housing need applying for a one-off house. He referred to a case where an application was refused by An Bord Pleanála on the outskirts of a town. He asked that the wording ‘endeavour to’ be added to the start of the Objective.

With regard to Objective UHO 10 Sequential Development, Cllr. Feeney expressed the view that this Objective should not be too restrictive as some degree of flexibility is required here. Ms. McConnell advised that Sequential Development is a principle of proper planning and sustainable development and it is not meant to prohibit good development in its own right.

*On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Broderick, it was agreed to amend Objective UHO 10 as follows:*

***“Objective UHO 10-Sequential Development***

***“Endeavour to*** promote the orderly and phased development of residential development in accordance with the principles of the sequential approach and as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns & Villages) Guidelines 2009 (or as updated). This shall include a positive presumption in favour of the sequential development of

*suitably serviced Residential (Phase 1) lands in zoned towns and villages. In un-zoned towns and villages, the presumption shall be in favour of sequential development emanating from the town/village core outwards, subject to compliance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and the County Development Plan. **This Objective will not refer to single house build.***

Cllr. Feeney queried the Section 2.4.10 Residential Yield on Mixed Use Zonings and felt it was negative towards Town Centres. He said that the Plan should be encouraging business and people into the Town Centre. Ms. McConnell advised that this was included to reflect the current situation. She explained that an increase in residential yield could only be achieved by a decrease in residential zoned land.

Cllr. Feeney asked if commercial development applied for planning permission in a Town Centre that included a mix of residential development, would this be considered. In reply, Ms. McConnell advised that the text at Section 2.4.10 is a narrative on mix use zonings but the situation outlined could be considered.

Cllr. Feeney queried Objective R3 Retail Surveys & Strategy which outlined the Planning Authority's commitment to commence and complete a joint Retail Strategy with Galway City Council within 3 years, and asked how this may affect small Towns and Villages. He said that the Council cannot allow the City to dominate retail development as development is required within our own towns and villages in the County. In reply, Ms. McConnell stated that there is no adopted Retail Strategy in place and this places the Planning Authority in the vulnerable position when large out of town centre retail planning applications are received. She said that the Planning Authority will commence and complete a joint Retail Strategy in consultation with Galway City Council within 3 years and this will be good for the County and it will seek to protect the retail function of small towns and villages, and it will provide a framework from which planning decisions can be made.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 1.***

#### **Submission CDP 2 – West Regional Authority**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **West Regional Authority** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Feeney queried the industrial and business enterprise zones detailed part of the Core Strategy. He asked if those areas are the preferred areas for industrial development and if other areas outside of the core strategy will be subject to change. He commented that a lot of rural enterprise was as a result of local entrepreneurship which provided jobs in rural areas and he does not want to restrict and direct rural enterprise into zoned industrial lands within the settlements. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the West Regional Authority requested that the Planning Authority identify and detail, as part of the Core Strategy, where enterprise lands were and where they should be. She explained that the County Development Plan was intended as a high level strategic document and referred to Chapter 4 – Section 4.9 Rural Enterprise which sets out the principles to rural enterprise and said Objective EDT 11 and DM Standard 12 clarify what is acceptable but explained that this is not an exhaustive list

Cllr. Broderick referred to Section 4.9 Rural Enterprise in the Draft Development Plan and said that the Section was vague and not encouraging and asked that the last sentence be removed.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the last sentence of Section 4.9 could be removed as it is not the only reference in the Draft Plan and she referred the Members to the Economic Development & Tourism Objectives in the Draft Plan which outlines how the Plan will support Rural Enterprise.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that the Draft Plan is supportive of development in rural areas and also town centres. He said that the Draft Plan is seeking to bring clarity that development in rural area would not be at the expense of development in town centres, and same that some development is more appropriate to be located in town centres. He said that the Draft Plan is seeking to protect town centres and to locate town centre type of development in rural areas would only serve to undermine the viability of town centres.

Cllr. G. Finnerty explained that all town centres were dying due to out of town Shopping Centre and said that complementary shops should not be allowed to move to these shopping centres and it should be strictly only the large supermarket that should be allowed there. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that town centres are about services which include service industries, private offices, and community facilities in addition to retail outlets as these all contribute to the viability of town centres.

Cllr. J. Byrne advised that the vast majority of town centre trade depends on footfall and said that that out of town centre in Ballinasloe has impacted on the footfall in the town centre.

Cllr. McClearn said that if paid parking could be introduced in out-of-town Shopping Centres, this may seek to address the parking problem as the free parking offered by these out-of-town shopping centres provides a great advantage.

Cllr. Canney said while the installation of parking charges for out-of-town Shopping Centres cannot be done retrospectively, it should be considered for future developments.

Cllr. Walsh said that for a new business to start up there are additional costs if one was to move into town centre.

In reply to Cllr. Rabbitte, Ms. McConnell referred to Appendix F – Chapter 6 Water, Wastewater, Waste Management & Extractive Industry of the CEO report which covers in general the Water Services requirements. Ms. Mc Connell read Objectives WS 3 *Irish Water*, WS 4 *Provision of Water Services in Unserved Towns & Villages* and WS 5 *Water Safety Plan* from the revised Chapter 6 which was updated as a result of increased role of Irish Water in the delivery of water services as follows:

***“Objective WS 3 – Irish Water***

*Liaise with and advise Irish Water in identifying, prioritising and progressing the implementation of water projects throughout County Galway over the lifetime of the Plan.*

***Objective WS 4 – Provision of Water Services in Unserved Towns & Villages***

*Support the provision of water services infrastructure in unserved towns and villages to assist in the proper planning and sustainable development of the County.*

***Objective WS 5 – Water Safety Plan***

*Support the preparation of water safety plans for the protection of the major public water supply schemes in County Galway within the lifetime of the Plan”.*

Ms. Rabbitte was happy with these objectives.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Rabbitte, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, the following motion was proposed:***

*“that the Council would work with Irish Water to deal with inadequate water in Portumna and Woodford.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Rabbitte, seconded by Cllr. Burke, the following motion was proposed:***

*“that the Council would work with Irish Water to deal with inadequate wastewater in Woodford, Tynagh, Kiltormer and Eyrecourt”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Broderick, seconded by Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to amend the text in Section 4.9 Rural Enterprise as follows:***

***“4.9 Rural Enterprise***

*“There are over one hundred rural villages and settlements dispersed throughout the County, many of which are devoid of enterprise and suffering from economic and population decline. It is therefore desirable that small scale enterprises and community services are channelled into these locations where possible. Notwithstanding this, rural enterprises can be defined as business or small scale industrial projects or services which are related to normal rural activities and cater for the needs of a predominantly rural client base. It therefore may be practical to facilitate certain developments relating to agriculture, forestry, tourism, recreation and food production at rural locations outside of established towns and villages. However, the type of development permitted in rural areas cannot be such as to further threaten the viability of our settlements and town centres.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. O’Tuairisg, it was agreed to amend Objective EDT 11 – Rural Enterprise, as follows:***

***“Objective EDT 11 – Rural Enterprise***

*Consider the establishment of small scale rural orientated enterprises in unserved rural areas outside of town or village settings which can be accommodated in existing farm buildings or can be established on a brownfield site, subject to satisfying the following criteria:*

- *Compatibility and general suitability to an unserved rural area (primary consideration will be given to agriculture, renewable & marine resources, forestry, tourism, recreation or food production related enterprise activities and services).*
- ~~*Substantive demonstration that the proposed rural enterprise cannot be located in a small village or settlement.*~~
- *Scale of development (assimilate appropriately into a rural setting).*
- *Nature of development (raw materials sourced locally).*
- *Consideration of social and environmental impacts (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or rural amenity).*
- *The Enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard or have a major adverse Impact on the road network, road capacity and traffic levels (the enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard).*

- *Residential amenity (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity)."*

The Chief Executive referred to the proposed changes to EDT 11 – Rural Enterprise and advised that the proposed changes would lead to difficulty as individuals would expect that they would receive planning permission on any field and this was not the case. He explained that the Draft Plan was written to give certainty to individuals and said that the policies and objectives are positive in a realistic way to give certainty to those who invest their money in seeking planning permission. He explained that these proposed changes do not have regard to the wider planning and sustainable issues and it may lead one to believe that they will be more successful than they can be.

In reply to Cllr. Kearney who said that people who own land should be allowed to set up a rural enterprise other than be forced to move into town centre, the Chief Executive said that rural enterprise is often viewed differently by members of a community and there is limited success with applications referred to An Bord Pleanála. He said that the Plan is supportive of rural enterprise but the right balance must be achieved and residential amenity must be protected.

Cllr. O'Tuairisg asked if extensions for small industrial estates could be considered and mentioned an industry in Indreabhán which is continuously expanding. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that an established business would be considered in a positive way but it would be impossible to give absolute certainty at this point in time but such a proposal could be considered.

Cllr. Canney asked if favourable consideration would be given to an individual who wished to use an unused building to set up a business.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Canney, seconded by Cllr. Fitzmaurice, the following motion was proposed:***

*"that Galway County Development Plan supports the conversion of existing farm buildings into commercial centres to promote economic development in Rural Areas."*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell said this scenario was covered in Objective EDT11.

Cllr. Canney referred to rural Post Offices and said the Council should recognise the importance of Post Offices. In reply, Ms. McConnell said this would be referred to the SEO in Community & Enterprise Section. Cllr. Broderick said that it was important that the Council supports rural areas to make them more sustainable and viable.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Canney, seconded by Cllr. Broderick, it was agreed to amend Section 10.7 Community Facilities and Service to include the following sentence:***

*"that Galway County Council supports the retention of rural Post Offices which are a vital service for the rural people".*

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, the following motion was proposed in relation to the addition of a new Section 11.3.7:***

*"That considering the strength of beef production's role in County Galway's economy, we recognize that all been produced in Ireland is to be regarded as beef of Irish origin and a food of highest quality."*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell agreed to have this Motion noted but it was not appropriate to include it in the Draft Plan.

Ms. McConnell advised the Meeting that it is stated in the Guidance for Executive and Elected Members that issues should be relative to the actual functions of the local authority and said where the local authority doesn't have a role, there is very little that can be achieved. She explained that the Draft Development Plan is a strategic plan which outlines a vision for the County going forward and is not a statement of belief but it is a physical, environmental, cultural and social blueprint.

Cllr. Feeney referred to proposed new Objective DS12 Service Led Development and expressed his concern that Irish Water's infrastructural priorities may not be in line with Galway County Council's infrastructural priorities. He queried if Waste Water Treatment Plants were permitted in the Draft County Development Plan. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the proposed Objective DS12 is not intended to restrict development to connect to a public system but that it allows Galway County Council to consider developments who wish to provide their own proper Waste Water Treatment system. She said this Objective (DS12) is to provide clarity for the Planning Authority to substantiate a request for planning permission where they propose to either connect to an existing supply or provide their own Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Cllr. Welby referred to Objective DS 12 Service Led Development which seems to be very restrictive. He said that the flexibility referred to is not evident in the wording of the Objective.

Cllr. Healy expressed concerns regarding the text contained in Objective DS12 and proposed that some exceptions are added.

Cllr. Canney also referred to Objective DS 12 Service Led Development and highlighted there was no reference to Irish Water and their role in this Plan. He advised that An Bord Pleanála refused planning permission for a development in Corofin citing the development was premature until a Waste Water Treatment Plant was in place. Cllr. Canney said the lack of a Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) in Corofin will restrict development but said he cannot see a WWTP being provided in Corofin in the foreseeable future. He asked that the Council direct Irish Water to provide waste water treatment facilities in areas with a population of 100 persons or more. He said that Irish Water should be included in the Plan as they have a huge part to play. He also noted that Irish Water made no Submission on the Draft Plan.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the proposed Objective DS 12 – Service led Development is not intended to limit development to where a public supply is in existence. She said that consideration will be given to a development if it can demonstrate that it can adequately supply the development and it can treat effluent to a suitable standard.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was proposed to amend Objective DS12 – Service Led Development as follows:***  
***“Objective DS12 – Service Led Development***



*Development shall only be permitted where there is satisfactory water and wastewater provision to service same. **In cases where existing infrastructure is not of a satisfactory standard, development will not be impeded on account of the government's failure to ensure that infrastructure is available** ~~either existing or to be provided in tandem with the development.~~*

*This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.*

*On the proposal of Cllr. Feeney, seconded by Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to amend the new Objective DS 12 – Service Led Development as follows:*

**“Objective DS12 – Service Led Development**

*“Development shall only be permitted where there is satisfactory water and wastewater provision to service same, either existing or to be provided by the applicant in tandem with the development.”*

In respect of Irish Water, Ms. McConnell explained that Irish Water was consulted as part of the Development Plan process but no submission was received. She explained that the legislation sets out that Irish Water must have regard to the Policies and Objectives in the Draft Plan and to where future development will or intends to happen. She advised that the Council cannot direct Irish Water to say where services should go but Irish Water must have regard to development as set out in the Core Strategy.

*On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. Canney, it was agreed to add a Policy WS2 – Irish Water and Rural Towns and Villages as follows:*

**“Policy WS 2 – Irish Water and Rural Towns and Villages**

*Galway County Council will work with Irish Water to provide proper Water and Waste water facilities in rural towns and villages”*

Cllr. Welby referred to Objective DS7 Flood Risk Management and Assessment and the CFRM's (Catchment Flood Risk Management Plan's) and said that the Council is currently working off draft OPW maps and these draft maps have errors and the Planning Authority is using these maps for planning decisions and said that these maps should not be taken into account for Local Area Plans or planning decisions. In reply, Ms. McConnell agreed that the CFRMs are still in draft form but that the Planning Authority must have regard to these draft flood zones and if an area is represented as a flood risk, it is incumbent on the Planning Authority to investigate it in order to protect landowners/ future applicants. She explained that in respect of Local Area Plans, the areas identified as flood risk are not wholly accepted and additional investigations are undertaken e.g. site walkovers etc are carried out.

Cllr. Welby queried Riparian Zones and asked if the distance from a water course is definable as he would have concern that this could take in a huge amount of land. He expressed his concern that this could be seen as open ended in respect of SAC designations as the Riparian zone could be extremely wide in some areas. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that while there is a legal definition, a definitive width is not given as each area could be quite different e.g. a stream in contrast to a major water source and it depends on a particular water source and how it floods. With regard to the onus on an applicant, she said that this would occur only when it might hinder a development and would be considered on a case by case basis as it is not possible to provide one width for every Riparian zone.

Cllr. Broderick referred to Section 4.11 – Major Accident & Seveso sites. He queried if the landfill at Kilconnell is included as it impacts on the environment and individual's lives and



expressed his concern if a major leakage occurred at this site. In response, Ms. McConnell explained that Seveso Sites were defined in European legislation and were restrictive sets of criteria and advised that the Planning Authority is advised of these sites by the Health & Safety Authority.

Cllr. Broderick referred to Broadband facilities and said that much of the County is void of Broadband facilities. In reply, Ms. McConnell referred the Members to Objective ICT 1 – Facilitate the Delivery of Telecommunications, Broadband and Digital Infrastructure which deals with Broadband facilities.

Cllr. Thomas asked if development was only permitted in tandem with the provision of waste water facilities, as this is in conflict with DM Standard 28: Water Supply. Cllr. Thomas read DM Standard 28 from the Draft Plan to the Meeting.

*“The provision of a safe and reliable water supply is a requirement of development. Where a site is served by mains water, a connection must be made and a bored well is not permitted. If the water is supplied by a group water scheme, any planning application must be accompanied by a letter of consent to connection from the secretary of the scheme and in certain circumstances; the developer may be required to extend the main to the site. Where a bored well is necessary, details of separation distances from treatment systems shall be in compliance with the standards in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Code of Practice for Wastewater Treatment Systems for Single Dwellings.*

***Private Bore Holes*** should comply with the Guidelines from Institute of Geologist of Ireland publication ‘Water Well Construction’ [www.igi.ie](http://www.igi.ie)

*The following should be submitted to the Planning Authority:*

- *A record of an appropriate test of the sustainable yield of the well;*
- *Documentation of the well construction, its yield and its water quality including a list of tested chemical and bacteriological parameters.”*

Cllr. Thomas proposed that a change is made to DM28.

Cllr. Thomas referred to Objectives WS12 Adequate Provision & Supply of Drinking Water, WS13 Connection to Public Water Supplies and WS 14 Private Water Supply. He asked that discretion be given to individuals to bore wells as a lot of areas have an inadequate water supply and should be entitled to bore a well, provided the person has included a proper treatment system. He said that currently if development is near a public water supply, than one cannot drill a well unless the public supply is inadequate. He said that not everyone wants to use the public system and one should have the option to bore their own well.

In reply, Ms. McConnell advised where a public water supply is available, potential development would be required to connect to the public supply but said that a Group Water Scheme or bored well may be accepted once water can be adequately treated. She said that while the Objective is mandatory, the Development Management Standard 28 could be applied flexibly. She advised that the policy of Galway County Council would be that development connects to the public water supply if one is available and that refers to all water usages and the Planning Authority would seek to apply this policy with regard to public water supply.

Cllr. Feeney concurred with Cllr. Thomas but asked is there a provision in the Sanitation Acts that compels one to join a public water supply. In response, the Chief Executive said that Galway County Council policy would be where a public water supply is available, persons

would connect to it so as to ensure public health and water standards are achieved and maintained.

The Chief Executive advised that removal of the requirement to connect to a public supply, it could affect the investment opportunity from Irish Water. He said Irish Water could question the policy as consideration would be required by them to ascertain if it would be viable for them to provide extensions to the public water schemes where there is complete discretion on households to connect to them.

Cllr. Thomas said that it actually costs more to bore a well and install one's own treatment system plus also there is a maintenance cost but it should be an option for people. He said that developers will not take on the responsibility of installing meters and taking responsibility for the water and human health of the occupants. He explained that local community groups such as the GAA are very reluctant to use a bored well system as it is a huge health responsibility.

Ms. McConnell said that minimum distances must be maintained in respect of multiple single houses served by wells and septic tanks and this would in effect limit the amount of houses in an area.

Cllr. D. Connolly said that careful consideration must be given so as not to place more conditions on people living in rural areas. He said that many farming households must bore their own well but if Objective WS13 and Objective WS14 are made mandatory, it may put a double cost on farming households, as they will have to sign up to the Irish Water contract and the cost to bore a well and install a treatment system. He said while he appreciated the CEO's advice, he would concur with Cllr. Thomas as the Council should not be over prescriptive in their objectives.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that in the approach of any County Development Plan, one wants the greatest amount of certainty for planning applicants and the objectives in the Draft Plan meant that people understood they would need to connect to a public water supply if available. He explained that the removal of this Objective would lead to a more discretionary status and it would remove the certainty as the applicant may want to use their private water but a difficulty could arise with An Bord Pleanála and the servicing of development. He said that the Plan allows for development to be serviced by public supply or other if a public supply is not available. He said the proposed amendments may lead to less certainty as people may apply and not get planning permission.

Cllr. M. Connolly concurred with the Chief Executive but said the persons who do not have proximity to a public water supply or who may have been refused a connection by a local Group Water Scheme (GWS), as many GWS's pick and choose their clients, need the flexibility in the Plan to be able to bore a well. Ms. McConnell clarified that this was already in the Draft Plan that one could bore a well, where a public supply is not available.

Cllr. D. Connolly said that applicants could be advised at pre-planning meetings the options they have regarding water supply.

Ms. McConnell read Objective WS 12 – Adequate Provision & Supply of Drinking Water which states “*Ensure that new developments are adequately serviced with a suitable quantity*

*and quality of drinking water supply and require that all new developments provide for water supply metering”.*

Cllr. Thomas proposed that Objectives WS12 and WS14 be amended and WS 13 be removed and a text change to be applied to DM Standard 28.

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend the following DM Standard 28 as follows:***

**DM Standard 28: Water Supply**

*“The provision of a safe and reliable water supply is a requirement of development.*

*~~Where a site is served by mains water, a connection must be made and a bored well is not permitted.~~ If the water is supplied by a group water scheme, any planning application must be accompanied by a letter of consent to connection from the secretary of the scheme and in certain circumstances; the developer may be required to extend the main to the site. Where a bored well is necessary **or more feasible**, details of separation distances from treatment systems shall be in compliance with the standards in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Code of Practice for Wastewater Treatment Systems for Single Dwellings.*

***Private Bore Holes*** should comply with the Guidelines from Institute of Geologist of Ireland publication ‘Water Well Construction’ [www.igi.ie](http://www.igi.ie)

*The following should be submitted to the Planning Authority:*

- *A record of an appropriate test of the sustainable yield of the well;*
- *Documentation of the well construction, its yield and its water quality including a list of tested chemical and bacteriological parameters.*
- ***A detailed account of the water treatment system that will be installed if necessary”***

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend the following Objective WS 12 – Adequate Provision & Supply of Drinking Water as follows:***

**Objective WS 12 – Adequate Provision & Supply of Drinking Water**

*“Ensure that new developments are adequately serviced with a suitable quantity and quality of drinking water supply and require that all new developments provide for water supply metering **when making a connection to the public water supply.**”*

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to remove the following Objective WS 13 – Connection to Public Water Supplies as follows:***

**~~“Objective WS 13 – Connection to Public Water Supplies~~**

**~~Require new developments to connect to public water supplies where services are available.”~~**

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend the following Objective WS 14 – Adequate Provision & Supply of Drinking Water as follows:***

**“Objective WS ~~14~~ **13** – Private Water Supply**

*It is an objective of the Council that where there is no public water supply, ~~where connection to a public water supply is not possible, or the existing supply does not have sufficient capacity,~~ **or where the property owner wishes not to consume the water from the public supply**, then the provision of a private water supply will be permitted, only where it can be demonstrated that the proposed water supply meets the standards set out in the EU and national legislation and guidance including adherence to Article 6 of the EU Habitats Directive, and would not be prejudicial to public health or would not significantly impact negatively on the source or yield of an existing supply.”*

Cllr. D. Connolly said that he was aware of three areas, Liskelly/Killinhowan, Cush, and Kilreekil that have no water supply at all as due to lack of resources these projects have not progressed. He expressed his concern with Irish Water and their lack of communication. He said that a proposal needs to be considered for these communities that the Elected Members represent. He said that Uisce Eireann (Irish Water) has a responsibility and the Council should expect them to meet their responsibility. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the previous Policy (PS2) proposed by Cllr. Canney and agreed would adequately cover that scenario. Ms. McConnell read new Policy WS 2 previously agreed by the Members

***“Policy WS 2 – Irish Water and Rural Towns and Villages***

*Galway County Council will work with Irish Water to provide proper Water and Waste water facilities in rural towns and villages”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was proposed to add the following text to Chapter 6:***

***Chapter 6 – Water, Wastewater, Waste Management & Extractive Industry***

*“That Galway County Council recognizes the need for areas such as Liskelly/Killinhowan, Cush, and Kilreekill throughout our county as being in immediate need of having a quality supply and request Uisce Eireann to move urgently to address this issue.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell advised that this proposal would be more appropriate as a Notice of Motion as it could not be written in as a Policy into the County Development Plan.

The Chief Executive advised that the Council can seek to influence and work with Irish Water but the Council cannot direct them. He clarified that any Policy or Objective should be general in nature.

Cllr. Broderick queried if the County Development Plan would supercede Irish Water’s Plan and if they made a Submission on the Draft Plan. In reply, Ms. McConnell advised that Section 2.4 Core Strategy in the County Development Plan sets out the priorities for growth and development and includes a Table highlighting the deficiencies in water and waste water. She said that it was a legal requirement for Irish Water to have regard to the Core Strategy. She said that Irish Water did not make a submission on the Draft Plan. She said that Irish Water is obliged to work with Galway County Council.

Cllr. Rabbitte queried what template Irish Water will use in their planning if towns and villages cannot be listed in the Draft Plan and expressed her concern that communities were omitted from the list.

Cllr. Cuddy said that Irish Water are a statutory body and are working on a cost-benefit analysis method working off the principle, income versus provision of a service.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that Irish Water is a public utility. He said that in essence, the Draft Plan seeks to include supportive policies and objectives to facilitate water and wastewater facilities anywhere in the County. He explained that there was a statutory obligation on Irish Water to have regard to the National Spatial Strategy, Regional Planning Guidelines and individual Local Authorities County Development Plans. He said that Irish Water would also have other parameters to take into account when undertaking their planning such as strategic need and environmental parameters not being met. He said that significant amendments were made to Chapter 6 which included the insertion of a Table to highlight the Water Supply Investment Programme to reflect the current priorities on stream. He explained

that the essence of the Plan is to support any proposed projects. He said if a project is not on the list, it can still be considered. He said that while he appreciated the Elected Members concerns, the Plan is generally supportive and asked that the Elected Members reflect on the way the Plan is written.

In reply to Cllr. Rabbitte, the Chief Executive advised that the inclusion of towns and villages is only adding a 'wishlist'. He said that by increasing the list, it is effectively reducing the effectiveness of the priority. He said that the Council would work with Irish Water to work on the priorities and the aim would be to support the Plan. He said that he expected that Irish Water will first seek to address the deficiencies in the high level towns, as shown in the hierarchy of towns listed in the Core Strategy, except where environmental issues are to be addressed. He said that he didn't accept that there was nothing for the smaller communities but their inclusion in the Plan is not going to advance their case any further or move them up the priority listing.

The Chief Executive advised that Table 6.2: Water Supply Projects Proposed to be Completed in County Galway under the WSIP (2010-2013) was compiled in conjunction with the proposed Capital Investment Plan 2014-2016

Cllr. McClearn advised whether included or not, irrespective of the Plan, there is a requirement to comply with European and EPA Directives in relation to drinking water and said if there is a problem with a water supply, its exclusion from the Plan does not mean that it will not be dealt with.

Mr. Cullen advised the Meeting that the Water and Waste Water Infrastructure Chapter should be a broad statement for the protection of public health, environment and economic development and not specific as the Members are suggesting. He explained that Irish Water will determine the priorities and there is no guarantee that an area will receive water/waste water facilities just by being mentioned in the Development Plan. He said the County Development Plan never previously included an extensive list of projects to be pursued as this is a separate piece of work.

In reply to Comh. O'Tuairisg, Mr. Cullen advised the Meeting that the Council will work with Irish Water to address the inadequacy of drinking water on the Islands.

***On the proposal of Comh. O'Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to include the following new Policy WS6 - Water Supply on the Islands:***

***"Policy WS 6-Water Supply on the Islands***

***That Galway County Council work with Irish Water to address the existing inadequacy of water supply on the Aran Islands."***

Cllr. Mannion asked why 'community gain' was omitted from Objective SS7 Development of Small Settlements.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Mannion, seconded by Cllr. Maher, it was agreed to leave Objective SS7 – Development of Small Settlements as outlined in the Draft Plan as follows: "Objective SS 7- Development of Small Settlements***

***In the case of smaller settlements for which no specific plans are available, development shall be considered on the basis of its connectivity, capacity (including social, cultural, economic, infrastructural and environmental capacity) and compliance with the Core***

*Strategy and Settlement Strategy, good design, “community gain” and proper planning and sustainable development.”*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 2.***

**Submission CDP 3 – The Minister for the Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **The Minister for the Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 3.***

**Submission CDP 4 – The Minister for the Communications, Energy & Natural Resources**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **The Minister for the Communications, Energy & Natural Resources** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 4.***

**Submission CDP 5– The Minister for Education & Science**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Minister for Education & Science** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 5.***

**Submission CDP 6 – An Taisce**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **An Taisce** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. G. Finnerty referred to the new Objective WW 9 – Integrated Constructed Wetlands and asked if this Objective would be forced on farm families. In reply, Ms. McConnell said this was a very sustainable way of treating contaminated water as ponds naturally cleanse water better in ways than a treatment plant. She said that farm families would not be forced to use this method but the Planning Authority would support the construction of these constructed wetlands as an alternative.

Cllr. J. Byrne referred to Policy NHB3 Green Infrastructure and asked if other green infrastructure issues could be included. In reply, Ms. McConnell said it was best to leave as ‘green infrastructure’.

**Submission CDP 7– Dublin Airport Authority**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Dublin Airport Authority** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 7.***

**Submission CDP 8 – Eirgrid**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Eirgrid** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Kearney said that there was planning delays for individuals seeking planning for individual turbines. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that a lot of Strategic Infrastructure is dealt with by An Bord Pleanala but that there would be no delay on the part of Galway Council as they have no part to play.

Cllr. Feeney referred to the now public preferred route of the high capacity power circuit linking the Bellacorrick area in Co. Mayo to Flagford in Co. Roscommon and whether in addition to this route, there was provision for the other route to Cashla, Co. Galway in the County Development Plan, that is, is there land set aside or a route identified on a map.

Ms. McConnell advised that while the Flagford route is the preferred route, that Eirgrid felt that reference to Cashla should be included in the Development Plan as, if economic activity increased, there would be a requirement for a second line into the National Grid. She explained that the Council were not asked to reserve land at this point and that reference within the text of the Development Plan was sufficient.

Cllr. Feeney referred to Appendix J - Energy Transmission Infrastructure Map of the CEO Report and asked if Gridwest have decided if the line is to terminate at Flagford and said more clarity is required. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that while Flagford is the preferred route, there may be a second line and it would be to Cashla. She referred to Objective ICT 2 – Assimilation of Telecommunications Infrastructure into the Landscape and said that this Objective recognises high scenic amenity areas and looks at the visual impact of the infrastructure and said it would proceed with great caution and have regard to landscape but ultimately it would be an An Bord Pleanala decision.

Cllr. Cuddy said that free range should not be given to Eirgrid to put masts where they want as they should not be sited near houses but said as An Bord Pleanala grants these permissions, Galway County Council has no say but the County Development Plan should safeguard local landowners.

In reply to Cllr. K. McHugh, Ms. McConnell said that Eirgrid and Wind Energy are unrelated as Eirgrid deals with transmission infrastructure.

Cllr. Canney asked if it was appropriate to ask Eirgrid to put down underground lines. Cllr. McClearn said while the proximity of masts to houses caused great concern, he said that there was little point in trying to formulate a County Development Plan and try to facilitate development in Galway if we don't support infrastructure to support this development. He said that underground lines would not happen and it would only delay projects. He said that the placing of high tension lines underground would be an astronomical cost of which there is no merit and said if the Council needs infrastructure, placing of lines underground would not be a realistic option.



Cllr. D. Connolly referred to Section 7.4.5 Bioenergy and said that an anaerobic digestion system might be viable as it is promoted by SEAI for biogas. In reply, Ms. Mc. Connell said while anaerobic digestion was not specified, Objective ER 4 – Renewable Energy supported and facilitated the development and use of renewable energy sources and associated infrastructure within the County, and said the list was not exhaustive. She said that this Objective would allow for other fuels and anaerobic digestion is covered under the bio-energy term.

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed that the term ‘Anaerobic Digestion’ be specifically mentioned in Objective ER4 – Renewable Energy.***

***“Objective ER 4 – Renewable Energy***

*1. Support and facilitate the development and use of renewable energy sources and associated infrastructure within the County, including*

- *Wind Energy;*
- *Wave/Tidal Energy;*
- *Hydro-Power;*
- *Solar Energy;*
- *Bio-Energy,*
- *Geo-Thermal*
- *Combined Heat Power (CHP);*
- *Heat Energy Distribution (such as District Heating/Cooling Systems);*
- *Anaerobic Digestion and*
- *Other renewable energy sources, as appropriate and in line with national guidelines for sustainable development. “*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was agreed to add a new Policy to Section 7.7 Information & Communications Technology as follows:***

***“Policy ICT 3-Broadband Infrastructure***

*Galway County Council will regularly audit existing broadband infrastructure in Galway County and will highlight areas which are structurally weak in the availability of this infrastructure. Galway County Council in recognition of ICT infrastructure as being socially and economically vital will endeavor to promote the use of existing infrastructure that is underutilized and make the promotion of ICT related activity in the County a priority for all Council development related forums.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, the following motion was proposed:***

*“Galway County Council will support and facilitate citizens to interact with the Council online. A strategy will be designed to maximize the council’s online presence and services with an emphasis on increasing customer satisfaction and achieving process efficiencies. In compliance with the government’s e-Payments policy, the Council online strategy will enact and promote online payments to and from citizens and other stakeholders.”*

***This proposal was not agreed.***

The Chief Executive said while he appreciated Cllr. Healy’s point, he advised that this proposal was more a customer service/customer action plan related proposal.

***It was agreed that the Proposal be referred for consideration on the Review of the Corporate Plan/Customer Service Action Plans.***



*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 8.*

**Submission CDP 9– Environmental Protection Agency**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Environmental Protection Agency** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. G. Finnerty referred to new Section 4.12.4 The Wild Atlantic Way and asked that an alternative route from Gort is noted which could take in Coole Park and Kilmaduagh. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the Plan is supportive of the creation of loops off the Wild Atlantic Way but an alternative Wild Atlantic Way could not be set up.

*On the proposal of Cllr. G. Finnerty, seconded by Cllr. Byrne, it was agreed that Section 4.12.3 The Wild Atlantic Way be amended as follows:*

**"4.12.3 The Wild Atlantic Way**

***The Wild Atlantic Way is an important gateway through Co. Galway. One of the major aspirations of the Connemara Infrastructure & Interpretation Plan 2012 ~~mentioned~~ plan is to integrate the Galway coastline which runs from Leenane to Kinvara into the wider Wild Atlantic Way project. In addition the N18 Kilcolgan to Gort road through Ardrahan – Labane could be listed as a loop route off the Wild Atlantic Route and can link back to the Wild Atlantic Way at Kinvara by Tierneevan – Kilmacduagh. It is envisaged as part of this project that there will be a host of discovery points at various intervals around the coastline of the County. These discovery points will be appropriately equipped to provide tourists with the opportunity to intimately explore the history, culture and wildlife of each locality.***"

*On the proposal of Cllr. Cunniffe, seconded by Cllr. Charity, it was agreed to add new text to the new Objective EDT 24 – Wild Atlantic Way as follows:*

**"Objective EDT 24 – Wild Atlantic Way**

***Support and facilitate the Wild Atlantic Way project in conjunction with the relevant stakeholders and Galway County Council will actively encourage the creation of spurs to link in with the Wild Atlantic as was intended.***"

Cllr. McClearn proposed that the Council support and develop tourism in the rest of the County as he said that Fáilte Ireland have stated that it was up to each community to tease out the benefit from the Wild Atlantic Way. He said that the South, East and North of the County are forgotten about by Fáilte Ireland and a County Tourism strategy is required.

Cllr. Healy said there should be a balance between tourism and industry around the County.

Cllr. Byrne said that the Wild Atlantic Way is a serious opportunity for tourism and he felt that the opportunity could be missed by how South Galway is dealt with. He said that €1.8m funding has gone to Connemara and asked that Galway County Council consult with Fáilte Ireland to seek additional funding. In addition, he asked that a Burren Lowland Geo Park be considered for South Galway where a landscape be developed similar to Co. Clare who received major funding towards this tourism initiative.

In reply, Ms. McConnell said that it was her understanding that Galway County Council was involved in the Burren GeoPark as part of North Kinvara is included. Ms. McConnell said

that the Council would support any development but the Council would not be undertaking any development itself.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed to amend Section 4.12.5 – The Burren, to include the following text as follows:***

*“That Galway County Council support the development of a Burren Lowlands Geopark which would support people and organizations in South/East Galway to ensure a cared for landscape, a better understood heritage and sustainable tourism.”*

***This proposal was subsequently WITHDRAWN (at the Meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014) and a new proposal agreed following consideration of CDP27 Burren Lowlands Development Group.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed to amend Section 4.12.5 – The Burren, to include the following text:***

***“4.12.5 The Burren***

*The Burren is a major tourism, landscape, heritage and cultural asset in south County Galway and north County Clare and is on the tentative list of sites for Unesco World Heritage Site Status. Its unique character which has evolved over many millennia, owing to the complex interaction of geology and physical landscape, natural beauty, wildlife, monuments and culture, makes it one of Europe's most cherished landscapes. The Burren Charter, which is a community led charter supported by the two local authorities is actively promoting the tourism, cultural and landscape assets of the Burren. Galway County Council will support the development of a Burren Lowlands Geopark which would support people and organizations in South/East Galway to ensure a cared for landscape, a better understood heritage and sustainable tourism.”*

Cllr. O’Tuairisg expressed that the Clonbur, Corr na Mona area would be the most varied and interesting area for a Geo Park. In response, Ms. McConnell clarified that the requirement for a GeoPark must come from the people involved i.e. the ground upwards as it is not a designation that the Council can develop but the Council would be supportive of developments.

***On the proposal of Cllr. O’ Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to Amend Section 4.12.2 Connemara Tourism to include the following text”***

***“4.12.2 Connemara Tourism***

*Tourism infrastructure and facilities in the County ..... in conjunction with Galway County Council through the Connemara Infrastructure and Interpretation Plan 2012. Galway County Council supports the development of a Geo Park in the Clonbur area.”*

Cllr. Rabbitte referred to EDT 22 East Galway, Lough Derg & The Burren and the setting up of an East Galway Tourism Board and Section 4.12.4 East Galway Tourism and said that the Council needs to be proactive and bring in mechanisms to encourage tourism. The Chief Executive concurred but said further consideration needs to be given as to how best this could be done as a local structure could not be set up without local consideration/consultation. Cllr. Rabbitte referred to Section 4.12.4 (2<sup>nd</sup> line) East Galway Tourism, and said the Council must have a strong say and be able to work with North Tipperary County Council and Clare County Council who are keen drivers and said it was vital that there was a link in East Galway.

Cllr. Mannion asked about a Tourism Board in Connemara.

Cllr. Fahy referred to a Lough Derg Group that consisted of Elected Members from Loughrea, North Tipperary and Clare but this Group has now faded away.

Cllr. Feeney asked if a Committee was established under the Community & Enterprise Section if it would make a huge difference.

The Chief Executive said that the setting up of a new Tourist Boards could be considered by the Economic Development SPC but it was not appropriate in the Development Plan. He advised that it would require further consideration and also consultation with the necessary stakeholders such as the Tourism Authority.

Cllr. McClearn agreed that the Council has a responsibility to promote Co. Galway but asked how this will be funded or how it would operate. He said there is a National Agency that has the brief and the budget and said that the three areas (South/East/North) mentioned should work together to ensure all areas are recognized as all three areas have their own unique qualities. He said that the Council does not have the resources and that the infrastructure is not in the areas and what is required is pressure to be placed on Fáilte Ireland to support tourism in these areas of Galway.

Cllr. Welby concurred with Cllr. Rabbitte and said that we need to get involved and said there was a lot of poor towns also in Connemara and said perhaps if Galway was looked at on a regional basis e.g. South Galway, Connemara etc. He said that the Council needs to work on our strengths collectively and the Economic SPC should examine this in more detail and get strong sustainable groups to work together to develop regional identities which are collectively strong.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice concurred and said that North East Galway should also be included and it should be a vision for all areas of the County so as to give all areas a fair chance.

Cllr. K. McHugh said that each area has something to offer and Tuam has a rich history also.

Comh. O'Tuairisg concurred and said that every region has its good points.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the consensus was that a sub-Committee of the Tourism Group be set up and she suggested that this should be progressed through the Economic SPC.

In reply to Cllr. M. Connolly, Ms. McConnell said that the Economic Strategy to be developed will have tourism at its heart and the Economic Development SPC can focus on developing tourism niches.

Comh. O'Tuairisg said that there was different tourism requirements within Galway and these should be developed such as yachts/marine and deep sea angling. He said that while the West and the Islands have a lot of tourist visitors as day trips, the spending power is felt in Galway City rather than Connemara.

Cllr. Feeney proposed that it be included in the text that Galway County Council be the lead for tourism. He said that areas of importance need to be highlighted and he referred to a recent Forum which listed only one place of interest in the Claregalway to Mount Talbot area.

He said that communities should be asked to supply that information as all communities have a tourism interest list and hidden interests but these are not listed anywhere.

In reply, Ms. McConnell said that this is covered in Policies EDT 5 County Tourism and EDT 6 Tourism Product.

***On the proposal of Cllr. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. Feeney, it was proposed to add the following text to Section 4.12 Tourism:***

*“that the Galway County Development Plan will support the development of tourism throughout County Galway.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Rabbitte, it was agreed to amend Section 4.12.1 Introduction to include the following text:***

***“4.12.1 Introduction***

*The importance of the tourism industry to the local economy of Galway is significant. Recently ..... The success of ‘The Gathering Ireland 2013’ campaign at national level is testament to what can be achieved around a good tourism product and it is against this backdrop that tourism in County Galway must build going forward. Galway County Council shall create strong geographical regions to try and maximize economic return to the County from tourist and recreational activity.”*

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó Curraóin, seconded by Comh. Ó Cualain, it was agreed to include the following Tourism Policy (similar to Policy ED 27 - Tourism Policies in the current Development Plan):***

*“that the development and amenities at Bearna Golf and Country Club remain as outlined in the 2009-2015 County Development Plan”*

The Chief Executive advised that the current objectives on tourism in the Draft Plan would cover this. He said that this was removed following a lot of discussion over a long period. He explained that for environmental reasons it was not possible for this development to go ahead and said while this proposal might give the landowner some comfort, it may not be achievable.

Cllr. Welby referred to AFF8 Aquaculture and said we should exclude text “and any National Strategic Aquaculture Plans or policies”. He said he has no problem with the additional text.

Ms. McConnell said that it was not legally allowable to include an objective that has a negative connotation. In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell said that the local authority does not have any jurisdiction regarding permits or granting of licences or regulation of offshore farming practices.

Cllr. Thomas referred to AFF8 Aquaculture and asked that additional wording be added. He said that environmental regulations have impacted on fish farms in an area but many areas need them. He said that gradually fish farms should move onshore and preference given to areas who haven’t gained from fish farming already.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Canney, it was agreed to omit the following text proposed to be included Objective AFF8 – Aquaculture:***

***“Objective AFF 8 – Aquaculture***

*The Council shall support and promote the sustainable development of the aquaculture sector and any National Strategic Aquaculture Plans or policies, in order to maximise its contribution to employment creation and growth in coastal communities whilst balancing environmental considerations.”*

***On the proposal of Comh. O’Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. M. Connolly, it was agreed to add the following text to Objective AFF8 – Aquaculture:***

***“Objective AFF 8 – Aquaculture***

*The Council shall support and promote the sustainable development of the aquaculture sector in order to maximize its contribution to employment creation and growth in coastal communities whilst balancing environmental considerations. Special consideration should be made to gradually enforce a policy that would encourage onshore fish farming practices and special consideration preference would be given when granting planning for on shore farms to areas that are already involved in the fish farming industry.”*

Cllr. M. Connolly referred to Objective NHBP9 Peatlands and said legal advice is required. Cllr. Fitzmaurice concurred with Cllr. M. Connolly and said that new legislation is over a year away. Cllr. McClearn concurred and said that the Council cannot support a strategy that is not yet adopted and said that he has no confidence in the National Peatlands Council as they do not have the welfare of the people at heart.

***On the proposal of Cllr. M. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. Fitzmaurice, it was agreed to remove Objective NHB 9 Peatlands.***

***“NHB 9 – Peatlands***

*Seek to support the National Peatlands Strategy when adopted (or updated version) in the achievement and delivery of its objectives, as appropriate.”*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 9.***

**Submission CDP 10– Fáilte Ireland**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Fáilte Ireland** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 10.***

**Submission CDP 11 – Iarnród Eireann**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Iarnród Eireann** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. M. Connolly referred to Objective TI 16 Bus Services & the Rural Transport Programme (RTP) and asked that the areas of Attymon and Woodlawn, which are mainline rail stations, be clustered to bring them to level 5 on the Settlement Hierarchy Tier (P.26 of the Draft Plan). He asked that Attymon and Woodlawn rail stations be included in Map OSS - Overall spatial strategy and proposed development options (Page 31 of Draft Plan), Map CSM - Core Strategy Map (P.32 of the Draft Plan) and Map SS2 - Settlement Hierarchy Map (P.33 of the Draft Plan).

Cllr. Cuniffe said that he was aware of Irish Rail's submission on the Draft Plan; but said there is evidence available to state that the railway line in Tuam will not be used for the next 15 years and it will be idle infrastructure. He said that a Greenway would protect the alignment of the railway and would be a good use rather than leave the infrastructure idle.

He said that while the Western Rail Corridor is listed as a priority rail project by Iarnród Éireann in their Submission they have acknowledged there is currently no funding provision for this project. He said that the Council should seek funding from the Minister to support a feasibility study for a greenway to be put in place on the disused railway line, similar to Sligo County Council. He advised the Meeting that the Tuam Railway is closed since 1976. He said that a Greenway would be a good interim use for the rail line and said the CIE are amenable to issue Greenway licences. He said that there is a positive outlook for a Greenway in the medium term as there is no funding available for a railway line. He referred to the CEDRA's (Commission for Economic Development of rural Area's) report '*Energising Irelands Rural Economy*' which said that Greenways can make a substantial contribution to the revitalisation of rural areas.

Cllr. Cuniffe said that the Greenway could revitalise towns such as Kilbannon, Tuam and Milltown and the economic benefit from a Greenway is enormous and is a tourist phenomenon worldwide. He proposed that sections of the Western Rail Corridor are not ruled out for Walkways/Cycleways.

In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the Plan supports Greenways and referred the Meeting to ED14 Tourism Infrastructure & Services. In reply to Ms. K. McHugh, Ms. McConnell said that the various relevant transportation objectives do not prejudice the Greenway /Western Rail Corridor along that route, as the Objective is left as flexible as possible.

Cllr. Fahy said that the passengers numbers have increased on the Athenry to Ennis railway line in the past year and he said while he was critical initially, he said that it is a great service and it is a major asset to Galway and the West of Ireland and he hoped that the Western Rail Corridor would continue to Claremorris and Sligo.

Cllr. Feeney said that it was good that Iarnród Éireann was prioritizing projects in the West.

Cllr. Feeney referred to Objective TI16 - Dualing of Rail Tracks - and referred to the Galway – Ballinasloe line and said this was hugely significant and it opens up more options. He said that it was very positive to hear that Iarnród Éireann has included the Western Rail Corridor as a priority and it sets out a great message in favour of rail travel on that line.

Cllr. Kearney said he welcomed the initiative of dual tracks by Iarnród Éireann but said that if the County was to have dual tracks, there would be a requirement for a proper commuter service.

Cllr. Canney concurred and welcomed Iarnród Éireann's proposals but said that the Tuam Municipal District should work to seek an alternative Greenway route.

Cllr. Roche concurred with Cllr.Canney and said that while he and other Elected Members are in favour with the progression of the Western Rail Corridor, they also wish to progress the Greenway initiative. He referred to the Mayo Greenway and asked that perhaps



consideration be given for a Greenway alongside the railway line and this would allow for two pieces of infrastructure in the area. He expressed his concern that if the railway line was used for a Greenway, it would seem like the Council was abandoning the railway project. He said that engagement should take place with those stakeholders that wish to be involved in the Greenway project to put forward a proposal for the Tuam area and its local towns.

Cllr. Cunniffe expressed his satisfaction that the Tuam Municipal District would work together to commence this project.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cunniffe, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh, it was proposed:***

*“that the sections of the Western Rail Corridor in the administrative area of Galway County Council not be ruled out of the County Development Plan as having potential for development as recreational cycle and walkways commonly known as Greenways”.*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. Canney, it was proposed:***

*“that every person in County Galway has the right to cut turf domestically for there own use. Ms. McConnell advised that this was not a matter for the County Development Plan”.*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 11.***

#### **Submission CDP 12 - National Roads Authority (NRA)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **National Roads Authority** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Comh. O’Tuairisg referred to the current County Development Plan and asked that the Table 11.2 *Forward Sight Distance and Y Distance (in meters)* in the current Plan be re-instated in the Draft Plan with respect to sight distances on regional roads. In reply, Ms Mc. Connell said that this table could be re-instated.

***On the proposal of Comh. Ó’Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to re-instate at DM Standard 20 – Table outlining Sight Distances required for Access onto National, Regional & Local Roads (Table13.2: Forward Sight Distance and Y Distance (in meters)) as follows:***

**That the sight distances required for Regional roads should be as follows:**

Design Speed	100	85	70	60	50	40	30
Y Distance	160	120	90	70	60	45	33

Comh. O’Tuairisg asked that Regional Road R340 be added into Table 5.1 Priority Transportation Infrastructure Projects for County Galway 2015-2021.

*On the proposal of Comh. Ó Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend Table 5.1: Priority Transportation Infrastructure Projects for County Galway 2015-2021 to include under the Section Other Roads: R340.*

*On the proposal of Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Noone, it was agreed to amend Table 5.1: Priority Transportation Infrastructure Projects for County Galway 2015-2021 to include under the Section Other Roads: R332.*

*On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. Thomas, it was agreed to add a new Section 5.3.4 Road Safety to the Section 5.3 Roads & Transportation Networks as follows:*

***“5.3.4 Road Safety***

*Galway County Council will work with relevant bodies and authorities to encourage, develop and improve existing entrances and junctions on restricted routes.”*

Cllr. Welby expressed his concern regarding Objective T16 – **Direct Access onto Protection of National Routes & Strategically Important Regional Road Networks** and asked if it was Council policy not to allow any intensification. He referred to DM Standard 18.1 and read that ‘*consideration shall be given on a limited basis and a functional need to live at this location must be demonstrated*’ and asked if that restricted family members. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that DM Standard 18.1 tries to differentiate between national routes, national policy and the danger on those routes as the maximum speed limit applies. She explained that on a national route, a person that is actively farming and wants to live on the farm will be accommodated subject to the normal planning conditions. In respect of a regional route, members of farm families not actively engaged in farming will be considered. She explained that in respect of a National Road, permission would normally be granted to one person only, who would be actively involved in the running of a farm and said that this policy was actually a liberal take on national policy.

Cllr. Roche concurred with Cllr. Welby and said that the Council should be more sympathetic to farm families. He asked that in respect of National Primary and National Secondary routes if the relationship be widened for those that wanted to carry out farming practice, as he said an Enurement Clause would probably be applied also. In reply, Ms. McConnell clarified that in respect of a National Road, notwithstanding other policies relating to the consideration of a, niece or nephew being accommodated on lands owned by an uncle/aunt who had no other immediate family, planning would be very restricted and any permission allowed would be subject to national policy.

Cllr. O’Cualain referred to DM Standard 18.1 and permission for farm families on a limited basis. He asked if this was limited to offspring of the farm holding or is it limited to the length of time as a farm family. In response, Ms. McConnell said that she understood his point but said that the DM Standard 18.1 was in accordance with national policy which can be referred to if there was any misinterpretation. She said that the DM Standard 18.1 allows the Planning Authority to facilitate a member of the family, once they can justify they are in full time management of the farm, but said that multiple family members would not be considered on National routes.

In reply to Cllr. Walsh, Ms. McConnell agreed and said that the applicant would need to demonstrate in a road safety audit that the access is safe and that road users will not be impeded.



In reply to Cllr. Cuddy's query regarding urban fringe, Ms. McConnell said that this referred to a new dwelling on a farm. She said there was no issue for farm families if they qualified under Objective's RHO1 criteria, to allow entitlement in restricted high landscape areas. In reply to Cllr. Cuddy's query re intrinsic links, Ms. Mc. Connell said it would prove very difficult to establish. She advised that the *Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005* set out the criteria on how an individual might qualify to live in an area and the Planning Authority cannot deviate much from that criteria. She said that a potential planning applicant has some certainty to apply where one has established links over a length of time.

Cllr. Hynes asked that in relation to enurement clauses that the Planning Authority consider defining 'exceptional circumstances'.

Cllr. McClearn said that while the area he represents does not have the planning pressure the GTPS area has, he said he was aware of an active farmer that sought planning permission on a National Secondary route and was granted planning permission but the NRA appealed the decision to An Bord Pleanala. He advised the Meeting that there were many stages in the planning process and it was not just the Planning Authority's decision that needs to be considered.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. O'Curraoin, it was proposed that Policy HP25 (Rural Housing Policies) in the Galway County Development Plan 2009-2015 be reinstated in the County Development Plan 2015-2021, as follows:***

*"Building conversions in Gaeltacht areas will be considered for the purpose of advancing Gaeltacht Tourism and Gaeltacht Cooleges provided they reach Environmental Protection Agency requirements for the effluent."*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Cllr. J. Byrne referred to Section 6.2 Mineral Extraction and Quarries and said that control measures should be implemented regarding cement products being compliant with SR21: 2014 in relation to pyrite control.

Cllr. J. Byrne said this could be an opportunity to raise awareness with suppliers and it should be part of the Building Control Regulations to get this information from Quarries. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the obligation under the Building Control Regulations lies with the Certifier and Builder of the building and these proposals would put a legal obligation on Galway County Council that the legislation never envisaged. She said that this is a matter that is covered by the Building Regulations as the Council does not have any control over cement production. She advised that the Council seeks to ensure that the correct documentation is in place as part of the Planning Authority's Building Control function but that the Planning Authority has no role in how Quarries operate, manufacture or distribute or grade their product.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. Kearney, it was proposed to add the following Objective to Chapter 6.20 – Mineral Extraction and Quarries, as follows:***

*"Control measures to be implemented and then controlled by Galway County Council to ensure Quarry/Manufacturers of cement products, compliance with SR21:2014. This measure specifically relates to Pyrite Control."*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

**SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

**1881**

It was proposed by Cllr. M. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. F. Kearney and agreed to suspend Standing Orders to allow the meeting continue beyond 6.00 pm.

*On the proposal of Cllr. G. Finnerty, seconded by Cllr. Rabbitte, it was agreed to amend Map TI 1- Strategic Transport Network to reflect the correct titles and reference number of roads : Change M18 from approved NRA Scheme to Motorway under construction, illustrate the Loughrea link-road and by-pass as a Secondary Road, and to amend the old N6 to R446, and change M18 from approved NRA route to Motorway and Old N18 to R458 and include Policy TI 10 Reclassification of Restricted Roads as follows:*

***“Policy TI 10-Reclassification of Restricted Routes***

***It is a policy of Galway County Council to liaise with the National Roads Authority on the re-classification of Restricted Routes as a result of the construction of motorways”.***

Mr. L. Gavin, Director of Services, Roads & Transportation Marine & General Services advised the meeting that this is a general policy and Galway County Council would engage with the NRA with regard to the reclassification of roads as a result of motorway construction.

Cllr. Feeney said that these roads should be classed as National Secondary roads so as the burden could be put on the NRA for maintenance of these roads. In reply, Mr. Gavin said there would be better maintenance options for National Secondary Roads than Regional Roads.

Cllr. D. Connolly made reference to the N6 and said that its classification as a National Secondary route could have implications for access in respect of farm families as the NRA policy could be more prescriptive.

In reply to Cllr. Cuddy, Ms. McConnell said that NRA policy restricts all development on National Roads and ‘no development’ is their default position. She said that the Council considers those who need to live on the farm to farm the land. She said the Council tries to accommodate farm families living on restricted routes that need new generations to continue farming.

In reply to Cllr. Cuddy who asked if one who was not a farmer if could they obtain permission on their land on a restricted road, Ms. McConnell said that the application would be considered on its merit but as it would not comply with NRA policy, it would have a very slim chance of approval if it went to An Bord Pleanala.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Rabbitte, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed to amend Table 5.2: Regional/Local Projects Proposed for 2015-2021 to include under the Heading Routes: N65 Kilmeen to Portumna.***

Cllr. Fahy asked for relaxation to the planning laws for the area from Gort to Oranmore. He explained when the new Motorway is opened; this road will be downgraded to a National Secondary route. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the N18 currently remains as a National Primary route and until such time that this road is reclassified then current policy applies. She said that if in 2018 the road is reclassified, a more flexible approach can be considered.

Cllr. Canney referred to the new Motorway from Gort to Tuam and said that the road network leading into it such as the R333 Barnaderg to Horseleap, Headford to Tuam and Milltown to Tuam are Regional roads, which have some very dangerous bends and are in a bad state and said that a 5 year Plan is required for the improvement of these roads. In reply, Mr. Gavin said that there is a policy in the Plan to improve a number of roads but said that specific improvements outside of that is a separate entity. He asked that this issue be raised at Municipal District level and funding could be sought from the NRA for those roads not listed in the Draft Plan.

Cllr. Kearney welcomed the inclusion of N63 and expressed his concern with regard to the lack of public lighting in Lackagh. He said that the ducting has been installed when new footpaths were installed ten years ago but the public lights were never connected.

Cllr. Feeney asked also if the enurement clause could be re-examined to facilitate families in serious financial circumstances so they could sell their property before the banks repossessed them, as the current policy of Galway County Council is to transfer the enurement clause to the buyer. In response, Ms. McConnell explained that the application of enurement clauses allowed development to happen where otherwise it could not take place. She said that in the case of a Regional Road in a landscape character sensitive area, a restrictive approach is applied. She said that transfer of an enurement clause is facilitated on a limited basis to try and protect the enurement provision. enurement clauses have been transferred and will continue to be transferred if the person to whom it is being transferred meets the requirements to live in the area. She said that the Planning Authority takes a human approach to hardship cases and in general the outcome is to the satisfaction of all, once evidence of genuine hardship is produced. She explained that the enurement clause is used genuinely to try and facilitate development in a more structured way.

Cllr. Canney expressed his concern with the enurement clause and explained that if the Banks repossessed a house, they can sell on the house to anyone and the enurement clause is removed and said this needs to be addressed by the Council.

Cllr. Charity concurred and referred to Objective RHO1 (3) and said the attachment of the Enurement Clause seven years after the 1<sup>st</sup> date of occupation was very rigid and said it was his understanding that no exceptional circumstances were allowed for and asked that consideration be given in the following scenarios where the:

1. Property owner is in negative equity,
2. Property owner is in mortgage arrears in excess of 12 months,
3. Property is within the GTPS zone.

He explained that within the vicinity of Galway City at the moment, there are unfinished housing littering the landscape, where developers have ceased to trade, but because these houses have enurement clauses attached, it limits the potential of these houses to be completed.

In reply, Ms. McConnell said the thinking behind enurement clauses was for locations under extreme pressure of single houses, urban generated need, and those persons who were working in the city but wanted a rural lifestyle. She said that the enurement clause was designed to facilitate those persons who could not compete on price but had family ties or were functionally dependent on the area. She said the enurement clause allowed the Planning Authority to facilitate these applications where possibly they would have been refused due to

ribbon development, over dense development or would have a negative impact on the area. She said that the enurement clause is put on a development but only enacted when the development is constructed and it is not put on a site alone and is placed on the person to whom the planning permission is granted. She said the enurement clause allows the Planning Authority to control development and to allow people get planning permission who have links in the area or are functionally dependent on the area or in exceptional health circumstances. She explained that where the enurement clause is posing a real and substantial difficulty, the Planning Authority takes a humane approach regarding the transfer of the enurement clause but it cannot be abandoned as if it was applied solely on physical merit, family ties could no longer be taken into consideration by the Planning Authority.

Cllr. Walsh said while enurement clauses are useful to prove the genuine bona fide applicant and it should not be regarded as a burden by those who would not have obtained planning permission without it, but he expressed his concern for those that are in financial difficulty and are genuinely distraught and said that by relaxing the enurement clause in those instances, the persons could sell their house before the bank repossessed it.

Cllr. McClearn expressed concern where an individual sought permission to knock and rebuild an old house, an enurement clause was now being placed on the new house. He said that this should not occur as the person is not adding to the housing stock, but merely replacing one house with another. He said he understood the concept regarding the application of enurement clauses and said all Elected Members support this concept but said that flexibility should be given to persons in financial difficulty to release them of the enurement clause as if the banks repossess the house, the enurement clause is removed. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that Objective RHO6 Replacement Dwelling does not state an enurement clause will be applied in this case. She said that in respect of RHO7 Renovation of existing derelict dwelling/semi ruinous dwelling – she explained where the total or substantial demolition of the existing dwelling is proposed an enurement clause will apply.

Cllr. M. Connolly concurred and asked for clarification if the Planning Act referred to a five year enurement clause rather than seven years. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the enurement clause is defined in the *Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2007* where it is established that seven years is the most appropriate length of time.

Ms. McConnell explained that the enurement policy cannot be written on past planning permissions and said that Elected Members are debating conditions on existing planning permissions. Ms. McConnell advised that she was not aware of a bank selling a property where the Planning Authority had engaged with the property holder.

The Chief Executive said that he was concerned about the Elected Members trying to develop an enurement policy within the County Development Plan. He explained that most County Development Plans do not mention enurements as it is an Executive function. He said it was continued in this Draft Plan as it is in current County Development Plan and it continued to provide the certainty for the Elected Members. He said that the Elected Members were trying to devise a policy to restrict the capacity to impose conditions on a planning decision. He said there was an enurement policy and system in place, which may not be perfect but works, to allow the Planning Authority grant planning permissions. He said that the Planning Authority allows a degree of flexibility as there will always be very different cases which might not be more amenable to be dealt with but these should not be the detriment of an enurement policy. He asked the Members to take cognisance that the imposition of an

enurement clause is a planning condition imposed by a decision maker when considering a planning application and this is an Executive function.

Cllr. Charity referred to RHO 1(3) and said it was a rigid policy that does not allow any scope for exceptional circumstances to be taken into account. He said that he understood the purpose of enurement clauses in the GTPS area but said the degree of flexibility allowed by the Planning Authority should be outlined in the Development Plan. He advised the meeting that the extent of house reposessions is astronomical and said the courts are at capacity trying deal with these cases, with approx 82 cases currently being heard in Co. Galway. He said that the majority of cases should not get to this stage and said he feels that every outcome should be first tried. He said that in many cases the enurement clause prevents this early intervention and asked for some flexibility by the Planning Authority when dealing with these cases.

Cllr. Fahy said that the Planning staff dealt generously and genuinely with those who had sincere requests to have their enurement Clauses removed. He expressed his concern for those who live within the radius of Kilmaduagh Steeple who cannot obtain planning permission and would ask An Taisce to stop boycotting local families.

The Chief Executive said that any flexibility will be determined by reference to the actual condition of the permission.

Comh O'Tuairisg referred to DM 7 Site Size for Single Houses using Individual On-Site Waste Water Treatment Systems. He explained that the Council considered sites in the Aran Islands and asked if this consideration could continue, once the site complies with the EPA guidelines.

Cllr. Welby asked if the Planning Authority would consider enurement clause transfers if the building was just started with only minor works undertaken.

Cllr. Charity referred to RHO1 position of an individual living in an area but no direct family links to the area that has rented for 15 years and has contributed to the area and has provided employment, has children attending the local school and he still cannot get planning permission in the area. He asked that Objective RHO1 be amended to take account and relax the criteria regarding longstanding rural links and immediate family ties.

Cllr. Killilea referred to RHO 1 Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS) – and the criteria for rural housing need and said that while it was necessary to protect our countryside, the Council has to be flexible to grant permission to a person who might be working 8/9 miles away and wants to live in the countryside. He queried why one is required to have a housing need when trying to buy an established house, and said that one sector should help another sector. He said it was the Council's duty to assist those in great need and those who cannot help themselves.

Cllr. Byrne advised the Meeting that there are persons who cannot get planning permission and asked what defines a rural housing need and the definition of rural links. He said he was aware of a person living 10 years in Kinvara and who had children in the local School and said that the applicant nor her children qualify as having a housing need. He said that the Planning Authority should be more sympathetic to persons who are contributing to a community and living in the area for at least 10 years.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the housing need criteria referred to in Objective RHO1 is based on the National Policy / *Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines* and it was introduced to balance development and manage urban generated housing pressure. She said that RHO1 is in accordance with Housing policy and it is considered that this has been a balanced approach up to now and it has worked well for 99% of the cases.

The Chief Executive said that in the current economic environment that situations/issues have arisen that would not normally apply. He said that the Executive are dealing with the issues arising from planning permissions granted in the past but the enurement clause issue is not solvable in the County Development Plan. He said the Elected Members outlined in their contributions that the Executive has gone some way in dealing with the hardship cases. He said that he was not aware of any one case where the Planning Authorities failure to deal with situations has resulted with the banks selling houses without people first getting to discuss their case. He asked that the Elected Members give consideration to refer this issue to the Planning SPC as it is inappropriate in the County Development Plan. He said that there are twenty Notice of Motions on rural housing provisions and it is clear from these Motions that the Elected Members want flexibility on enurement clauses but also want flexibility on the housing need criteria and cautioned that this was not achievable. He said in the past twenty years a lot of one-off rural houses were built in the County and there is a limit on the capacity for rural housing. He explained that the Council has achieved a balance in the last few years and he would not like this balance be affected. He said that planning permission should be such so as to accommodate the building of rural houses in areas where the applicant has grown up and lived but a move to accommodate greater numbers of people will impact negatively on this.

Cllr. Kinane acknowledged the advice received and asked prior to the examination of the rural housing motions asked of the Elected Members to refer to Section 1.6 Vision for County Galway.

*“Enhance the quality of life of the people of Galway and maintain the County as a uniquely attractive place in which to live, work, invest and visit, harnessing the potential of the county’s competitive advantages in a sustainable and environmentally sensitive manner.”*

Ms. McConnell said that the Enurement Clause and hardship cases can be referred to the Planning SPC for consideration and discussion.

***On proposal of Cllr. M. Kinane, seconded by Cllr. N Thomas it was agreed to refer this proposal to the Planning Strategic Policy Committee for consideration and discussion:***

*“An Enurement condition shall apply for a period of 7 years, after the date that the house is first occupied by the person or persons to whom the enurement clause applies. The Enurement condition is used as a safeguard against speculative development in restricted or sensitive areas. It is not intended as a penalty or burden on genuine Rural Housing Need applicants. Due to the recent downturn in the economy, some families have experienced extreme financial distress. Others have encountered major change to family circumstances. In such cases consideration will be given to an easement of the Enurement condition to allow for the sale of the dwelling on the open market.”*

Cllr. Charity asked that Objective RHO 1(3) be removed from the Draft County Development Plan. Ms. McConnell advised that the enurement policy is an Executive function regarding the imposition of conditions and clarified that most of the issues relate to planning permission

granted in the past. She said that this should not be an issue going forward but conditions on previous planning permissions cannot be lifted or ignored/waived. She said the Planning Authority would look sympathetically and aim to facilitate cases be dealt with but it cannot abandon a condition attached.

In reply to Cllr. Killilea, the Chief Executive said that the Planning SPC should be in place before Christmas and the issue of enurement clauses could be included in the first Agenda but said while the application of enurement conditions is an Executive function, it would be hoped that an understanding would be reached that would meet both the Elected Members and the Executives requirements.

Cllr. Killilea said that he would agree with the Enurement policy in general but that persons buying a house with an enurement clause attached should not need to have a housing need requirement. He said that he was happy that it would be seen as a priority with the Planning SPC and was willing to withdraw his proposal.

The Chief Executive said that it was about getting the Policy right and advised that the Planning Authority has already dealt with a lot of cases within a short period. He explained that the County Development Plan is about future planning and the Elected Members concerns relate to past planning permissions with conditions attached.

In response, Cllr. Charity said he reluctantly agreed that his motion regarding RHO1(3) could be referred to the SPC.

***On the proposal of Cllr. J Charity, seconded by Cllr. S Cunniffe, it was agreed to refer this proposal to the Planning Strategic Policy Committee for consideration and discussion:***

***“Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

***3. An Enurement condition shall apply for a period of 7 years, after the date that the house is first occupied by the person or persons to whom the enurement clause applies, **save in exceptional circumstances.*****

***“Exceptional circumstances in the context of an individual case shall be examined on a case by case basis and the definition of “exceptional circumstances” shall be non-exhaustive but at all times the onus of establishing such “exceptional circumstances” shall rest with the applicant. For the avoidance of doubt, the Local Authority will consider under this heading:***

***(a) Properties in negative equity***

***(b) Properties where the applicant is party to a mortgage that is more than 12 months in arrears.***

***(c) Properties upon which construction has commenced but which remains unfinished.***

***(Text in bold print is new text)”***

Cllr. Noone said that he was happy with the commitment given by the Executive to deal with hardship cases. Ms. Kinane concurred and said that she respected the commitment given.

Cllr. Feeney said that the Enurement policy is an Executive function and said that by referring this issue to the SPC, the Executive is actually giving the Elected Members a role in this process which is welcomed.

Cllr. Mannion said that if the lifetime clause is not included in the new Plan, she would be in agreement with the re-instatement of same. In reply to Cllr. Walsh, Ms. McConnell said that if a planning permission had a lifetime enurement attached and seven years had passed, the

enurement clause would still remain on the C3 (Grant of Planning Permission) and a planning application would have to be submitted for its removal.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Mannion, seconded by Cllr. Maher, it was agreed to reinstate Policy HP27 which is in the current County Development Plan 2009-2015 into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021 as a new Objective RHO 14 Lifetime Enurements as follows:***

***“Objective RHO 14-Lifetime Enurement Clause***

***Lifetime enurement clauses will be considered to have expired after a period of seven years of full time occupancy by the applicant. Actual removal of the enurement clause will have to be established by a planning application.”***

Cllr. Burke referred to Appendix II - Housing Strategy and referred to Section 4.7 of the Housing Strategy - Groups Requiring Special Attention (page 31) and asked if wording could be included to take into account the needs of those with intellectual difficulties.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Burke, seconded by Cllr. Kinane, it was agreed that the following text be inserted under Section 4.7 Groups requiring Special Attention, Page 32 in Appendix II of the Draft Plan:***

***“Galway County Council will give particular guidance to the needs of persons of intellectual and physical disabilities in allocating social housing units, given the difficulties experienced in accessing rent supplement and the requirement for such houses to be registered with HIQA.”***

Cllr. Maher referred to Table 5.1 Priority Transportation Infrastructure 2015-2021 which supports Cycleways/Greenways and Cycle Routes. Cllr. Cunniffe wished to express a note of caution that roads are not suitable for cycle routes.

***On the proposal of Cllr. M Maher, seconded by Cllr. P Feeney it was agreed that Table 5.1 Priority Transportation Infrastructure 2015-2021 under the Heading National and Local Cycle Networks – Cycle Routes be amended to include the following:***

***“Cycle Routes***

- Support and develop the National Cycle Route between Dublin, Ballinasloe and Galway City and Clifden along a mostly off line route”***

Cllr. G. Finnerty referred to Objective TI 7 - Service/Rest Areas & Scenic Viewpoints and Policy R3 – Large Scale Retail Proposals & National Roads/Interchanges, which outlined that the Planning Authority shall give a “*general presumption against large scale retail proposals adjacent to existing, new or planned national roads*” and asked that the Planning Authority state that there be no service stations on motorways as their presence is at the detriment of towns and villages. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that large-scale developments follow part of National Guidance from the Department of the Environment and Galway County Council must adhere to that. She said that if there is a strong case for a village to provide services, the Planning Authority will have regard to these proposals. She said that it is not possible the Plan restrict the services to Towns/Villages and said the policy is as set out in the document and is reasonably flexible but outlines the specific requirement regarding access and regress.

Ms. McConnell cautioned the Elected Members as it is not legally appropriate that a negative objective is inserted in the Draft Plan. Cllr. G. Finnerty said the Objective is required as



local towns need to be developed and most towns are easily accessed within Co. Galway. Ms. McConnell said the Planning Authority cannot prejudice the outcome of an application before it is submitted and the Planning Authority must adhere to National Guidelines and if there is conflict between the Councils standards and national standards, the Council must have regard to the national standards.

***On the proposal of Cllr. G. Finnerty, seconded by Cllr. Donnellan, the following motion was proposed:***

*“I propose that no service facility can be facilitated on any motor route where within 30km on motorway there is a service town or village.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Cllr. D. Connolly expressed his concern over the housing crisis nationally. He said that the housing stock obtained in the last three years was not sufficient to meet demand and said the delivery of social housing should be a priority of Galway County Council as the lead authority of Co. Galway. He said while the Voluntary Housing sector has a role to play in the provision of housing, the Government should not rely on these Organisations to deliver housing units alone. He said it was important that the Council establish where proper good social housing can be delivered as it is essential for our communities and said the local authority needs to start building or acquiring housing stock as Part V is not delivering and it cannot be reliant on the voluntary sector to meet the demand. He asked that the Executive consider this topic at the next Council Meeting.

Cllr. Killilea referred to the Section on the Voluntary Housing sector and said that the Council should give the Voluntary housing sector an enhanced role as the Council has a limited housing budget and would not be in a position to meet all the housing needs.

Cllr. Welby said that the Council should be in position to deliver housing as the Council has land banks all over the County. He said that there are seventeen acres of land idle in Oughterard and the Council should be proactive and not be reliant on housing organisations who do great work but can be selective to whom they choose for their housing units.

Cllr. Burke asked that the Housing Section consider the Universal Design Principles when designing/renovating houses.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Feeney it was agreed to add additional text to Chapter 3 Urban and Rural Housing, Section 3.2.2 Voluntary Housing and Co-operative Sector as follows:***

***“3.2.2 Voluntary Housing and Co-Operative Sector***

*Voluntary bodies and housing associations have a major role to play in developing social and specialist housing in the county. Approved-non profit housing bodies/voluntary housing bodies are established by a voluntary management board to benefit the community in which they are based, and are approved and funded by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government. Voluntary bodies provide accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly, persons with disabilities and other persons who require supportive housing responses. The impact of the voluntary sector has become increasingly important in recent years. The voluntary housing sector has greatly increased its capacity to deliver social housing through the utilization of the Capital Advance Leasing Facility, Payment and Availability Agreements and private finance over the past three years. The Irish Council for Social Housing estimates that housing associations have the capacity to develop a total of*

*4,860 new homes in the period for 2014-2016. Many of the larger voluntary housing bodies have approval to borrow funds from the Housing Finance Agency and it would be advantageous for the local authority to benefit from this opportunity with a view to partnering with Voluntary Housing Bodies in the provision of social housing.*

*Examples of such voluntary housing and co-operative sectors include Cluid, Respond, Peter Triest, Tuath Associations and Tearmann Eanna Teo."*

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was agreed that the following text be added to the end of Section 3.2.2 Voluntary Housing and Co-Operative Sector as follows:***

***"3.2.2 Voluntary Housing and Co-Operative Sector***

*"Galway County Council will strive to be the lead provider of social housing which will provide quality housing for the citizens of our County who qualify and that we recognize the need for the state to ensure adequate resources are afforded to the council to ensure that social housing need is delivered without applicants being on the housing list for extended periods."*

Cllr. Fitzmaurice asked if the social housing policy could be amended to examine where one damages a council house.

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was agreed to refer this proposal to the Housing Strategic Policy Committee for consideration and discussion:***

*"Those council tenants who wish to apply for a transfer can be considered, even including a change from urban/rural where a genuine reason is demonstrated."*

The Chief Executive advised that these issues would be best referred for discussion to the Housing SPC as they are not amenable to being resolved in the County Development Plan as it would not address these issues.

Cllr. Fahy said that Thoor Ballylee was a real tourist attraction for the area and said the locals in the area want the river diverted from Thoor Ballylee in case it floods again. Ms. McConnell said this proposal was very site specific and it would require the Council to carry out SEA investigations as part of the County Development process. She suggested amended wording to 'work with the OPW & Bord Fáilte to address issues at Thoor Ballylee'.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fahy, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty it was agreed to add additional text to Section 8.6 Flooding as follows:***

***"8.6 Flooding***

*Flooding cannot be completely eliminated, but its impacts can be minimised with proactive and careful management of catchments and identified flood risk areas and by ensuring that any development does not individually or cumulatively give rise to new flood risks. In order to minimize the impact of an increased future flood risk, there are various steps that local authorities can take. These include flood protection works, stormwater attenuation and more significantly, avoidance of development in floodplains subject to flooding, except in very limited circumstances. Galway County Council recognises the need for measures to address the regular and repeated flooding issues that arise along the River Shannon and related tributaries, such as the River Suck and Galway County Council recognises that a maintenance programme for Aibhann Na Shionna, fo aibhneacha a théann isteach ann agus*

*srutháin is essential. Galway County Council will seek to work with the OPW, Failte Ireland and the relevant authorities to address the issue of flooding at Thoor Ballylee."*

***On the proposal of Cllr. J Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Cunniffe, the following amendments were proposed to Objective RHO-1 as follows:***

***"Objective RHO 1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

*It is an objective of the Council to facilitate Rural Housing in the open countryside subject to the following criteria:*

***1. (a) Those applicants with Rural Links\* to the area through long standing existing and immediate family ties seeking to develop their first home on existing family farm holdings. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.***

***1. (a) of the proposal was agreed.***

***OR***

***1.(b) Those applicants who have no family lands but who wish to build their first home within the community in which they have long standing Rural links\* and where they have spent a substantial, continuous part of their lives (i.e. have grown up in the area, schooled in the area and have immediate family connections in the area e.g. son or daughter of longstanding residents of the area). Consideration shall be given to special circumstances where a landowner has no immediate family and wishes to accommodate a niece or nephew on family lands.*** Having established a Substantiated Rural Housing Need\*, such persons making an application on a site within a 8km radius of their original family home will be considered, subject to normal development management criteria and provided the site is not closer to Galway city than the original family home or encroaches within the Urban Fringe\* of the towns of Gort, Loughrea, Athenry, or Tuam. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.

***1. (b) of the proposal was not agreed and 1. (b) was withdrawn.***

***OR***

***1. (c) Those applicants who can satisfy to the Planning Authority that they are functionally dependent on the immediate rural areas in which they are seeking to develop a single house in the countryside. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.***

***1. (c) of the proposal was agreed.***

***OR***

***1 (d) Consideration shall be given to special circumstances where a landowner has no immediate family and wishes to accommodate a niece or nephew on family lands. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed application and will be assessed on a case by case basis."***

***1. (d) of the proposal was agreed.***

Ms. McConnell said that there were a number of proposals with varying degrees of change to Objective RHO1 – Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area under Strong Urban Pressure – GTPS). She explained that the Guidelines from the Department and the Sustainable Rural Housing

*Guidelines 2005* seeks to clarify what are intrinsic links rather than relying on family relationships. She explained that the wording in the proposed objectives would mean that an individual who never lived in an area would get planning contrary to individuals who are genuine and have intrinsic links to the area. She said that intrinsic links are a more true reflection of housing need and would accommodate most situations.

Cllr. Feeney advised the Meeting that the Elected Members had previously considered this objective at their February Meeting when agreeing the Draft Plan to go on public display and said that it was not practicable to let everyone live where they want to live. He said the proposed objective would allow an individual who had the finance to reside anywhere they liked and he said this could lead to a Ministerial Direction to restrict permissions and the Planning Authority will have no flexibility. He said if there are no restrictions in an area, it can lead to overdevelopment of an area and may lead to pressures on water infrastructure. He said it is also the case that persons wish to reside in the countryside but cannot abide by the rules of the countryside with regard to slurry, dogs barking etc, and a scenario could arise where a daughter or son of a farmer who want to manage the family farm will be refused planning. He said that this topic was discussed prior to the previous County Development Plan in 2009 and it is not good planning policy.

Cllr. Cuddy referred to a proposal made at the February meeting but was not used in the Draft Plan.

Ms. McConnell said that Cllr. Cuddy's proposed amendment to Objective RHO1 (b) omits the following text "*consideration shall be given to special circumstances where a landowner has no immediate family and wishes to accommodate a niece or nephew on family lands*" and this text (with additional text) is now included as part 1 (d) shown above.

She said that the Draft Plan already accommodates a niece or nephew in exceptional cases where the landowner has no immediate family and they are not bound by the 8km rule. She said this Policy refers to Rural Housing Zone 1 area only and not the full County and related only to areas of strong urban generated pressure which is inundated for development but yet has many vacant houses. She said that the proposal is quite specific and states who does not have other dependents to provide support to that family.

The Chief Executive said that essentially the rural housing policy in the Draft Plan is similar to the current County Development Plan. He said it has worked well and only minor amendments have been made. He said that the Elected Members need to consider in the broader context how the rural housing policy has worked. He said that the Development Plan cannot cover all eventualities.

Cllr. K. McHugh asked if the owner of a farm had one child that did not want to manage the farm, could a niece or nephew be considered in this instance. In reply, Ms McConnell said that it could be considered as the policy states where "*one has no immediate family.*" She reiterated that this policy only refers to GTPS Area 1. She advised the Members that the current policy has worked up until now and one cannot legislate for all minor variations as the policy is as flexible as it can be for those that do not have dependents.

Cllr. Cuddy referred to an individual who lived in the city and farmed in the county and said he should be able to build on the farm. Ms. McConnell said that this person was functionally dependent so no requirement for another policy as this scenario is already covered in the

Draft Plan. Cllr. Feeney said he was aware of persons living in urban areas and farm in rural areas and cannot get planning despite having a herd number and is actively farming. In reply, Ms. McConnell said this could be examined under 'functional dependency' and family ownership of 20 years, she said there are several avenues that could be examined and there is no requirement for an additional policy.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Kinane, seconded by Cllr. Thomas, the following amendments were proposed to Objective RHO1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

***"Objective RHO1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

*It is an objective of the Council to facilitate Rural Housing in the open countryside subject to the following criteria:*

*1. (a) Those applicants with Rural Links\* to the area through long standing existing and immediate family ties seeking to develop their first home on existing family ~~farm~~ holdings. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis. ~~Where a landowner wishes to accommodate a parent, brother, sister, son, daughter, niece or nephew on family lands shall be facilitated.~~ "*

***1. (a) of the proposal was not agreed and 1. (a) was withdrawn.***

**OR**

*1. (b) Those applicants who have no family lands but who wish to build their first home within the community in which they have long standing Rural links\* and where they have spent a substantial, continuous part of their lives (i.e. have grown up in the area, schooled in the area and have immediate family connections in the area e.g. son or daughter of longstanding residents of the area). ~~Consideration shall be given to special circumstances where a landowner has no immediate family and wishes to accommodate a niece or nephew on family lands.~~ Having established a Substantiated Rural Housing Need\*, such persons making an application on a site within a 8km radius of their original family home will be ~~considered accommodated~~, subject to normal development management criteria and provided ~~the site is not closer to Galway city than the original family home or~~ it does not encroach within the Urban Fringe\* of the towns of Gort, Loughrea, Athenry, or Tuam. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.*

***1. (b) of the proposal was agreed.***

**OR**

***1. (c)***

*Those applicants who can satisfy to the Planning Authority that they are functionally dependent on the immediate rural areas in which they are seeking to develop a single house, ~~as their Principal Family Residence~~, in the countryside. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.*

***1. (c) of the proposal was agreed.***

**OR**

**1. (d)**

*Where applicants can supply land registry or folio details that demonstrate that the lands on which they are seeking to build their first home, as their permanent residence, in the area have been in family ownership for a period of 20 years or more, their eligibility will be considered. Where this has been established to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, additional intrinsic links will not have to be demonstrated.*

**1. (d) of the proposal was agreed.**

**OR**

**1. (e)**

*Infill in Development Areas within Rural Housing Zone 1*

*Infill developments of limited scale such as small gap infill for a single house will be generally accommodated in areas where the established character is residential.*

*Innovative and contemporary design solutions will be encouraged to maximize the potential of the site, subject to the protection and enhancement of residential amenity.*

*Such infill will not require the substantiation of Housing Need and will not be subject to an enurement condition.*

**1. (e) of the proposal was not agreed and 1. (e) was withdrawn.**

**OR**

**1. (f)**

*In cases where all sites on the family lands are in a designated area, family members will be considered subject to the requirements of the Habitats Directive and normal planning considerations.*

**1. (f) of the proposal was agreed.**

**Definitions applied above:**

**\*Rural Links:**

*For the purpose of the above is defined as a person who has strong links to the rural area and wishes to build a dwelling generally within an 8km radius of where the applicant has lived for a substantial continuous part of their life.*

**\*Substantiated Rural Housing Need:**

*Is defined as supportive evidence for a person to live in this particular area and who does not or has not ever owned a house/received planning permission for a single rural house or built a house (except in exceptional circumstances) in the area concerned and has a need for a dwelling for their own permanent occupation. In addition the Applicants will also have to demonstrate their rural links as outlined above.*

**\*Urban Fringe:**

*Urban Fringe of Gort, Loughrea, Athenry, and Tuam. Applicants whose family home is within the Urban Fringe will be requested to establish a substantiated Rural Housing Need and only this category of persons will be allowed to construct a dwelling in this area.*

**\*Family:**

*Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Brother, Sister, Nephew or Niece. (see 1 (a) above)*



In reply to Cllr. K. McHugh, Ms. Mc. Connell advised that the word ‘farm’ in the proposal is not the issue, she said that if rural links are defined as ‘Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Brother, Sister, Nephew or Niece’, its defining the objective to the relationship of the applicant and ‘blood-ties’ and this is not in accordance with the *Rural Housing Guidelines*.

In reply to Cllr. N. Byrne, Ms. McConnell said that if an individual can establish they have strong intrinsic links to a rural area they can be considered but intrinsic links cannot be defined on blood links.

The Chief Executive said this was a significant step and it was widening the criteria for people to be considered and removing farm so in effect it was stating ‘any piece of land’ whilst also widening the number of qualifying persons.

Cllr. D. Connolly concurred with the Chief Executive and said that this proposed objective by removing the word ‘farm’ would lead to speculative buying of land. He concurred with Cllr. Feeney and said that many individuals from a non-farming background who have moved to a rural area and are not agreeable /do not understand rural farming culture.

In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell said that the Planning Authority does not seek evidence of farming e.g. Certificate in Farming from a planning applicant, except if the proposed development is on National routes. She said if an individual has a genuine proven link, they would be entitled to live beside their family. She said if they do not have family lands, special consideration could be given. She said that ‘rural links’ is not based on who one was related to or owned a farm in the area; it is based on the demonstration of rural links to an area. She said that intrinsic links are considered if one has grown up in the area, attended local Schools, member of local Clubs, and/or lived there for a substantial portion of their lives.

Cllr. McConnell advised that in the case of a niece or nephew who is moving to take care of their uncle/aunt as they have no immediate family, the exception would be that this niece or nephew would not need to be from the area where the farm is sited.

In reply to Cllr. Thomas who enquired regarding the planning requirement for non-farming families on a national route, Ms. McConnell said that the policy on a national route is much more restrictive.

Cllr. McClearn said that the Development Plan is aspirational and broad and said it was not wise to be too restrictive as a situation may arise that no-one can foresee and advised he supported the proposal as it would deal with a lot of situations that might arise during the life of the Plan.

Ms. McConnell referred to 1(a) of the proposal and advised that the objective makes a relationship link between the applicant and the landowner and not an intrinsic link. She said that if ‘relationship’ is the only criteria used, this would be contrary to the National Guidelines.

Ms. McConnell asked for clarification regarding 1(b) of the proposal with regard to the removal of the text “*the site is not closer to Galway City than the original family home* ‘.

Cllr. Cuddy clarified that this allowed an individual to build within an 8k radius of their original family home and can move towards Galway City.

Ms. McConnell referred to 1(c) of the proposal and advised that the '*functionally dependent*' individual makes their case and it is not differentiated whether it is on a full-time or part-time basis. Comh. O'Tuairisg confirmed that functionally dependent could be either 'full or part-time'.

The Chief Executive referred to Objective regarding land Registry and stated this provision was not in use and only caters for those who can afford to buy land in any location and it remains in their possession for 20 years and then they can apply for permission.

Cllr. Walsh said that the Elected Members were not promoting this scenario but said that it was an urban generated issue. He explained that this objective may be used to accommodate persons who may have moved into the town from their home place in a rural area but may wish to return to the rural area in the future and this would assist them in proving it was their family home. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that these persons would qualify in their own right due to the fact they were from a particular area notwithstanding how long the house was in ownership or not and said this objective may allow for speculative buying.

Ms. McConnell referred to 1(e) of the proposal which she said would be a new sub section entitled Infill in Development Areas within Rural Housing Zone 1. Ms. McConnell said that the rural housing policy should apply to these sites.

Cllr. Walsh referred to 1(f) of the proposal and clarified that he had discussed this with a Planner and said while there is some resistance; planning permission has been granted for genuine applicants. He said if the individual has no other lands and undertook the necessary environmental assessments, this should be accommodated.

Cllr. McClearn cautioned the insertion of an objective that the Council cannot adhere to. He said that if the Planning Authority 'delisted' an SAC area in order to approve a planning permission, then it would portray the wrong impression.

In reply to Cllr. Walsh, Ms. Mc. Connell clarified the fact that the land Cllr. Walsh referred to is in a SAC designated area does not invoke that they cannot get planning permission. She advised that nothing can be inserted into the Plan that would prejudice the planning application process. She said that every planning application must be considered on its own merit and on a case by case basis, and an outcome cannot be put into the Plan.

In reply to Cllr. Walsh, Ms. McConnell said that all the Material Alterations will go on public display. She advised that any amendment to a designation will have to be screened for environmental purposes. She explained that these changes would trigger a requirement for environmental screening which would not pass as there would be no way of knowing the environmental impact on that specific area.

Cllr. Feeney said while he was sympathetic to allow villages to grow but said any planning application that had a detrimental effect on SAC could not be considered. He said if the objective is workable it could be included but if not, it would only give false hope to applicants.



Ms. McConnell advised that any proposal for development within a SAC site must be screened with regards to the integrity of site and said while each ½ acre may not have an individual impact; the cumulative impact must be examined. In reply to Comh. O'Tuairisg, Ms. McConnell said that by adding the words '*will be considered*' will not add any certainty.

Cllr. M. Connolly referenced the *Rural Housing Guidelines* and said a landowner with a site that is within a SAC is not prevented from applying for planning but more rigorous screening is required.

Cllr. Welby said that the objective may give people false hope and advised that if a fraction of a site is in a SAC area, the Department would make a very strong objection on it, based on the cumulative effect.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to reinstate Policy HP 16 1© of the current County Development Plan 2009-2015 into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021 (now Objective RHO1 (e)) as follows:***

***“Rural Housing Objectives***

***Objective RHO 1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

***I(e) Where applicants can supply land registry or folio details that demonstrate that the lands on which they are seeking to build their first home, as their permanent residence, in the area have been in family ownership for a period of 20 years or more, their eligibility will be considered. Where this has been established to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, additional intrinsic links will not have to be demonstrated”***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Cunniffe, it was proposed to add additional text to the re-instated Policy HP 16 1© of the current County Development Plan 2009-2015, into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021as follows:***

***“I propose that the Sons and Daughters of people who are living in the Clonbur fringe but who own and farm land in the County Council area be allowed to build a family house on the farm. “***

***This proposal was not agreed and it was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell referred to Objective RHO6 Replacement Dwelling and explained that one does not require a housing need or is an enurement clause applied and advised no amendment is required to the Draft Plan.

Cllr. McClearn said that the Planning Authority should examine rural house design and develop a more suitable house design than was there previously. He expressed his concern regarding Objective RHO 6 where it may arise where one wants to demolish an existing small house and build a much larger house in its place and it should be modern but traditional and in line with the countryside.

Cllr. Welby referred to Objective RHO 7 - Renovation of existing derelict dwelling/semi ruinous dwelling and advised that there were some very good developments undertaken under the current policy HP19.

Ms. McConnell advised that there is an issue regarding sustainability where perfectly good houses are being bought and demolished and a far bigger house built in its place. She said this causes issues within the housing market. She said there needs to be certainty for people

carrying out refurbishment as An Bord Pleanála will not grant them and the Council's proposal is to keep the ethos of re-use and retention of existing dwellings and no housing need or enurement clause is required.

The Chief Executive said that having to make a case to demolish allows some degree of control. He said that requesting the applicant to make a case to demolish is a reasonable approach. He said that there have been many examples in the County and it is not something that we don't accommodate or permit.

Cllr. D. Connolly said that this objective needs to be considered carefully. He said he is aware of houses that have been demolished and rebuilt to a high standard but he lives in a 200 year old house and it would not make sense to do this. He recommended the deletion of 'case basis' so as to bring the common sense element into it and to still ensure good design.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. O'Tuairisg, it was agreed to amend Objective RHO6 Replacement Dwelling as follows:***

***"Objective RHO 6 - Replacement Dwelling***

*It is an objective of the Council that the refurbishment of existing habitable dwelling houses would be encouraged, as a more sustainable option than the demolition and construction of a new dwelling house, ~~The demolition and construction of a new dwelling house shall be resisted, unless a conclusive case for demolition~~ based on technical evidence is made for the Planning Authority's consideration on a case by case basis. It will be a requirement that any new dwelling house be designed in accordance with the Galway County Council's Design Guidelines for Rural Housing in the countryside. Applicants, who require the demolition of an existing dwelling house shall be accommodated without the requirement to establish a Housing Need or proof of residence and will not be subject to an enurement clause."*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. O'Tuairisg, it was proposed to reinstate Policy HP 19 ( Renovation of existing derelict dwelling/semi ruinous dwelling) which is in the current County Development Plan 2009-2015 into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021 as follows:***

***"Policy HP 19***

*Applicants, who require the replacement of an existing dwelling house shall be accommodated without the requirement to establish a Housing Need or proof of residence and will not be subject to an enurement clause.*

*Where the existing dwelling which is to be replaced is vacated it shall not be used for human habitation except to accommodate the bone fide housing need of a family member of the original owner who has been accommodated by the new permitted dwelling or for tourist or related economic activity."*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. O'Tuairisg, it was proposed to reinstate Policy HP 24 ( Rural Housing Policies) which is in the current County Development Plan 2009-2015 into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021 as follows:***

*"The Planning Authority shall encourage the re-development of derelict/semi ruinous buildings for commercial, residential or economic purposes (including tourism). The refurbishment of some derelict structures may not be possible due to conflict with building regulations. In such instances the Council will consider permitting development. It will be a requirement that the proposed development be designated to be externally similar to the*

*original property using traditional materials. In practice the redevelopment of these buildings will be permitted where they;*

*(1) Can be adequately serviced*

*(2) Have their original external walls largely intact*

*An enurement condition will not be imposed where the property is in the ownership of a local farm holder on their holdings.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Cuddy, it was agreed to amend the last sentence of Objective RHO7 – Renovation of existing derelict dwelling/semi ruinous dwelling as follows:***

**Objective RHO 7 - Renovation of existing derelict dwelling/semi ruinous dwelling**

*“It is an objective of the Council .....Where the total ~~or substantial~~ demolition of the existing dwelling is proposed an Enurement Clause for **seven years duration** will apply”.*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Thomas, seconded by Cllr. Kinane, it was agreed to amend Objective RHO1 2 (a) as follows:***

***“Objective RHO 1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

***2 (a) Those applicants who lived for substantial periods of their lives in the rural area, then moved away and who now wish to return and build their first house as their permanent residence, in this local area, ~~to reside near other family members, to work locally, to care for elderly family members, or to retire.~~ Special consideration will be given to one member of the immediate family of emigrants returning to this local area to live near their immediate family. Family members who wish to build their first house as their permanent residence in the same rural area as their parents lived be accommodated.***

*Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to illustrate their links to the area in order to justify the proposed development and it will be assessed on a case by case basis.”*

In reply to Cllr. Walsh, Ms. McConnell said this objective opens the Objective to a wider base than those not just emigrants with no substantive intrinsic link to area.

**The Chief Executive asked if it is the intention of the Elected Members to include returning emigrants and their family. He said if this is the case, the emigrant must have returned and lived in the area and then the family comes home to live near the family.**

In reply to Cllr. Feeney, Ms. McConnell said virtue of the fact, automatic assumption of housing needs.

In reply to Cllr. McClearn, Ms. McConnell said special consideration could be given to ‘one family member of emigrant family’.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Thomas, seconded by Cllr. Kinane, it was proposed to amend Objective RHO1 2 (b) as follows:***

**Objective RHO 1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)**

***“2 (b) To recognise that exceptional health circumstances, supported by relevant documentation from a registered medical practitioner and disability organisation, may require a person to live in a particular environment or close to family support. Documentary***

*evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis."*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

Comh. O'Tuairisg referred to the Clár areas where the population is in decline and schools are closing and these areas need to be revitalised and asked if the Enurement Clause could be removed from Class 3 areas. In reply, Ms. McConnell advised that Class 3 landscape is of a high quality and said there was an Objective in the Draft Plan to update the Landscape Character Areas once national guidance was received. She said that high landscape classification includes a lot of inland areas not subject to development anyway and the GTPS would cover a lot of these areas.

***On the proposal of Comh. O'Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was proposed to amend Objective RHO2 Rural Housing Zone 2 (Structurally Weak Area) as follows:***

***"Objective RHO 2 - Rural Housing Zone 2(Structurally Weak Area)***

*It is an objective of the Council to facilitate the development of individual houses in the open countryside in "Structurally Weak Areas" subject to compliance with normal planning and environmental criteria and the Development Management Standards laid down in Chapter 13 and other applicable standards with the exception of those lands contained in Class 3, 4 & 5 where objective RHO3 applies."*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Comh. O' Tuairisg, it was agreed that a new Rural Housing Objective - Objective RHO8 – Substantially Completed Single Dwelling be added as follows:***

***"Objective RHO8 – Substantially Completed Single Dwelling***

*Where planning permission has elapsed on a previously permitted development that has been substantially completed and the dwelling remains unfinished it will not be a requirement to establish a Rural Housing Need if it were not a condition of the previously granted planning permission."*

***On the proposal of Comh. O' Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed that RHO4 Rural Housing Zone 4 (Gaeltacht) 1(a) remain as outlined in the Draft Plan and amend Objective RHO4 (b) as follows:***

***"Objective RHO 4 - Rural Housing Zone 4 (Gaeltacht)***

*It is an objective of the Council to facilitate Rural Housing in the open countryside subject to the following criteria:*

*(a) Those applicants within the Gaeltacht which are located in Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS) and Zone 3 (Landscape Category 3, 4 and 5) shall comply with the objectives contained in RHO1 & RHO3 as appropriate. Applicants, whose original family home is located on the coastal strip west of An Spidéal, will be permitted to move closer to the city but not more than 8 km from the original family home.*

***OR***

*(b) It is an objective of the Council that consideration will be given to Irish speakers who can prove their competence to speak Irish in accordance with Galway County Council's requirements and who can demonstrate their ability to be a long term asset to the traditional, cultural, arts, heritage and language networks of vibrant Gaeltacht Communities. This consideration will apply to applicants seeking to provide their principal permanent*

*residence, in landscape designations Class 1 & 2 and 3. It will also extend to Class 4 areas that are not in prominent scenic locations. A Language Enurement Clause of 15 years duration will apply to approved developments in this category.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Charity, seconded by Cllr. A. Rabbitte, it was proposed to insert a new Objective RHO1 (4) in Chapter 3 as follows:***

***“Objective RHO 1 (4) - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GTPS)***

*“that rural housing be facilitated in the countryside for those applicants who have spent a substantial portion of their lives ( a minimum of 10 years rental accommodation) within an area, subject to any additional conditions that may exist within a Local Area Plan relevant to the area and the Irish language requirements if any, specified therein.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

In reply to Cllr. Charity’s proposal, Ms. McConnell cautioned the inclusion of ‘rented in area’ as she said that the applicant must demonstrate they are part of their community.

Cllr. Walsh said that one cannot just move to an area in the GTPS and rent for 10 years and then expect he has an entitlement and said that one needs to have a link to an area. He concurred with Cllr. McClearn and said that individuals should consider buying vacant houses in towns/villages or purchase an old house and make a case to knock and rebuild.

***On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was proposed to add the text to Objective RHO3 Rural Housing Zone 3 (Landscape Category 3,4,5) as follows:***

***“Objective RHO3 Rural Housing Zone 3 (Landscape Category 3,4,5)***

*Substantial Rural Housing Need would include families who are resident within an area for at least 7 years and have children who are born in the locality and attend local schools. “*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Cunniffe, the following was proposed:***

*“I propose that an applicant for housing within the GTPS area who can demonstrate this link to the area, such as working in the area, children attending local school , involvement in sport and county activities. They should be considered if they have been in the area for 10 years or more.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

Cllr. Welby said that 7 years was proposed to give certainty to the Objective RHO3. He said that it works off the unwritten rule of 7 years applied by the Planning Authority.

Ms. McConnell referred the meeting to the first objective and rural links to substantive bona fide of community. She said that consideration would be given if one can demonstrate links to a community. She said that if a timeframe was included, it would be too prescriptive and it would put an onus on the applicant to prove the timeframe.

Cllr. Charity said he was aware of a case where the applicant is renting in an area in excess of 10 years and the applicant is not able to obtain planning permission. He referred to RHO1 (a) and said the applicant contributes to area but has no family ties.

Cllr. McClearn advised the Meeting that there is a substantial number of houses unoccupied and not completed and could be purchased much cheaper than constructing a house. He said the Council needs to take recognition of unoccupied houses throughout the County.



In reply, Ms. McConnell said that a timeframe will not solve the urban generated need as one must have a substantiated link to the area. She said that intrinsic links are used to match to enurements that want to be transferred. She said that the inclusion of 10 years could affect the housing need to transfer the enurement clause.

Cllr. Charity said that the existing objective does not make any provision regarding one who moves into an area and has no family ties. He proposed that those who have rented in an area for 10 years be included.

Ms. McConnell explained that both requirements are not required as intrinsic link on its own will qualify the individual not just family ties. She said that RHO1 (a) family ties or (b) no family lands, longstanding rural links, both are not required and she referred the Meeting to the definition of 'Rural Link's on Page 47 of the Draft Plan.

Cllr. Kearney said that links are not based on children but they are based on the applicant on a case by case basis and it is the applicants' links that need to be examined. He said that those who moved to an area through sporting /community activities should not be excluded. Cllr. Noone advised that planning would be considered based on the merit of the individual.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Noone, it was proposed to amend Objective RHO1 Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area under Strong Urban Pressure- GTPS) as follows:***

***"Objective RHO 1 - Rural Housing Zone 1 (Rural Area under Strong Urban Pressure- GTPS)***

*An Enurement condition shall apply for a period of 7 years, after the date that the house is first occupied by the person or persons to whom the enurement clause applies. The Enurement condition is used as a safeguard against speculative development in restricted or sensitive areas. It is not intended as a penalty or burden on genuine Rural Housing Need applicants.*

*Due to the recent downturn in the economy, some families have experienced extreme financial distress. Others have encountered major change to family circumstances. In such cases consideration will be given to an easement of the Enurement condition to allow for the sale of the dwelling on the open market."*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Comh. O'Tuairisg, it was proposed to amend Policy RHO1 Management of New Single Houses in the Countryside as follows:***

***"Policy RHO1 Management of New Single Houses in the Countryside***

*It is a policy of the Council to facilitate the management of new single houses in the countryside in accordance with the Rural Housing Zones 1, 2, 3 & 4 and to support the sustainable re-use of existing housing stock within the County."*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell clarified that Policy RHO1 in the Draft Plan related to Rural Housing Zones and not landscape categories.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Comh. O'Tuairisg, it was proposed to amend Objective RHO10 – Vacant /Unfinished Housing as follows:***

***“Objective RHO 10 - Vacant/Unfinished Housing***

*Applicants for rural housing on lands other than family lands ~~shall~~ may be given encouraged to consider the option to avail of existing or permitted housing in areas where there are high levels of such stock available. A statement relating to same should be submitted as part of the application indicating that an examination of such stock was carried out.”*

*This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. O’Tuairisg, it was proposed to reinstate and amend Policy HP 23 ( Rural Housing Policies) which is in the current County Development Plan 2009-2015 into the Draft County Development Plan 2015-2021 as Objective EDT 20 Rural Business follows:***

***“Objective EDT 20-Rural Business***

*Bone fide applicants who are not considered eligible under the preceding categories may be considered as qualifying to build a permanent home in the rural areas, which are not subject to strong urban influence, subject to being able to satisfy the Planning Authority **that they operate an existing established full time business which they now propose to operate** from their proposed home in a rural area, as part of their planning application, in order, for example, to discourage commuting to towns or cities. Applicants must be able to submit evidence that:*

- Their business will contribute to and enhance the rural community in which they seek to live and*
- They can satisfy the Planning Authority that the nature of their employment or business is compatible with those specified in the local needs criteria for rural areas ie. That they are serving a predominantly local rural business need. “*

Cllr. Walsh referred to Policy HP 23 and asked that it be re-instated in the Draft Plan with some amendments. Ms. McConnell said that the proposed Motion would allow those who ‘intend’ to set up a business to qualify for housing need in structurally weak areas 1, 2 and 3. Cllr. D. Connolly said that this wording should be amended to ‘must’ establish a business. Cllr. McClearn concurred and said that the business may never be set up. Ms. McConnell suggest linked to ‘existing business’ as it is more concrete.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Comh. O’Tuairisg, it was agreed that DM Standard 7 Site Size for Single Houses using Individual On-Site Waste Water Treatment Systems be amended as follows:***

***“DM Standard 7: Site Size for Single Houses using Individual On-Site Waste Water Treatment Systems***

*A minimum site size of 2000m<sup>2</sup> (~~1/2 acre~~) ~~will be~~ is generally required for a single house so as to provide for adequate effluent treatment, parking, landscaping, open space and maintenance of rural amenity. For house sizes greater than 200m<sup>2</sup> the site size shall be increased by 10m<sup>2</sup> for each 1m<sup>2</sup> of house area ~~over~~ above 200m<sup>2</sup>. **Special consideration will be given to existing houses and to proposed developments who can demonstrate Rural Housing Need and comply with EPA guidelines where the minimum size is not totally achievable.***

*~~The requirements for site size for houses greater than 200m<sup>2</sup> will not apply to existing houses.”~~*

Cllr. Killilea said the current County Development Plan promotes existing tourism initiatives and asked that the Council consider the provision of short-stay accommodation (glamping/camping/mobile home sites in non-greenfield sites) outside of settlements where it

can be demonstrated that there is a justifiable tourist product/demand. He said that this short stay accommodation would be close to existing sites where capacity has been reached.

Ms. McConnell said the Planning Authority would have serious concern that holiday homes would be encouraged where demand arises, as it would bypass the requirement to substantiate a housing need in area.

Cllr. McClearn advised that there has been demand led planning for over 10 years. He said that planning should be granted based on development demands rather than need for the proper sustainable development of the County.

Cllr. Healy expressed his concern regarding additional tourist accommodation and said that 70% of holiday homes are vacant throughout the winter.

Ms. McConnell advised that Objective ED19 provides for short-stay tourism accommodation and Objective ED18 provides for stand alone holiday homes and guest accommodation and the Council wants to keep in proportion to what is there already.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Noone, it was proposed to amend Objective EDT 18 Holiday Accommodation in Serviced Settlements and Objective EDT 19 Holiday Accommodation in Open Countryside, in Section 4.14 Economic Development & Tourism Policies& Objectives as follows:***

***Objective EDT 18 – Holiday Accommodation in Serviced Settlements***

*Encourage the proportionate development of new stand alone holiday homes/independent guest accommodation and short-stay accommodation within existing adequately serviced town and village settlements and close to existing established sites that have reached capacity and/or where a demand may be.*

***Objective EDT 19 – Holiday Accommodation in Open Countryside***

*(a) Consider the reuse of existing buildings for holiday homes/guest accommodation outside of settlements where it can be demonstrated that there is a justifiable tourist product/demand. Any renovation work shall be similar in scale and design to the existing building(s). In such cases, documentary evidence shall be submitted to substantiate the proposed development and each individual application will be assessed on its merits.*

*(b) Consider the provision of short-stay accommodation (glamping/camping etc) outside of settlements where it can be demonstrated that there is a justifiable tourist product/demand. The need to develop in a particular area must be balanced against environmental, social and cultural impacts of the development and benefits to the local community. In such cases, documentary evidence shall be submitted to substantiate the proposed development and each individual application will be assessed on its merits.*

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

Cllr. Walsh referred to Objective RHO8 Design Guidelines and asked that item (d) is omitted, but asked that note is taken that this needs to be re-examined.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Walsh, seconded by Cllr. Thomas, it was agreed that Objective RHO8 Design Guidelines be amended as follows:***

***“Objective RHO 9 - Design Guidelines***



*It is an objective of the Council to have regard to Galway County Councils' Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House and to seek Public Consultation with specific reference to the following:*

- (a) It is an objective to encourage new dwelling house design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape.*
- (b) It is an objective to promote sustainable approaches to dwelling house design and encouraging proposals to be energy efficient in their design and layout.*
- (c) It is an objective to require the appropriate landscaping and screen planting of proposed developments by using predominately indigenous/local species and groupings.*
- ~~(d) It is an objective to discourage linear development (defined as five or more houses alongside 250 metres of road frontage). The Council will assess on a case by case basis whether a given proposal will exacerbate such linear development.~~*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP12.***

It was proposed by Cllr. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. M. Connolly and agreed that the meeting be adjourned and reconvened on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014 at 10.30am.

**CUIREADH AN CRUINNÍÚ AR ATHTRÁTH ANSIN.**

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETINGS OF GALWAY COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT  
THE ARD RÍ HOTEL, TUAM, ON FRIDAY 3 OCTOBER 2014 COMMENCING AT  
10.30 AM**

**CATHAOIRLEACH:**

Cllr. Mary Hoade, Cathaoirleach of the County  
of Galway

**I LATHAIR FREISIN:**

**Baill:**

Cllrs. T. Broderick, D. Burke, J. Byrne, N.  
Byrne, S. Canney, J. Charity, D. Connolly, M.  
Connolly, G. Cronnelly, Comh. S. Ó Cualáin,  
Cllrs. J. Cuddy, S. Cunniffe, Comh. T. Ó  
Curraoin, Cllrs. S. Donnellan, A. Donohue, M.  
Fahy, P. Feeney, G. Finnerty, M. Finnerty, M.  
Fitzmaurice, T. Healy, P. Hynes, F. Kearney, P.  
Keaveney, D. Killilea, M. Kinane, M. Maher, E.  
Mannion, J. McClearn, K. McHugh, T.  
McHugh, M. Noone, A. Rabbitte, P. Roche, N.  
Thomas, Comh S. Ó Tuairisg, Cllrs. S. Walsh,  
T. Welby

**Oifigigh:**

Mr. K. Kelly, A/Chief Executive; Mr. J. Cullen  
Directors of Service; Ms. C. McConnell  
A/Director of Services; G. Mullarkey, Head of  
Finance; M. Owens, County Secretary &  
Meetings Administrator; P. Ó Neachtain,  
Oifigeach Gaeilge, Ms. S. Kennedy, Senior  
Executive Planner, Mr. B. Dunne, Assistant  
Planner, Ms. G. Kavanagh, Assistant Planner,  
Ms. M. Doddy, Architectural Conservation  
Officer & Ms. M. Donohue, Senior Staff  
Officer.

Thosnaigh an cruinniú leis an paidir.

The meeting reconvened on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014.

The Cathaoirleach invited Ms. Kennedy to continue the presentation of the Chief Executive Officer's Report on the submissions received to the Draft County Development Plan for Galway 2015-2021.

**Submission CDP 13 – Cllr. J. Cuddy**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by Cllr. J. Cuddy in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 13.***

**Submission CDP 14 – Green Way Properties Ltd.**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Green Way Properties Ltd.** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 14.***

**Submission CDP 15 – Donal Walsh (O'Neill/ O'Mahony)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Donal Walsh (O'Neill/O'Mahony)** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 15.***

**Submission CDP 16 – Coiste Pobail na Tulaigh (Nuala Ní Chonaghaile, Runaí)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Coiste Pobail na Tulaigh** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

Comh. O'Tuairisg advised the Meeting that An Tulaigh had a number of industries in the area including HID Global, Fintrack Cashback, TG4, and Telegal which provided employment for people in the area and surrounding areas. He said the School had over 160 pupils and Tearman Eanna. He said that these industries need more services and this Submission should be considered in conjunction with the Údarás Submission which states that a sewerage system is vital for the area. He said an objective is required that a Water treatment sewerage system will be provided.

Comh. O'Tuairisg said nothing has been done for the Clár areas which are classed as Structurally Weak areas. He explained while there is an objective that a housing need is required for Areas 1 & 2, but said all the structurally weak areas are in landscape categories 3, 4 and 5. He proposed that An Tulaigh be given village status and also be provided with a sewerage system.

Cllr. Walsh concurred and said that Submission No. 16, Submission No. 30 and Submission No. 63 are interrelated regarding An Tulaigh. He said that the Executive's response states that the population is small in the area and said that the Census figures are misleading as the actual situation on the ground is not accurately reflected. He explained that there are large

numbers of people in the area each day due to the employment created by the number of industries in the area. He said that these industries wish to expand and cannot do so without a sewerage system. He said there is a Irish college in the summer. He said that this Council is committed to economic development and in order for these industries to continue to grow, it is vital that a sewerage system is provided.

Cllr. Healy concurred with Cllrs. Walsh & O'Tuairisg and expressed concern that the availability of waste water systems could define a village over economic development and community facilities defining a village. He explained that the Council does not build industrial towns and asked that a village should not be defined on the basis of infrastructure alone.

Cllr. McConnell said that provision of water and wastewater services was previously debated and advised that the Elected Members approved several additions to the Draft Plan and read new Objectives (WS2, WS3 and WS4) in Chapter 6 and advised to include that Galway County Council will work with Irish Water to improve the water and wastewater infrastructure. She said that the Members also agreed that schemes would not be individually listed as there are several supporting policies in the Plan which includes for Irish Water to support the Water Capital Investment Programme and any updates to it and asked recommended against listing further individual schemes.

Cllr. McConnell said that the Elected Members are requesting the amalgamation of 5/6 specific settlements in the 'Other Settlements in Rural Areas' so they can move up the next tier 'Other Villages' on the Settlement Hierarchy Tier and advised that there could be other settlements in rural areas that could also argue the same point. She advised the Meeting that practically, it would not work on the ground and it would undermine the Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy as these settlements each have their own individual character and are interdependent on the rural area and said that the amalgamation would not change the position on services from a settlement point of view.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP16.***

**Submissions CDP 17 Patricia Sheridan Foley & CDP 18 Michael Sheridan**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Patricia Sheridan Foley and Michael Sheridan** in their respective Submissions and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation for both was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submissions CDP17 & CDP 18.***

**Submission CDP 19 – Patrick Kennedy (Declan J Maloney)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Patrick Kennedy (Declan J Maloney)** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 19.***

**Submission CDP 20 – Niall Mitchell**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Niall Mitchell** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 20***

**Submission CDP 21 – An Fóram do Phobal Iorras Aithneach Carna**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **An Fóram do Phobal Iorras Aithneach Carna** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP16.***

**Submission CDP 22 - James Sullivan**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **James Sullivan** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP22.***

**Submissions CDP 23 - Tesco Ireland & CDP 24 - Musgrave Retail Partners & CDP 25 – Pat Joyce**

Ms. Kennedy outlined/summarised the issues raised in **Tesco Ireland's, Musgrave Retail Partners, Pat Joyce's** Submissions, as the issues related to retail, and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. D. Connolly said that he felt that large multiples for profit are trying to dictate policy and he concurred with Cllr. G. Finnerty who previously said that the Council needs to support the regeneration of Town Centres. In reply, Ms. McConnell clarified that Tesco wanted an undertaking where retail zoning was identified in Local Area Plans that the local authority would not seek a Retail Survey but advised that the Planning Authority strongly disagrees with this as it could have a major impact.

Ms. McConnell explained that there is an objective in the Draft Plan to recognize, encourage and strengthen small settlements to provide a retail function. Cllr. D. Connolly wants no acceptance to financial viability as it could be a detriment to small shops in villages and towns and said the Council needs to support small villages and towns as they provide a community service. In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell explained that the issue around financial viability occurs when large retail proposals are made and said that the *Retail Planning Guidelines* requires development to show that they are financially viable so as they do not have a negative impact on the area and also to deter from the retail unit not being left as a white elephant on the edge of a town. In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. Mc. Connell advised that the *Retail Planning Guidelines* does not envisage that the financial viability requirement will apply to small shops.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submissions CDP23, CDP 24 & CDP25.***

**Submission CDP 26 – Marian Keane, Tiernakill Farmhouse**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Marian Keane** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. O'Tuairisg advised the Meeting that the R336 has been upgraded in many places and said in respect of the road between Coshla and Maam X, there are no footpaths and this is causing problems for pedestrians.

Cllr. Mannion said that the Council is promoting cycling and walking and the introduction of the Wild Atlantic Way has created an increase in traffic and said footpaths are required.

Cllr. Welby explained that while the works on the R336 were required in order to facilitate the Wild Atlantic Way route, walkers are now coming onto the detour of the R336 and asked that consideration be given by the Roads Department to endeavour to upgrade the loops in the area.

Cllr. McClearn advised that while the submission is valid and improvements works may be needed, he said that this is not the forum as it is not relevant to the County Development Plan and instead should be referred to the Roads SPC where it would have a better chance of advancement.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that the Plan is written broadly to support development and the Policies and Objectives are written to support infrastructure including footpaths in all areas, not just specific areas and it would support development proposals as they come forward in the future. He cautioned Elected Members in listing areas as this could have a negative impact, in the assessment of planning applications, if the works were not undertaken. He said that he was confident that the Development Plan could support any infrastructural issue that would arise over the life of the Plan.

Comh. O'Cualain concurred with the Chief Executive and said that the Plan is a framework rather than a 'specifics' Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 26.***

**Submission CDP 27 - Burren Lowlands Development Group**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Burren Lowlands Development Group** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. J. Byrne welcomed this objective and commended the Burren Lowlands Development Group for analyzing the Development Plan and relating it to their own area. He said that on reflection and advice he suggested alternative wording to Objective EDT22.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed to amend Section 4.12.5 – The Burren, to include the following text as follows:***

*"That Galway County Council support the development of a Burren Lowlands Geopark which would support people and organizations in South/East Galway to ensure a cared for landscape, a better understood heritage and sustainable tourism.*

***This proposal is to replace the previous proposal agreed (at the Meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014) following consideration of Submission CDP 9 EPA.***

Cllr. J. Byrne also asked that Farmers Markets be examined and explained that the Farmers Market in Kinvara had great difficulty in obtaining permission and said that the Farmers Markets adds vibrancy to Kinvara village each Friday morning.

Cllr. Fahy referred to Transport Infrastructure for Gort and Surrounding Areas and said it was deplorable the way the NRA wasted land on developing the Motorway Crusheen to Gort and asked that an objective be inserted in the Development Plan not to allow this land wastage by the NRA. In response, the Chief Executive said this was an operational issue regarding the planning and development in delivering the road in question and was not appropriate to the County Development Plan. He said it was his understanding that the Motorway is already designed and is heading to the construction phase.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 27.***

**Submission CDP 28 - Keep Ireland Open (Roger Garland)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Keep Ireland Open (Roger Garland)** in his Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. D. Connolly referred to the Recreation & Amenity Policies and proposed a new Policy RA 5 be included regarding the development of bridleways.

***On the proposal of Cllr. D. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. G. Cronnelly, it was agreed to include a new Policy RA 5 Bridleways as follows:***

***"Policy RA 5 Bridleways***

***That Galway County Council will support and promote programmes and initiatives that will help develop Bridleways in Galway county."***

Cllr. McClearn referred to monuments and sites in the ownership/care of the OPW to which there is no proper access. He said that the OPW are refusing to deal with these issues and people are entering onto private land to visit monuments and it is leaving the landowners in a vulnerable position. He said that recognition must be provided to these landowners. He proposed that the OPW engage with landowners where access to a monument is an issue. He explained that the landowners are left in a vulnerable position and open to legal compensation and the OPW is responsible. He said a Notice should either be placed that one cannot visit the monument or positive engagement should be undertaken by the OPW with the landowners.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice concurred and said that people think they can walk on lands without consent and said that the right of the landowner should be recognized.

Cllr. Broderick concurred with Cllr. McClearn and also said that the OPW does not make provision for disability access to their monuments and sites. He said it should also be included in the Plan that the Council strive to provide disability access to burial grounds.

Cllr. O'Cualain said that most of land where monuments are sited are on farming land and cognisance should be given that farm land is more dangerous than an industrial site. He said

notwithstanding the Health & Safety issue, it is a matter of courtesy for permission to enter the lands to be requested.

Cllr. M. Connolly said this was a very complex issue and the access permission is a very serious situation as a working farm is very dangerous. He said he has seen many people undertaking Slí na Sláinte /Golden Mile walks in his area and many of these are adjacent to fields which have wild bulls on their farm and if there is not adequate fencing, an accident could occur as farm animals are much more dangerous now due to farm practices in place.

Cllr. K. McHugh said that people are unaware of the danger on farms and walkers bring dogs onto farms and could transfer disease to the lands.

Cllr. Cronnelly advised the Meeting that the landowner is liable even if the landowner hasn't given permission.

Cllr. Charity concurred and said that the Occupiers' Liability Act, 1995 outlines that the duty of the occupier is "*not to intentionally injure the person or damage the property of the person, nor act with reckless disregard for the person or the property of the person*". He said that numerous claims have been made against landowners and said that recreational users cannot walk away from the lands. He said that landowner has to deal with it into the future and said that the provision in legislation does nothing regarding public liability insurance.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, the following was proposed:***

***"I propose that the rights of private property landowners are recognized in the County Development Plan."***

***This proposal was not agreed and was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell advised that the Plan does not seek to give rights over and above legislation or assume that the walkways the Council promotes would supercede the right of the landowner to protect their property. She said that in practical terms the Objective would make no difference to the legislative provision for property rights what the Plan seeks to achieve of the landowner (property rights).

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP28.***

#### **Submission CDP 29 – Margarita Donohue**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Margarita Donohue** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 29.***

#### **Submission CDP 30 – Coiste Pobail na Tulaigh (Nuala Ní Chonaghaile, Runaí)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Coiste Pobail na Tulaigh** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.



Ms. McConnell advised that agreement was reached that individual towns and villages are not named as the Capital Investment Programme is agreed between Irish Water and Galway County Council.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 30.***

**Submission CDP 31 – Daniel & Mary Murphy**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Daniel & Mary Murphy** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

Cllr. Welby advised the Meeting that the new R336 is having a huge impact on the people in Connemara and said that this issue needs to be addressed. He asked if Galway County Council has any input into the process as said there has been no local input.

Ms. McConnell said that the Road is referred to the Draft Plan but this does not give any indication as to the solution it is as high level as that. She said that the involvement of the local authority in approving a route, but it is statutory that such projects go to An Bord Pleanála but extensive consultation and views of the Elected Members and public are intrinsic to that process. She confirmed that while the Elected Members would be consulted, they would not be the decision makers.

In reply to Cllr. E. Mannion's query regarding the length of time it would take to eliminate the other routes when a route is selected, the Chief Executive said that there has been a number of discussions at local level regarding the route but there was no agreement on a viable solution regarding designated sites. He said that the length of time depends on 1) whether or not a route is brought before and agreed with the Elected Members and 2) funding to proceed with the road. He advised that this issue requires more discussion at Municipal District level.

Cllr. Feeney said that while the Elected Members have no role in the decision making process, the Connemara Municipal District Members have been consulted but no agreement has been reached by them so the process has stopped there.

Cllr. Walsh said that this issue needs to be discussed at a future Connemara Municipal District meeting.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 31.***

**Submission CDP 32 – Seán F Ó Drisceoil**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Seán F Ó Drisceoil** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 32.***

**Submission CDP 33 – Bríd Nic Dhomhnaill**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Bríd Nic Dhomhnaill** in her Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 33.*

**Submission CDP 34 – Forbairt Pobal Teoranta/ Comhlacht Forbatha an Spidéil**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Forbairt Pobal Teoranta/ Comhlacht Forbatha an Spidéil** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 34.*

**Submission CDP 35 – Chomharchumann Shailearna Teo(CST) (Morgan Ó' Concubhair)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Chomharchumann Shailearna Teo(CST) (Morgan Ó' Concubhair)** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 35.*

**Submission CDP 36 – Comhairle Ceantar na nOileán**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Comhairle Ceantar na nOileán** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 36.*

**Submission CDP 37– Máirín Mhic Lochlainn**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Máirín Mhic Lochlainn** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 37.*

**Submission CDP 38 – Máire Ní Chonghaile**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Máire Ní Chonghaile** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

Comh. O'Tuairisg commented that there are over 700 exits on the R336 Bearna to Ross a Mhíl road. He said that his road was built in the 1800's and these exits are highly dangerous and asked that the Roads Department address this.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 38.*

**Submission CDP 39 – Mór Oil Ltd (Planning Consultancy Services).**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Mór Oil Ltd (Planning Consultancy Services)** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Welby referred to DM 22 Standard Parking Standards and referred to the Matrix in the Draft Plan and expressed concern with regard to parking and said this was another tax on businesses. He said that the car parking charges applied by the Planning Authority is having a serious impact on development and it is a hidden cost people are unaware of and that a lot of revenue is generated by the Planning Authority by these charges yet no new car park space has been provided in the Oughterard area and said there was no benefit for the local towns.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Broderick, it was agreed to amend DM Standard 22: Parking Standards as follows:***

***"DM Standard 22: Parking Standards***

***4. Car Parking Standards***

*Extract from Table 13.3 Car Parking Standards which shows the car parking standards for different types of development:*

Development	Car Parking Standard
Lounge/Bar	1 car space per 4.5m <sup>2</sup> of public floorspace 1 car space per 10sqm of public floorspace
Restaurants	1 car space per 4.5m <sup>2</sup> of public floorspace 1 car space per 10sqm of public floorspace

*Extract from Table 13.3: Car Parking Standards"*

The Chief Executive said that the implications of this Proposal are not clear as the standards are set out in consultation with the Road Design Section.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP39.***

**Submission CDP 40 – Office of Public Works (OPW)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Office of Public Works** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. D. Connolly expressed his concern that the OPW will not meet the Elected Members to discuss their concerns. He said that the Elected Members should take a proactive approach as the flood maps are not an accurate reflection. He said that the Council needs to ensure that the flood mapping is not a desk top exercise as it could be restrictive and it could affect a significant amount of people. He said that it is vital to have accurate flood maps. He expressed his concern that the OPW are not mapping some areas where they only have periodic floods but these areas should also be addressed.

Cllr. G. Finnerty said that flooding is the most important issue in the County Development Plan. He said that it is of utmost importance that we adhere to the Guidelines so as one does not build on a flood plain or in areas that could get marooned by flooding and said that access is also a serious issue at a time of flooding. He said that while the OPW has carried out projects to alleviate flooding, some households still cannot get insurance as they are awaiting OPW certification to approve the works.

Cllr. McClearn said that the maps cannot be taken as gospel as there may be localized flooding for a variety of reasons. He said that in some highlighted flood risk areas, simple culverts could alleviate floods and eliminate it from being a flood risk areas. He said that 2009 was a unique situation and if an area didn't flood in 2009, it is doubtful it ever will.

Cllr. Noone said that there is also an issue with regard to flooding on access roads into households. He said that a common sense approach needs to be taken with regard to practical solutions such as culverts, soakage pits and said that the requirement to add an extra block on foundations would assist.

Cllr. Cuddy said that the difficulty with the OPW is that they did a major study and the OPW now advised that further studies are required and it is now 5 years since the 2009 flooding. He said his main concern is that the local people with the local knowledge are not consulted at all. He said that the raising of roads also is leading to water flowing onto properties as the road is higher than the houses.

Cllr. Fahy expressed his concern that planning permission is not required to construct Dams and said that artificial flooding has been created due to a Dam being erected by the OPW.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that the OPW is the statutory body in relation to flood maps and nationwide flood programme. She said that the maps are preliminary maps. She advised that for each Local Area Plan, Galway County Council carried out their own studies in conjunction with the maps. She said that Galway County Council must adhere to the Guidelines and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) but the Catchment Flood Risk Management (CFRM) plans, which include more detailed maps and modeling, are awaited. She said that the CFRM's will take into account interventions and infrastructure. She said that the Council has no control over when the CFRMs will be available and advised that until the CFRM's are in place, the Council must adopt the precautionary principle regarding flood risk. She said in addition, individual site specific flood risk assessments can be provided by the applicant for their properties. She clarified that the SFRA for the County will be updated when the CFRMs are received.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 40.***

#### **Submission CDP 41 – Galway Flying Club**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by the **Galway Flying Club** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Cuddy asked that Galway County Council maintain the airport for the strategic management of Galway.

Cllr. D. Connolly asked regarding the Terms of Reference for the Report on the future of this site. He asked if the Elected Members are to give an evaluation of use as an airport into the future. He said that while he was aware that there are some viable sports visions for part of the site, he said that it has merit to use as an airport and asked that the Council considers that.

Cllr. Kinane expressed her concern with regard to the removal of the airstrip and said that a feasibility study should be carried out before it is removed.

Cllr. Cronnelly said it should retain its status as a regional airport.

Cllr. Charity asked that a proposal be considered for the alternative use for airport space/consultation process.

The Chief Executive advised that the Consultants were being appointed, following tender, to consider the future of the lands. He said that the Terms of Reference provided for everything to be considered and said that the closing date for submissions was in the coming days and the matter would be included in the Agenda for a future County Council meeting for discussion.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 41.***

**Submission CDP 42 – Irish Concrete Federation**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Irish Concrete Federation** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. J. Byrne referred to his previous proposal which he withdrew based on the advice of the Director of Service. He expressed concern that the issue of pyrite is a serious issue and said Galway County Council should 'highlight the pyrite contribute in aggregates.

Cllr. M. Connolly concurred with Cllr. J. Byrne but said that this related to the manufacturer and awareness should be created by the Quarries at the earliest stage possible.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice concurred and said that the "NPWS Guidance on Biodiversity in the Extractive Industry" is destroying rural life in Ireland.

Cllr. McHugh said that it is a requirement under the Building Regulations that the Quarry owner must supply certification to state the product they are supplying is free of pyrite.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that pyrite is dealt with by the Building Control Regulations and said that a lot of standards are set out regarding energy efficiency. She said that the Planning Authority cannot choose one over another. She explained that the responsibility lies with the assigned certifier in accordance with the Building Regulations and Building Control Standards and inclusion in the Plan is not recommended.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. Canney, it was agreed as follows:***  
***"That the additional wording as recommended by the Manager (Page 100 and 101) (of the Chief Executive Officer's Report) referring to NPWS Guidelines be deleted from the County Plan."***

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP42.*

**Submission CDP 43 – Richard Lee (Planning Consultancy Services)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Richard Lee (Planning Consultancy Services)** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

Cllr. Welby asked for amended wording to Objective EDT 17 to include "include former quarry sites". He explained that there was a huge amount of quarries in Connemara and some operators may not be able to go through constitute consent and the Council needs to examine alternative uses as an amenity and this needs to be from the private section.

*On the proposal of Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Thomas, it was agreed to add text to Objective EDT 17 Outdoor Pursuits as follows:*

***"Objective EDT 17 – Outdoor Pursuits***

*Support the provision of sporting, sailing, boating, kayaking and angling facilities, pier and marina development, pony trekking routes, golf courses, adventure and interpretative centres and associated ancillary uses throughout the County in appropriate locations including former Quarry sites."*

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 43.*

**Submission CDP 44 – Comharchumann Fuinnimh Oileáin Arann Teoranta**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Comharchumann Fuinnimh Oileáin Arann Teoranta** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

In response to Comh. O'Tuairisg's query regarding a Plan for the Islands which is vital, Ms. McConnell explained that a Framework Plan for the Islands would primarily be driven by the people it would affect whereas a Local Area Plan is undertaken by the Council. She said that the Framework plan would allow more local buy-in and has more achievable actions and could include more statutory bodies and actions that locals can undertake.

In reply to Comh. O'Tuairisg's request to remove the words 'as resources permit' the Chief Executive advised that the issue of resources is significant and it is planned to decrease the number of Local Area Plans due to the amount of resources spent is not warranted at this point in time.

*It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 44*

**Submissions** CDP 45 Erin Gibbons, CDP 46 Margaret Carr, CDP 47 Anne McDonagh CDP 48 Coiste Pobail Chamuis, CDP 49 Rob Shairp, CDP 50 Mattie O Domhnaill CDP 51 Margaret O'Domhnaill, CDP 52 Mattie O Domhnaill, CDP 53 Máire Uí Ghiobúin, CDP 54 Muracha O' Suilleabháin, CDP 55 Seán O'Flaitheártha, CDP 56 Irish Wind Energy Association

Ms. Kennedy outlined/summarised the issues raised in Submissions **CDP 45, CDP 46, CDP 47, CDP 48, CDP 49, CDP 50, CDP 51, CDP 52, CDP 53, CDP 54, CDP 55 and CDP 56** said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan in respect of these Submissions, with the exception of CDP 48 which had one Chief Executive Recommendation regarding Objective CF 10 – Fire Service in the Conamara Area.

In reply to Comh. O'Cualain, Ms. McConnell said that the DoECLG are in the process of developing new Guidelines in respect of Renewable Energy and until such time as the Wind Energy Policy and Guidelines for the Local Authority is complete, changes should not be made to Galway County Council's Wind Energy Strategy. She advised that the Council are instructed by the DoECLG not to make changes to the Strategy until the DoECLG guidance is received.

In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell said that the delay is due to the extensive consultation process being undertaken and advised that Galway County Council's Wind Energy Strategy is very well written and is in accordance with best industry standards at this time. She explained that Galway County Council has stated 500m distances from any existing residential development.

Comh. O'Cualain asked should planning decisions be prohibited until the guidance is received. In response, Ms. McConnell said that the Council could not make such a statement and development must be considered. She said that every development has to be assessed on its merits and in line with National, Regional and local Policies and Objectives. In reply to K. McHugh, Ms. McConnell said that interim guidelines are not required as the Council has already a very strong well thought out Wind Energy strategy which is in line with best practice at this time.

The Chief Executive advised that Galway County Council's Wind Energy Strategy has included the 500m distance in accordance with current guidelines and said what is actually in place is far in excess of that. He said that the assessment of planning applications cannot be deferred. He explained that nearly all applications considered pre-dated the Council's Wind Energy Strategy and there has not been many new applications. He said many applications are repeat applications that have been through the process. He reiterated the Council's commitment to adhere to any new Guidance received and said if this Guidance is received while the Material Alterations on are on display, it can be taken account of.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submissions CDP 45, CDP46, CDP47, CDP48, CDP49, CDP50, CDP51, CDP52, CDP53, CDP54, CDP 55 & CDP56.***

**Submissions CDP 57 Seosamh O'Cualáin, CDP 59 Sean O' Conghaile, & CDP 62 Daithí O'Cualáin –**

Ms. Kennedy outlined/summarised the issues raised in Submissions CDP 57, CDP58 and CDP62 which were all in relation to a Fire Service in Connemara and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan in respect of these Submissions.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submissions CDP57, CDP 59 & CDP62.***

**Submissions CDP 58 Paula Nic Cionnaith & CDP 60 Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige (Donncha Ó hÉallaithe)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined/summarised the issues raised in Submissions **CDP 58 Paula Nic Cionnaith & CDP 60 Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige** as they were similar and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Burke referred to CDP 60 and asked if information could be provided in an easy to read format including pictures. In response, the Chief Executive clarified that as this relates also to services provided by others, it would be difficult to impose. He said that in the Council's delivery of services, consideration could be given to this proposal under the Customer Services Action Plan that will be considered in conjunction with the Corporate Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 58 and Submission CDP60.***

**Submission CDP 61 – Cillkornan Community Facilities Ltd. (Planning Consultancy Services)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Cillkornan Community Facilities Ltd** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Kinane, it was agreed to amend Objective CF4 – Sport, Amenity and Recreation as follows:***

***“Objective CF4 – Sport, Amenity and Recreation***

*Support and facilitate local communities, sporting organizations in the development of sport and recreational facilities. Support the modest expansion of existing and authorized sporting facilities throughout the County, Seek to develop open spaces throughout the county which will support a range of recreational and amenity activities that provides for active and passive needs.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Kinane and Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to amend Objective RA 3–Recreation Facilities as follows:***

***“Objective RA 3–Recreation Facilities***

*It is an objective of the Council to develop sport, recreation and amenity facilities and support the modest expansion of existing and authorized sporting facilities throughout the County, in appropriate locations consistent with proper planning and sustainable development in the County and in partnership with local community and sports groups and/or private parties.”*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP61.***

**Submission CDP 63 – Údarás na Gaeltachta**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Údarás na Gaeltachta** in their Submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Comh. O'Tuairisg said that the lack of services and infrastructure is affecting the Gaeltacht areas and said while he was aware that specific sites can be added to the County Development Plan, he said assistance needs to be given to the Clár areas.



Comh. O’Cualain said that the lack of sewerage facilities is inhibiting the existing economic developments as it is impacting the location of new business and the expansion of existing business and said that sewerage treatment plants need to be installed.

In reply, Ms. McConnell said that the Plan includes supporting objectives to work with Irish Water.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submissions 63.***

**Submission CDP 64 - Comharchumann Forbaths Árann Cill Rónáin, Inis Mór.**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Comharchumann Forbaths Árann Cill Rónáin** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Comh. O’Tuairisg commented that the Framework Plan for the Islands would address most issues here but said that he would like also that marine tourism be also examined.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submissions 64.***

**Submission CDP 65 - Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige (Donncha Ó hÉallaithe)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige** in their Submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendations, as outlined in the Chief Executive Officers Report.

Cllr. Healy advised the Meeting that the Connemara Municipal District met with a deputation from Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige and said that An Cnoc has a Credit Union, Post Office, National School, Secondary School, Church, a football pitch, playground, Handball Alley, Community Centre, Theatre, Creche, Educational facility – summer school; all the elements of a village but yet cannot be called a village until a sewerage system is put in place and he said this was unacceptable. He said that while development should be close to services, it should not be necessary that services are adjoined. He said that An Cnoc should not be regarded as a rural area.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was agreed to amend Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy as follows:***

***“Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy***

***Galway County Council will add An Cnoc/ Na hAille to the ‘Other Villages’ category in the Settlement Hierarchy Tier.”***

Comh. O’Tuairisg concurred with Cllr. Healy and said that this was not opening the area to all development and said there was a population of 500+ in area. Comh. O’Cualain advised that the area has all services, has two industrial estates and has hurling, football and handball clubs.

Ms. McConnell said there were 3 or 4 similar proposals to move settlement centres up on the Settlement Hierarchy Tier of the Draft Plan and advised that careful consideration must be given as to how this would affect the settlement strategy in its totality.

Cllr. Healy said that he is not requesting adhoc categorisation on the basis of who made a submission on the Draft Plan but village/town status cannot be turned down based on water and waste water facilities. He said that to avoid adhoc categorisation, a list of criteria must be agreed other than water and waste water facilities.

In reply, Ms. McConnell explained that the category of settlements is as per Settlement Hierarchy Tier of the Draft Plan is not based on water and waste water services. She said the Draft Plan tries to define what each settlement tier represents i.e. population less than 1500 strong settlement structure and advised that waste water requirements in investment is plan led.

She explained that the Settlement Hierarchy Tier follows on from the previous County Development Plan and said that small settlements have different characteristics predominately rural in nature and it is important to support these areas. She confirmed that inclusion on the hierarchy is not based on water and wastewater infrastructure but based on the area's character and its capacity to grow.

Cllr. Healy said he was aware of the criteria but advised that key reasons as outlined in the CEO report for non-inclusion in the Settlement Hierarchy Tier were the 'lack of water and waste water services'. In reply, Ms. Mc Connell said that the hierarchy is representative of the level of service and structural characteristics of settlements and explained that the larger settlement centre's would have a certain level of physical presence than smaller settlements. She said that town/village developments are assessed and based on the 3 c's – connectivity, capacity and characteristics.

Ms. McConnell said that there were several proposals to move settlements from one part of the Tier to another in the Settlement Hierarchy outlined in Section 2.6.1. In reply to Cllr. D. Connolly, Ms. McConnell said that the consequence of moving from one tier to another is unclear but it does undermine the rationale as to why certain settlements were put into certain categories. She explained that the hierarchy is the same as is in the current Plan and in the previous Plan. She said that the reason why settlements are included in each category is outlined in the text beside it and is based on the characteristics of the settlement. She explained that the Tuam status as a hub town is different from other key towns such as Loughrea, \*\*\*Oranmore, Athenry, Gort, Clifden, Portumna, Maigh Cuilinn.

She said that on the ground it will not make much difference to the day to day function of settlements as planning permissions are dealt with based on site characteristics but it does call into question the rationale of each tier of the pyramid. In reply to Cllr. McClearn, Ms. McConnell said that it would have no implications on Development Contributions.

Cllr. Charity referred to Section 2.6.6 and said that Cor na Dola (Corrandulla) is a fast growing area in Co. Galway and the housing estate in the area has increased the population significantly and he said there are percolation difficulties serving the adjacent development. He said it was important that recognition be given to Cor na Dola (Corrandulla) regarding a plan led approach to planning.

Cllr. Kililea said that any proposal agreed would not want to affect rural parts of Corrandulla and he does not want any adverse effect on rural areas planning applications.

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that it does not affect the rural area. He clarified that the Plan is supportive of appropriate development in any of the towns and villages. He said that development is approved based on its infrastructure, size, services, status etc and this would not be affected by moving it into another tier. He explained that if doesn't have the services, by moving it into another tier wont progress the advancement of obtaining these services and said the area can only sustain an appropriate amount of development in the Plan period.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Charity, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh, it was agreed to amend Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy as follows:***

***“Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy***

*Galway County Council will add Cor an Dola to the ‘Other Villages’ category in the Settlement Hierarchy Tier of the County Development Plan.”*

***On the proposal of Comh. O’Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. S. Walsh, it was agreed to amend Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy as follows:***

***“Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy***

*Galway County Council will add An Tulach to the ‘Other Villages’ category in the Settlement Hierarchy Tier of the County Development Plan.”*

In reply to Cllr. J. Byrne, the Chief Executive advised that clustering a number of small villages together in order to advance up the tier does not improve their priorities for water or wastewater services. He explained that expenditure on water services will be considered nationally and said that the Council’s Core Strategy gives a clear indicator as to the priority of where population will go and where growth will be accommodated. He said there is a statutory requirement on Irish Water to have regard to the County Development Plan as well as the National Spatial Strategy and Rural Housing Guidelines. He said that it will not in itself provide a better outcome for those areas.

In reply to Cllr. Brodeirck, the Chief Executive said that a small number of other villages have Local Area Plans but said there were also those within that tier that does not require a Local Area Plan and said it wouldn’t be the Council’s intention to extend the number of Local Area Plans due to limited resources, human and financial, for any additional towns under that category.

Cllr. M. Connolly referred to TI 16 and referred to Woodlawn Railway Station. He said that Woodlawn Railway Station was served fifteen times a day and is a very important piece of infrastructure and said this wasn’t acknowledged in the Draft Plan. He advised the meeting that it was agreed at the Ballinasloe Municipal District that it is important that we have a new approach to development and the Council should encourage settlement along the railway line. He said that Objective TI6 should include all the stops Galway, Oranmore, Athenry, Attymon, Woodlawn, Ballinasloe. He said there was no benefit from being aspirational if we don’t build the critical mass and facilities along the railway line and this would in turn give opportunities to these rural areas to enhance and increase the rural decline in these areas.

Cllr. D. Connolly expressed concern that it was a pity that Attymon and Woodlawn were not earmarked for development as they were strategically placed and he hoped that initiatives like the dual tracks would be acted upon by the Government as it will go a long way to revitalize these rural areas.

Cllr. McClearn said it would be more helpful to give Woodlawn a second platform. He said he would have concern that by including these villages would give out a signal to people that has no meaning and if the local school was closed, it was closed for a reason.

***On the proposal of Cllr. M. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. D. Burke and Cllr. A. Donohue, it was agreed to amend Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy as follows:***

***“Section 2.6.1 Settlement Hierarchy***

***“Galway County Council will cluster Woodlawn, Ballymacward, Kilconnell and New Inn to bring them up to Level 5 on “Other Villages” in the Settlement Hierarchy Tier of the County Development Plan.***

*Galway County Council will include Attymon and Woodlawn train stations on the following Maps: OSS Map - Overall Spatial Strategy and Population Development Option, CSM Map – Core Strategy Map, SH Map Settlement Hierarchy Map, RHO1 Map - Rural Area Types, RHO2 Map Rural Housing Policy and EDT1 Map Economic Engine Corridors in the Draft Development Plan.*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report, as amended by the Members, in respect of Submission CDP 65.***

**Submission CDP 66 – Joe Burke**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Joe Burke** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 66.***

**Submission CDP 67 – Comhlacht Forbartha An Spidéil**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Comhlacht Forbartha An Spidéil** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 67.***

**Submission CDP 68 – Pat Lee (Cyril J Kelly & Associates)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Pat Lee** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 68.***

**Submission CDP 69 – Mulcaire Hefferenan Ltd. On behalf of Anne Hughes**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Mulcaire Hefferenan Ltd. On behalf of Anne Hughes** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP69.***

**Submission CDP 70 – Ivor Duane**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Ivor Duane** in his Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 70.***

**Submission CDP 71 – Katarzyna Sitek**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Katarzyna Sitek** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

Cllr. D. Connolly suggested that Ballinasloe's role in health service provision be expanded in Section 2.6.4 Ballinasloe – County Town, as Ballinasloe plays a considerable role in health service provision and is an area of health excellence. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that this is included already in Section 2.4.1 as it states "*It (Ballinasloe) provides higher order important services such as Portiuncula Hospital and St. Brigid's which serve a regional population*"

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP71.***

**Submission CDP 72 – John and Mary Joyce**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **John and Mary Joyce** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP 72.***

**Submission CDP 73 – Mairin Ui Chonghaile**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Mairin Ui Chonghaile** in her Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer's Report in respect of Submission CDP73.***

**Submission CDP 74 – Mór Oil Ltd (Planning Consultancy Services)**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **Mór Oil Ltd** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive's Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to amend Objective LCM1 – Landscape Sensitivity Classification (Landscape Conservation and Management Objectives) as follows:***

***"Objective LCM 1 – Landscape Sensitivity Classification***

***The Planning Authority shall have regard to the Landscape Sensitivity Classification of sites in the consideration of any significant development proposals and, where necessary, require a Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment to accompany such proposals. This shall be balanced against the need to develop key strategic infrastructure to meet the strategic aims of the Plan, and having regard to the zoning objectives of serviced Development Land within the Galway Metropolitan Areas."***

*On the proposal of Cllr. Cuddy, seconded by Cllr. Welby, it was agreed to amend Objective LCM1 – Landscape Sensitivity Classification (Focal Points and Views Objectives) as follows:*

***“Objective FPV 1 – Development Management***

*Preserve the focal points and views as listed in Map FPV1 from development that in the view of the Planning Authority would negatively impact on said focal points and views. This shall be balanced against the need to develop key infrastructure to meet the strategic aims of the plan, and have regard to the zoning objectives of serviced Development land within the Galway Metropolitan Area.”*

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 74.***

**Submission CDP 75 – James Ward**

Ms. Kennedy outlined the issues raised by **James Ward** in their Submission and said that the Chief Executive’s Recommendation was no change to the Draft Plan.

***It was agreed to accept the Recommendations in the Chief Executive Officer’s Report in respect of Submission CDP 75.***

*On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, it was proposed to amend Objective IS 1 – Economic and Tourism Development on the Islands as follows:*

***“Objective IS 1 – Economic and Tourism Development on the Islands***

*Support the economic and tourism development of the islands for the benefit of island communities generally and to encourage the development of speciality or niche economic sectors that might be appropriate to different island with recognition for the impact of this development on the islands associated onshore port.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Cllr. Healy clarified for the Meeting that this proposal is in relation to heavy tourist traffic on the Islands and if there was an increase in tourist traffic this could affect the Port if the Port is not developed in tandem with the Island.

Cllr. Broderick said that the Islands benefit from increased tourism and said that the County Development Plan is committed to tourism.

The Chief Executive said that consideration of development on the Islands and the capacity of the Port would be considered in that context and if the Port couldn’t sustain development on the Islands, this would be taken into account.

Cllr. Walsh said that the Islands are so undeveloped that nothing should restrict development on the Islands.

Cllr. E. Mannion said that issues are being addressed at present and said she would not be in favour of having a negative objective in the Plan.

Cllr. Broderick expressed his concern about placing an extra financial burden on the local authority when there is still an outstanding debt for previous Pier works at another location and a levy had to be placed on Islanders.

In response, Ms. McConnell said that this additional wording could place the local authority in financial pressure and it could restrict development on the Islands if it was possible that the Port could not hold it.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, it was agreed to amend Objective TI 16 © – Bus Services & the Rural Transport Programme (RTP) as follows:***

***“Objective TI 16 – Bus Services & the Rural Transport Programme (RTP)***

- a) Support the provision of public and private bus services and ancillary infrastructure including bus shelters, park and ride facilities at appropriate locations.*
- b) Support and help implement the Rural Transport Initiative including any revisions to same. Work with the HSE/local communities including the Galway Transport Co-ordination Unit (TCU) in order to encourage and promote a sustainable community-based public transport scheme*
- c) Ensure that all bus services and ancillary infrastructure including bus shelters, park and ride facilities at appropriate location have appropriate regard to the needs of the disabled in line with regulatory requirements. GCC supports shall be subject to there being prior compliance before being provided.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was proposed to add a new Objective ER 10 MicroHydro Energy Strategy as follows:***

***“Objective ER 10 MicroHydro Energy Strategy***

*The Council will recognise the special requirements needed to facilitate the development of MicroHydro energy in the county and will draft a strategy document similar to the existing strategy document for Wind Energy. This will be based on best international practice.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, it was agreed to amend Policy ER 2 Development of Renewable Energy as follows:***

***“Policy ER 2 – Development of Renewable Energy***

*The Council shall support proposals for renewable energy developments at all scales (including ~~transmission grid development~~, ocean energy/wave and tidal technologies and ancillary facilities including associated grid connection) at appropriate locations within the County having regard to residential amenities, biodiversity and landscape sensitivities, where such proposals are in compliance with the County Development Plan 2015- 2021 and the principles of proper planning and sustainable development. Where possible the Council will develop its own micro generation projects to facilitate its own energy requirements.”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, it was proposed to add new text (e) to Objective ER 7 Energy Efficiency Technology in Buildings as follows:***

***“Objective ER 7 Energy Efficiency Technology in Buildings***

*The Planning Authority will have regard to the DoEHLG Guidelines on Sustainable Residential Developments in Urban Areas: Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009 and the accompanying guidance document Urban Design Manual in the assessment of any proposals for residential development, including inter alia those in respect of energy efficiency, passive solar design and renewable energy sources.*

*The Council shall:*

- a) Encourage and actively promote innovative housing design, energy efficient technologies and layout solutions that address concerns of environmental sustainability with regard to matters such as energy efficiency and the use of materials;*



*b) Actively encourage the integration of micro renewable energy sources into the design and construction of all developments throughout the County.*

*c) The Council shall work with local and relevant departments to identify where there is poor energy infrastructure and low penetration of renewable energy. The Council shall promote the use of district heating/cooling and combined heat and power in new single and multiple housing developments, within schools, commercial and public buildings throughout the County.*

*d) Galway County Council shall require the provision of energy efficient street lighting in all public and private developments.*

*e) Galway County Council shall retrofit its buildings to meet the carbon emissions and energy consumption requirements of the 2011 Building regulations where possible."*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was proposed to add a new Policy ER5 – Council Renewable Energy Opportunities as follows:***

***“Policy ER5 – Council Renewable Energy Opportunities***

*Galway County Council will review the possibility of renewable energy generation on suitable projects where appropriate and will seek to organise an audit of available renewable energy resources within the County.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Cllr. Healy explained that the Building Regulations referred to new buildings but said existing buildings should also be examined.

The Chief Executive advised that this Objective would impose a requirement on the Council as it is introducing a new Strategy and the local authority would be required to do an Audit and the consequences are way beyond the County Development Plan. He explained that as this proposal affects the use of resources including financial, discussion should be considered at the County Council’s Meetings relation to the Corporate Plan, where the Members could agree if this is a necessary piece of work and at the Budget Meeting where the Elected Members could decide if this piece of work is to be undertaken what resources should be assigned to it. He said that this objective inferred clear significant financial implications without consideration.

Mr. Cullen advised the Meeting that all public bodies have mandatory targets set out that must be achieved. He said if this motion was passed, it would mean the Council was implementing targets for the local authority and it would be inconsistent to existing governing piece of legislation. He said it would be best if the motion was framed to complement the mandatory carbon omission obligations in place.

Ms. McConnell suggested that such an audit could be undertaken in conjunction with the Renewable Energy Strategy.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. D. Connelly, it was agreed to amend Objective ER 4 Renewable Energy as follows:***

***“Objective ER 4 – Renewable Energy***

*1. Support and facilitate the development and use of renewable energy sources and associated infrastructure within the County, including*

- Wind Energy;*
- Wave/Tidal Energy;*



- *Hydro-Power;*
- *Solar Energy;*
- *Bio-Energy,*
- *Geo-Thermal*
- *Combined Heat Power (CHP);*
- *Heat Energy Distribution (such as District Heating/Cooling Systems);*
- *Anaerobic Digestion and*
- *Other renewable energy sources, as appropriate and in line with national guidelines for sustainable development.*

**2. The Council shall commence ~~prepare~~ a County Renewable Energy Strategy within the lifetime of the plan as resources permit. This document will also take micro generation options in to account and will recognise that Renewable Energy projects are not just limited to large scale infrastructural projects”.**

Cllr. Walsh said this Objective was very prescriptive and said that it is generally accepted that microgenerated energy is not more economically efficient and small generation projects are supplemented by our ESB bills.

Ms. McConnell advised that the proposed development of a Renewal Energy Strategy will take account of all renewable energies.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was proposed to amend Policy NHB7 – Invasive Species as follows:***

***“Policy NHB7 – Invasive Species***

*It is a policy of the Council to support measures for the prevention and eradication of invasive species. This will include the dissemination of information to raise public awareness, consultation with relevant stakeholders, the promotion of the use of native species in amenity planting and landscaping and the recording of invasive/native species as the need arises and resources permit. The Council will seek to understand international best practices and will develop an invasive species strategy plan.”*

***This proposal was not agreed and the Proposal was withdrawn.***

Ms. McConnell advised that this strategy would be wide ranging and time consuming and she was unsure if the local authority could commit resources to it.

In reply to Cllr. Healy, the Chief Executive advised that the Policy as it stands sought to do what the Draft County Development suggests without taking on a specific role in Invasive Species. He said that the insertion of an objective to be undertaken within the Council’s resources may give rise to an expectation that cannot be met. He confirmed that the local authority would adhere to international best practice in this area.

Cllr. Thomas said that he is in favour to eradicate invasive species but to enforce a policy is too costly and he said he felt that any eradication measures should be funded by the Department of Agriculture.

Cllr. Cronnelly said that under the Wildlife Acts, flora and fauna are not part of the food chain.

Cllr. S. O’Cualain said if the invasive species is on private land, the landowners should be encouraged to deal with it.

Ms. McConnell said it was not Council responsibility and the Policy in the Draft Plan supports all measures to eradicate invasive species.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Charity, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh, it was agreed to amend Policy CF6 – Burial Grounds and Objective CF6 Burial Grounds as follows:***

***“Policy CF 6 – Burial Grounds***

*Implement the ongoing programme for the provision and extension of burial grounds within available resources. The planning authority will seek to acquire lands where the extension of public burial grounds in the ownership or charge of the Council **which is necessary or is** likely to be necessary during the Plan period. Archaeologically significant medieval burial grounds will not be considered for extension if such an extension would constitute a proven risk to the archaeological heritage.”*

***“Objective CF 6 – Burial Grounds***

*”Acquire lands where the extension of public burial grounds in the ownership or charge of the Council **which is necessary or is** likely to be during the Plan period. Archaeologically significant medieval burial grounds will not be considered for extension if such an extension would constitute a proven risk to the archaeological heritage”*

***On the proposal of Cllr. Charity, seconded by Cllr. Cunniffe, it was agreed to refer this proposal to the Environment Strategic Policy Committee for consideration and discussion:***

*“That a new Objective be inserted as CF 10 of the County Development Plan that Galway County Council prepare a comprehensive plan for the extension of those burial grounds which currently require extension, and are likely to require extension during the plans period, for submission to the elected members on a bi-annual basis, with clear plans for the expansion of such cemeteries set out in detail “.*

Ms. McConnell advised that this action would be more appropriate in the Corporate Plan. The Chief Executive advised that while this issue may need addressing, he said that the Corporate Plan Meeting and the Budget Meeting is the most appropriate forum where the Elected Members can discuss the issue as the Corporate Plan is a clear indication of priorities going forward and the budgetary process aligned to it. He said there was no requirement to have it in the County Development Plan.

Mr. Cullen said that extensions to burial grounds are entirely driven by the availability of resources from the revenue budget. He said that the inclusion of this statement in the County Development Plan is purely aspirational if the revenue budget isn’t adequate to achieve the objective. He said that Galway County Council tries to address the most urgent burial ground extensions in the most effective way as possible through the Environment SPC.

Cllr. Cuddy said that unless the Council gets the necessary resources no works can be undertaken.

Cllr. Charity expressed concern that there is no comprehensive plan set out by the Council to outline the burial grounds that require extension and how this can be achieved. He said that the Council is failing throughout the County to deal with this issue and he said that the

Council should take the lead rather than leaving it to local communities to deal with and he said he felt that the County Development Plan would force the Council to take the lead.

Cllr. M. Connolly said that the acquisition of land was the most difficult issue. He advised that Meeting that there is no statutory obligation for the Council to provide burial grounds but they undertake this role.

Mr. Cullen advised that burial ground extensions have been dealt with in consultation with the Environment SPC. He said that historically people want to be buried in their own local area and it is Galway County Council policy to try to achieve this and said it was not fair to say that there is no plan as the Council works with local communities with limited resources to deal with this issue. He said that another option may be the least attractive way in that the Council obtain a large piece of land and all burials go to this one area but this is not the preferred policy of the Council. He said that the Council has a policy that reflects the communities' wishes but it is a costly policy.

Cllr. Kearney said that the Council does carry out a lot of work but expressed caution that if land does become available that the Council examine it to ensure that the land is suitable.

In reply to Cllr. Hynes, Ms. McConnell said that the funding provision for the purchase of land for burial ground extensions could be discussed at the Budget meeting.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Cronnelly, seconded by Cllr. Healy, it was agreed to include a new Policy TI 11 Signage under Section 5.4 Road & Transportation Policies and Objectives as follows:***

***"Policy TI11-Signage***

***It is a policy of Galway County Council to liaise with the National roads Authority in relation to increased signage for rural towns adjacent to motorways in order to promote service availability."***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Fitzmaurice, seconded by Cllr. D. Connolly, it was agreed to amend Policy SI 1 Social Inclusion and Universal Access as follows:***

***"Policy SI 1 Social Inclusion and Universal Access***

Support the principles of social inclusion and universal access and ensure that all individuals have access to goods, services, facilities and buildings and in light of these principles recognise the social and economic disadvantages in areas of East Galway and Conamara. ~~in order to~~ and assist individuals ~~them~~ to participate in and contribute to social and cultural life within County Galway as a whole. "

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. Cronnelly, it was agreed to include text under Section 7.4 Renewable Energy as follows:***

***"Galway County Council will strive to achieve a reduction in the carbon emissions targets for public bodies through the implementation of energy efficient and energy management priorities"***.

***On the proposal of Comh. O'Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend Objective UHO 13 Urban Housing in Gaeltacht Areas as follows:***

***"Objective UHO 13 Urban Housing in Gaeltacht Areas***

***Development of multiple residential units(2 or more) in the Gaeltacht settlements shall be subject to Galway County Council's linguistic and occupancy requirements in order to***

*protect the linguistic and cultural heritage of the Gaeltacht including the promotion of Irish as the community language.”*

***On the proposal of Comh. O’Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to add a new Objective AFF16 Marine Tourism as follows:***

***“Objective AFF 16 – Marine Tourism***

*The Council will support the development of the necessary infrastructure and amenities to support marine tourism such as deep sea angling, sailing, canoeing, surfing, island exploration and cruise ship passengers.”*

***On the proposal of Comh. O’Tuairisg, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was agreed to amend Objective TI 23 (TI 22 in Draft Plan) Sustainable Development of Ports, Harbours, Piers and Slipways as follows:***

***“Objective TI 23 – Sustainable Development of Ports, Harbours, Piers and Slipways***

- 1) Support the development of Ros an Mhíl Harbour as a deep water port and support and facilitate improvements the and maintenance to other harbours including Inis Oirr and Inis Meáin, piers and slipways and consider any new marine infrastructure where appropriate. and improvement of, exiting ports, harbours, piers and slipways and consider any new marine infrastructure where appropriate and as resources allow;*
- 2)Facilitate the safe and convenient access to the water for the purpose of public transport, industry commerce, sea rescue, tourism, aquaculture and recreation where appropriate and as resources allow.”*

**Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures (RPS)**

In respect of the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures (RPS), Ms. McConnell advised that the Minister of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht carried out a survey in 2011 and 1400 structures were recommended for protection. She advised that the recommendations were examined by the Architectural Conservation Officer and 870 were put forward for inclusion and it was decided that these would be proposed as part of the Review of the County Development Plan.

Ms. McConnell advised the buildings/structures on the Proposed Additions to the RPS were included because of their special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest, as outlined in the Planning & Development Act.

In reply to Comh. O’Tuairisg who referred to the 8500 petitions regarding the Quiet Man Cottage, Ms. McConnell advised that the introduction of a new structure is a separate procedure. She said it can be initiated by the owner or the Elected Members at any time. She said the proposal is put on public display to allow the public to make submissions and the opinion of the Minister of Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht must be sought.

In reply to Cllr. Mannion, Ms. McConnell advised that structures can be removed using the Section 55 procedure as outlined in the Planning & Development Act.

Cllr. M. Connolly said that he was advised that some owners did not receive any notices. In response, Ms. McConnell explained that an extensive exercise was undertaken to notify each known owner/occupier of their proposed addition in the RPS. She said owners/occupiers were issued notification firstly by registered letter, and if this was unsuccessful, the Community Warden for the area either served the notice on the owner/occupier or pinned it to the building/structure in accordance with the prescribed

process set out in the Planning Act. She advised that any Notices not properly served are listed in the CEO Report. She clarified that any submissions received on properties were examined and recommendations made on whether or not they should remain on the RPS and said that in many instances properties were recommended for removal from the RPS based on the information received in the submissions.

Cllr. McHugh advised that he has listed three properties for proposed removal from the RPS, at the request of the owners, and he advised that he also made contact with a number of owners who were happy to leave their properties on the list and advised that the Elected Members should not take it on themselves to decide without discussion with the Owners.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice concurred and said one owner who lives in the USA was unaware that his house was a proposed protected structure. He said that this is putting a burden on private property and until proper grant funding becomes available, people do not want their houses on the list.

Cllr. Hoade asked who was notified in respect of churches. In reply, Ms. Doddy said that Catholic Churches are private property and the Bishop and parish priest were notified.

In response, Ms. Doddy advised that the owner/occupier was notified in each case. She explained that the information received from the NIAH included a description of the building and a picture and the Planning Authority had to identify each owner/occupier and they were notified with the prescribed process set out in the Planning Act. She advised that each owner/occupier was issued with a Notice and an Information Guide by registered post and if any were returned, the Community Warden for the area then re-served the notice and if this failed then the Notice was affixed to the building /structure.

Ms. Doddy said that each owner/occupier was given the opportunity to make a submission and contact numbers were given and a synopsis of each Submission is set out in the CEO Report. She explained that those notices that were not properly served, these are also listed in the CEO Report.

Cllr. Kinane asked if the Council provided feedback to persons who made submissions. In reply, Ms. Doddy said that an acknowledgement was issued to each person who made a submission on the Draft Plan including the proposed RPS. She added that phone numbers of Council officials were included in the cover letter and many persons did contact the office and Ms. Doddy confirmed that she visited buildings if requested by the owners. Ms. McConnell advised that there is no statutory provision to respond or engage in a dialogue but an acknowledgement was issued with contact details of the appropriate staff.

Cllr. Feeney said that there was a considerable amount of community/public buildings on the proposed list which includes a lot of bridges. He explained that many Fás Schemes are employed to enhance and improve such facilities and said the inclusion of bridges on the list could put constraints on the community to enhance or upgrade and it might cause unnecessary delay or cost in the manner of which they need to be upgraded.

Comh. O'Curraoin expressed his deep concern regarding the protection of bridges as he said if works is required to these bridges, it may cause difficulty.

In reply Ms. Doddy said that conservation is about managing change and said that inclusion on the RPS does not mean that change cannot happen. She advised that buildings which could be 100-200 years old would possibly undergo change every generation and the ethos behind conservation is that buildings are kept in use. She said that one could enhance and upgrade their house as that is an aim of conservation, to maintain a building and keep it in use.

Cllr. Charity expressed his concern regarding Annaghdown Pier and said that the description of the Pier and the picture dates back to 2011 and works have been undertaken by the Council since and the current position is not adequately reflected. Ms. McConnell said that amendments to Annaghdown Pier do not mean that it is less worthy of inclusion as the character of the Pier remains the same.

Cllr. Charity said that the description and picture of Annaghdown Pier is fundamentally at odds as the bridge has been materially altered due to the works undertaken and the character has been effectively changed. He asked that an examination of materials be undertaken before it is decided that it is not materially altered. In response, Ms. McConnell said that a lot of structures were inspected but the undertaking of remedial/renovation works on structures does not fundamentally alter its history, character or structure and it cannot be determined that it does not have intrinsic value and advised that no submission was received in relation to this Pier. Ms. Doddy said that the Pier still has social values and it has developed over time over the lake and said that these changes don't intrinsically affect the underlying character of the structure.

Cllr. Kearney concurred with Cllr. Charity and said that he was aware of other houses that have been renovated since 2011 and are not accurately reflected in the proposed RPS listing. In reply, Ms. Doddy said that process being undertaken is to consider the Minister for Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht's recommendations. She advised that the Minister's recommendations are based on a survey undertaken in 2011. She accepted that some pictures need to be updated and this would be undertaken for the final County Development Plan by the end of January 2015.

Cllr. J. Byrne referred to Appendix IV – Architectural Conservation Areas and asked in respect of Gort if this takes precedence of individual buildings going onto the RPS. In reply, Ms. Doddy clarified that the ACA means the protection of the character of a place rather than a building.

In reply to Cllr. Cunniffe and Cllr. Burke, Ms. McConnell said that the procedure under Section 55 of the Planning & Development Act to add or delete structures on the Record of Protected Structures can be invoked at any time.

Ms. McConnell advised that notices regarding structures in the public realm were sent to the appropriate local authority Department such as the Roads Department in respect of bridges in a public space. In reply to Cllr. J. Byrne, Ms. McConnell said that the notification regarding piers and harbours would have forwarded to the Roads Department.

Ms. McConnell advised that legislation requires the consideration of the Submissions received. She explained that the Elected Members can only consider the Ministerial recommendations that were on public display. See Pg 120.

She advised that Submissions 1-7, 9, 25, 41, 43, 49, 50, and 90 all referred to the Quiet Man Cottage. She advised that the Chief Executive Officer's recommendation is that the decision of the inclusion of a new protected structure is a separate legal process.

In reply to Cllr. Healy, Ms. McConnell said that the inclusion of a new protected structure must be initiated by either the owner or by the Elected Members and said there is a statutory process to be followed.

***On the proposal of Cllr. Healy, seconded by Cllr. S. Walsh, it was agreed to commence the regulatory process required to add the 'Quiet Man Cottage to the Record of Protected Structures.***

Ms. McConnell cautioned the Elected Members and said that any decision taken by the Elected Members to remove buildings/structures must act on the full knowledge of owner and said where Elected Members have proposals to remove structures from the RPS, a reason is required.

Ms. McConnell said that she is not taking issue with structures where a case is made but saying that no piers should be included is fundamentally flawed as this is not a valid reason. She said the Elected Members should be acting in the full knowledge of the property owner and said some owners are happy to have their building included as they see this as adding value and importance to their property.

Cllr. M. Connolly said that conservation grants are insignificant and said if proper funding was available there would be more of an incentive for owners as the grant aid is currently insufficient to meet the works required. In reply, Ms. McConnell said that every intervention that an owner/occupier wants to carry out may not impact on the character of the building and the Architectural Conservation Officer can work with the owner/occupier regarding same. She said that there seemed to be uncertainty and mis-information as it may not cost any additional monies on an owner/occupier.

In reply to Cllr. J. Byrne & Cllr. Welby, Ms. Mc Connell said that a Section 57 Notice, under the Planning & Development Act, can be requested from an owner at any time and there is no cost associated with this request. She explained that a Declaration under S. 57 under the Planning & Development Act could be drawn up to clarify what is of special interest within the building however this can only be undertaken when the building is included on the RPS.

In reply to Cllr. Cunniffe, Ms. Doddy said that if, for example, the roof was destroyed in a 200 year old house, there is no requirement on the owner to re-instate the roof similar to the original roof. Ms. Doddy said that thatched houses are a definitive feature within Galway as it had approximately 600 thatch houses within the county so this could feed into Tourism and the landscape.

## **Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014**

*The following are the agreed proposals of the Elected Members regarding the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures, with the Proposer and Seconded. There were additional Proposers and Seconders in some instances.*

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconded	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
1	N/A	N/A	Sara Stewart	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
2	N/A	N/A	Marie Ellis	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
3	N/A	N/A	John Loughlin	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
4	N/A	N/A	Jerry Burch	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
5	N/A	N/A	Jan Dusdale	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
6	N/A	N/A	Eileen Meredith	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
7	N/A	N/A	Veronica McGinley	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
8	3851	30402803	Conny Hartmut Von Conrady	Rockwell House, Tobberoe	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Charity		
9	N/A	N/A	Daithi O'Brien	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
10	3514	30411201	Elaine & Gerard Mahon	House at Dooras Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan
11	3024	30406813	Diocesan Office Galway	Church of Immaculate Conception	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
12	3793	30327007	Diocesan Office Galway	Scoil Mhichil, Spiddal	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. J. Charity, Cllr. Thomas	Cllr. K. McHugh, Cllr. S. Walsh
13	3408	30405402	Colm Hassett for Eoin Hassett	Thatch, Eighterard	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
14	3950	30405627	Thomas O'Brien	House at Balroe buck More	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
15	3819	30331048	Courts Service	Derelict Courthouse	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone		
16	4022	30411027	Commissioner of Irish Lights	Lighthouse, Rock Island	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
17	3183	30406011	Baverly Bayliss	outbuilding Clonbrock House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			



# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
18	3804	30331017	Jarlath P. Canney	Mrs. Quins charity shop/Davin Travel Town parks	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. P. Roche
19	3015	30335002	Oliver Higgins Cons. For Mike Carr Jnr.	Tce Thatch, Clarinbridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Canney	Cllr. F. Kearney		
20	3110	30333035	Mary Molloy (deceased)	House at Garbally Demesne	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. P.Roche
20 (b)	3112	30333037	Mary Molloy (deceased)	House at Cleaghmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. P.Roche
21	3020	30336006	Michael Conway	Thatch, Craughwell	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
22	3073	30411907	Bartley Conneely	Outbuilding at Carrowtemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
23	3613	30409708	Florence Mitchell	Rathville House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
24	3614	30409709	Florence Mitchell	Gateway Rathville House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
25	N/A	N/A	Tina Corcoran	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
26	3808	30331030	Scott Talon Walker Arch for P. Byrne Son Ltd.	Byrne - Townparks Tuam	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
27	3717	30405632	Thomas Shaughnessy	Thatch Cottage, Shanbally(Clare)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
28	3401	30409103	Mary Cahalan	Thatch, Cornarona	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. S. Cunniffe		
29	3622	30410610	Frank Martyn	ThatchCarrowroe (Kilmeen)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Hynes	Cllr. M. Fahy		
30	3513	30411202	Fintan Fordham	House at Geehy South Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
31	3077	30411911	Sean O Fatharta	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
32	3670	30409502	Colette MacDonagh White	Thatch, Frenchfort	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
33	3738	30407002	Margaret Anne Connolly	House at Ballyglass	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. J. Charity
34	3968	30332001	Charles Powell	Cullairbaun House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
35	3690	30409521	John Dooley	Thatch, Kilcaimin	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. J. Charity		
36 (& 39)	3402	30409201	Coláiste Cholmcille - Peadar Ó Sé Príomhoide	Gairmscoil Cholmcille	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
37	3589	30412306	Patrick J. Lahiff	Cappard House - Courtyard	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
38	3364	30405303	T.W. Kilgariff (Galway Diocesan Trustees)	Leam National School	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
39	3413	30402701	Declan Glynn	Petersburgh House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg		
39 (& 36)	3402	30409201	Declan Glynn	Gairmscoil Cholmcille	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. S O'Tuairisg		
39 (&80)	3052	30411101	Declan Glynn	Gairmscoil Éinne	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. S O'Tuairisg	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
40	3555	30340009	John Paul Lennon and Co	Former Dispensary Ardahan	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
41	N/A	N/A	Joe Finio	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
42 & 64 & 74 & 127	3876	30400705	Trustees of Diocese of Elphin	Tobberoe National School	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. Keaveney
43	N/A	N/A	Joe Fields	Quiet Man Cottage	Process under Section 55 process	Cllr. Tom Healy	Cllr. S. Walsh		
44	3582	30410511	Thomas Murphy	Millmount House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Donnellan	Cllr. P. Hynes		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
45	3358	30403902	Deirdre Keogh for Kathleen Keogh	Maam Cross Station	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. D. Killilea		
45	3297	30404902	Deirdre Keogh for Kathleen Keogh	RIC Barracks at Ballyconneely	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. D. Killilea		
46	3869	30400101	Mary Cooley	Clough Mill	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
47	3320	30400901	John Coyle	Renvyle House Hotel	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Canney, Cllr. E. Mannion, Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice, Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg, Cllr. S. Walsh
48	3750	30326005	Maura Joyce	House at Clare	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. Welby	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
49	N/A	N/A	Tracy Walsh	Quiet Man Cottage	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
50	N/A	N/A	Sharon O'Brien	Quiet Man Cottage	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
51	3355	30405101	Robert and Ann Jocelyn	Doon House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
52	3735	30407015	Johnny Kenny	Thatch Cottage, Kiltroge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. D. Killilea		
53	3218	30408708	J.R. North	Northbrook House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. Broderick	Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. T. Broderick	Cllr. T. Welby
54 & 112	3912	30404405	Patrick D. Dunleavy	Barbersfort House - House and Outbuildings	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone
55	4026	30412003	Sean & Brid O'Chonghaile	Outbuilding at Baile an tSéipéil	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
56	3615	30409806	Cahir O'Higgins and Co. Ltd	House, Cloonmain	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
57	3604	30411501	Robert Ewing	Abbeyville House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
58	3844	30405609	Michael Mussen	House at Keekill	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
59	3208	30408606	Derek Hampson	Killaan House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. K. McHugh		
60	3406	30404002	John Conroy	Gortdrishagh House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
61	3971	30332004	Ray McGrogan	Banba	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
62	3281	30410905	J.G. Finney on behalf of H.N. Finney (deceased)	House (Shannon Grove)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Burke	Cllr. M. Connolly		
63	3731	30407003	Kevin O'Connell	Bawnmore House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
64 (& 42 & 74 & 127)	3876	30400705	Glinsk Parish Council	Tobberoe National School	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. Keaveney
65	3089	30411925	<i>John Concannon</i>	<i>Outbuilding at Carrowlisheen</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
66	3046	30411013	<i>Áine Conneely</i>	<i>Thatched House at Oghil</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
67	3806	30331023	Josephine & Martin Buckley	House at Townparks Tuam	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Cunniffe	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Cunniffe	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. Charity
68	3713	30405631	Teresa Curry	Thatch, Annagh West	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Hoade	Cllr. S. Canney		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
69	3723	30406914	William Moran & Patrick Moylan	House at Cloonboo	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Donnellan	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. J. Charity, Cllr. Cuddy, Cllr. Keaveney, Cllr. K. McHugh, Cllr. S. Canney, Cllr. Killilea, Cllr. M. Connolly, Cllr. Donnellan, Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. S. Cunniffe, Cllr. Charity Cllr. Fitzmaurice Cllr. Noone, Cllr. G. Finnerty, Cllr. M. Kinane
70	N/A	N/A	Paddy McCormick and Richard Mc Laughlin	Quiet Man Cottage	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
71	N/A	N/A	Paddy McCormick via change.org	Quiet Man Cottage	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
72	4003	30405608	Martin & James Malone	Thatch Cottage, Cahermorris	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
73	3551	30411308	Patricia Coen Touhy for Coen Family	House at Ballyglass west	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. M. Noone
74 (& 42 & 64 & 127)	3876	30400705	Glinsk Parish Council	Tobberoe National School	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. Keaveney
75	3662	30412603	Joseph Gannon	House at Ballyglass	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. M. Kinane
76	3766	30343023	Vera Burke	Palmerstown House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NAIH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
77	3924	30405810	Abbeyknockmoy Parish Council Ltd	Handball Alley at Liss	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Roche	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Finnerty
78	3365	30405304	Reinhold Hills & Ursula McMorro	Former Teachers House, Leam East	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
79	3203	30407315	Cllr. M. Connolly for Julia McDonagh	Greenhills House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty
80 (&39)	3052	30411101	Gairmscoil Éinne Oileáin Arainn	Gairmscoil Éinne	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. N. Thomas		
81 Part of	3972	30332005	Iarnród Éireann	Railway Bridge at Caheroyan	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Feeney	Cllr. M. Maher		
81 Part of	3973	30332006	Iarnród Éireann	Railway Bridge at Caheroyan	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Feeney	Cllr. M. Maher		
81	3348	30403707	<i>Iarnród Éireann</i>	<i>Bridge at Garroman Recess</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	<i>Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification</i>	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
81	3305	30403601	<i>Iarnród Éireann</i>	<i>Bridge at Gowla West</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	<i>Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification</i>	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
81	3349	30403703	<i>Iarnród Éireann</i>	<i>Bridge at Lissoughter</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	<i>Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification</i>	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
81	3199	30408506	Iarnród Éireann	Clooncah ( Kilconnell) Humpback Bridge	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
81	3269	30408704	Iarnród Éireann	Killeen (Clonmacnawen) Railway Bridge	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
81	3360	30405301	Iarnród Éireann	Letterfore, Railway Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		

## Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
81	3334	30403612	<i>Iarnród Eireann</i>	<i>Railway Bridge, Ballynahinch</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
81	3983	30332034	Iarnród Eireann	Railway Bridge, Athenry	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
81	3905	30402903	Iarnród Eireann	Varley's Bridge	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
82	3663	30412604	Noel Gantley	House at Loughaunroe West	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. M. Kinane
83	3142	30404512	Anthony Colleran	Clooncallaga House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. D. Burke	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty
84	3435	30406809	O'Donnellan & Co. Arch. For Thomas Shaughnessy	Thatch Cottage, Killannin	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
85	3874	30400604	Williamstown Heritage Society	Templetogher Mill	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
86	3875	30400605	Williamstown Heritage Society	Forge/Smithy	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
87	3101	30333008	Valerie & Noel Swanwick	Former Gate Lodge, Ballinasloe	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
88	3299	30404904	Noreen Murphy	Aillebrack Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
89	4021	30410601	<i>Ignatius T. Greaney for Michael Corcoran</i>	<i>House at Ballybroder</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. J. Cuddy, Cllr. Feeney.	Cllr. S. Cunniffe, Cllr. Maher.
90	N/A	N/A	Cindy Lynch Nearing	Quiet Man Cottage	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
91	3156	30406003	Oliver Ryan	Thatch, Crannagh (Tiaquin)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
92	3891	30403202	Paddy and Anne Mannion	Mill (Water)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
93	3172	30403311	Liam Cormican	Gate Lodge	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
94	3427	30402713	Brian O'Connor	House at Creggaree	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
95	3271	30410006	Diane Murray	Former School, Kylemore (Longford)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
96	3947	30405624	Bernie O'Mahoney	Thatch Cottage, Balroobuck Beg	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
97	3927	30404304	John Joseph Loughlin	Thatch Cottage, Doonbeg	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
98 (& 114)	3786	30328004	Margaret MacDonnell	House at Roundstone/Library	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
99	3240	30410813	John Payne & Frank Payne	Former School, Carrownafeinnog	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
100	3574	30409702	Bernadette Collins	House - public house	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
101	3716	30405628	Judy Greaney	Thatch Cottage, Annagh East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. K. McHugh		
102	3548	30411307	Gerard Keane	Thatch, Caherawoneen North	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
103	3446	30341004	Emer Mary Larkin for Michael Kennedy	House at Ballyhugh Gort	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan
104	3010	30342007	Brian & Mary Keary	House & outbuildings at Woodford	Main house and buildings to the East of stream are to be Included on the RPS and Structures to the West Excluded from the RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
105	3007	30342003	Marita Whyte	House at Woodford	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Hynes	Cllr. M. Fahy		
106	3243	30338011	M.I.G. Clarke & P.A. Clarke	St. Martins Townparks	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. D. Burke	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty
107	4032	30402715	Frank Costello	Former School House, Deerfield	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
108	3836	30404212	Mary Newell	House at Glebe	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. S. Canney	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone
109	3445	30341002	Martina Moon	Tce House End, Church St. Gort	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			



# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
110 & 111	3403	30409203	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg/Maire Ni Iarnain	House at Aille	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
112 (& 54)	3913	30404406	Patrick D. Dunleavy	Barbersfort House - Entrance Gates	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone
113	3245	30338005	Michael Simcock	Former Convent, Eyrecourt	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
114 (& 98)	3786	30328004	Patrick Conneely	Outbuilding - House at Roundstone	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
115	3318	30329001	Bridget Davis	Casson's Hotel	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. Walsh		
116	3872	30400203	Eileen Mary Moughan	House at Ballymoe (Durragh)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. P. Keaveney
117	3011	30342008	John Tully	Former Bridewell, Woodford	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
118	3264	30409902	Elaine & John Bleahan	Parochial House at Garryduff	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
119	3147	30404611	Anthony Kelly	Abbeylands House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
120	3760	30343006	Willie Burke	Hibernian House, Portumna	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. McClearn	Cllr. M. Maher		
121	3685	30410326	Caterina Gardiner & Noel Murphy	House at Stradbally North	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. M. Kinane	Cllr. A. Rabbitte
122	4007	30405617	Margaret Joyce	Gateway Cahermorris House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
123	3675	30410319	Alan Monaghan	House at Ballynamanagh West	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. S. Cunniffe

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
124	3139	30405904	Tim & Ann Devaney	House at Menlough Commons	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. A. Donohue	Cllr. J. Cuddy, Cllr. Canney, Cllr. Broderick, Cllr. M. Connolly, Cllr. M. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Cunniffe, Cllr. Fitzmaurice, Cllr. Welby, Cllr. G. Finnerty, Cllr. P. Roche
125	3237	30338007	Donal Burke for Mary Morris	Woodfield. House at Gortnakilla	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. S. Donnellan	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty
126	3908	30404303	Kevin O'Brien	House at Garraun South	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Canney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. S. Canney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice
127 (& 42 & 64 & 74)	3876	30400705	Trustees of Diocese of Elphin (Nolan & Quinlan)	Tobberoe National School	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. Keaveney
128 ( & 14 8)	3969	30332002	<i>Mulcaire Heffernan, Architects, for Dr. K. Coffey</i>	<i>Raheen House</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. P. Feeney</i>	<i>Cllr. M. Maher</i>		
129	3539	30412308	Teresa Nolan	House at Rineen Roseville Cottage	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan
130	3184	30406103	Hutchinson Davidson & Son for Dympna & Michael Dunne	South Park House	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
131	3658	30410715	Francis Martyn	T. Treacy House at Garryduff Killimor	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Hynes	Cllr. M. Fahy		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
132	3820	30331049	Ronan Glynn & Breda Kenny	House at Parkmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Cunniffe	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. S. Canney, Cllr. Cunniffe	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice, Cllr. Charity
133	3787	30328005	Patrick Conneely	Quay, High St, Roundstone	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. Walsh		
134	3409	30405403	John & Myra Manifold	Thatch, Rushveala	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. Welby	Cllr. M. Fahy		
135	3086	30411922	Padraig O'Fátharta	Outbuilding at Carrownlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
136	3648	30411605	Joseph Shaughnessy	Thatch, Derry french	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
137	3835	30404209	Mary McDonough	Stable Moyne Hill	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
138	3460	30341039	Francis Patrick & Monica A Glynn	Frank Glynn's	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan
139	3484	30339017	Seamount College	Corrugated Iron Clad	corrugated iron clad building is to be removed from RPS but the school is to remain on the RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
140	3722	30406921	Paraic Burke	House at Cloonboo	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification	Cllr. J. Charity, Cllr. Noone, Cllr. Killilea	Cllr. J. Cuddy, Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. Noone
141	3604	30411501	KJ Rooney for A Kelly	Gateway Moyne Hill	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
142	3463	30341033	J. Coleman Keane	House at Gort	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. M. Fahy, Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. G. Finnerty & Cllr. S. Donnellan
143	3641	30411712	Michael Martyn	Walled Garden, Pallas (Leitrim)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
144	3731	30407003	Martina Goulding	Bawnmore House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. J. Charity		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
145	3387	30408903	John Folan	House at Maumeen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
146	3478	30339011	John Griffin	Building at Main st Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty
147	3272	30410003	Bord Na Mona	Bridge, Kylemore (Longford)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	to be amalgamated with 30410027		
148 ( & 12 8)	3969	30332002	Dr. Kathleen Coffey	Raheen House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Feeney	Cllr. M. Maher		
149	3280	30410901	Shane Hanniffy, Consulting Engineers, for Deirdre & Martin Burke	House at Cloonkea (House & extension removed)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Kinane	Cllr. D. Burke		
150	3273	30410027	Bord Na Mona	Former Canal, Lismanny	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	to be amalgamated with 30410003		
151	3790	30327001	Steve O Culain	House at Boochoona East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
152	3759	30343004	Brendan Connolly and Mary June Connolly	School at St. Brendans Rd Portumna	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Cronnolly	Cllr. J. McClearn	Cllr. G. Cronnolly, Cllr. J. McClearn	Cllr. A. Rabbitte, Cllr. Maher.
153	3789	30328011	James Slattery	Ivy House, Roundstone	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
154	3749	30405626	Paraic Fahy	House at Balroebeck More	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
155	3372	30407705	Breandan O'Maolagain / Údaras na Gaeltachta	Cé Chill Chiarian	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
156	3860	30330007	Carmel Canny	Tce House, Castle St, Dunmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Canney	Cllr. T. McHugh		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
157	3711	30406919	Daniel O'Donoghue	Thatch Cottage, Muckrush	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
158	3966	30328018	Noel Coyne	House at Roundstone	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
159	3560	30410404	Ignatius Greaney for Patrick Greaney	Thatch, Lavallyconor	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. M. Fahy		
160	N/A	N/A	Ignatius T. Greaney for Reps Sean Greaney		Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
161	4011	30407019	Ignatius Greaney for Esther & James McGrath	House at Cregmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. S. Cuniffe
162	3027	30409513	Sean Dockery for Eileen Lydon & Kathy Gavin	House Bayview, Rinville West	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
163	3294	30325021	John Brendan Mannion & Doris Mannion	Building at Clifden	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
164	3025	30409516	Leahy & Partner Solc for Phyllis McNamara	House at Rocklands	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
165	3894	30403101	Desmond Joyce	St. Francis Monastery at Derren Lower	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. P. Keaveney
166	3106	30333026	Mal Croffy	House at Townparks Bsloe	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Finnerty
167	3515	30411203	Evelyn Sikora	Thatch Cottage, Cregboy (Dorus)	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
168	3470	30341047	O'Neill O'Malley on behalf of Sisters of Mercy	School, Convent of Mercy, Gort	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
169	3674	30410318	Michael Burke	House at Ballynahanagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal	Cllr. M. Kinane	Cllr. D. Burke
170	3926	30406201	Richard and Linda Stephens	House at Murvey	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal		
171	3336	30403609	Dept of Communications Energy & Natural Resources	Gateway Ballynahinch Castle	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
172	3709	30407014	Tobin Constr Eng for Mary & John Kenny	House at Summerfield/M. Hession shop	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. M. Noone	Cllr. J. Cuddy	Cllr. S. Cunniffe
173	3627	30411608	Dan Shields /VP Shields	Walled Garden, Dalystown Demesne	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
173	3626	30411609	Dan Shields /VP Shields	Farmyard Complex, Dalystown Demesne	Agreed to REMAIN ON RPS	Agreed with CEO Report			
N/A	3032	30411001	N/A	House at Onaght	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3036	30411005	N/A	House at Onaght	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3040	30411009	N/A	House at Onaght	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3075	30411909	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3076	30411910	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3080	30411927	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		

**Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014**

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Second	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3082	30411917	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3083	30411919	N/A	Outbuilding a Carrowlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3084	30411920	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3085	30401921	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3087	30411923	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowntemple	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3088	30411924	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3090	30411926	N/A	Outbuilding at Carrowlisheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3093	30412009	N/A	Outbuilding at Inisheer	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3391	30409011	N/A	House at Keeraunbeg	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3543	30412213	N/A	House at Killomorán Gort (Crannagh)	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>	<i>Cllr. M. Fahy</i>

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3671	30409518	N/A	House at Moneymore East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3693	30409427	N/A	House at Prospect Hill	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3704	30410305	N/A	House at Ballynacourty	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	4012	30407113	N/A	Tower at Bellville	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Agreed with CEO Report	Proposed for Removal/Inadequate notification		
N/A	3035	30411004	N/A	<i>Séipéal na Pádraig Onaght</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
N/A	3043	30411011	N/A	<i>Scoil an Cheatrar Álainn Kilmurvy</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
N/A	3053	30411107	N/A	<i>Caladh Chill Ronain</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
N/A	3068	30411901	N/A	<i>Cuan Chill Éinne Harbour</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. N. Thomas</i>	<i>Cllr. S. Walsh</i>		
N/A	3100	30333007	N/A	<i>House at Cleaghmore</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3102	30333009	N/A	<i>Cleaghmore Villa</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3137	30405903	N/A	<i>House at Skehana</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
LAT E 177	3141	30404510	N/A	<i>Lakeview House</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3145	30404509	N/A	<i>House at Moyloughmore</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3146	30404505	N/A	<i>Gilmore &amp; Co Moyloughmore</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3188	30407311	N/A	<i>Church View Alloonbaun</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. M. Connolly</i>	<i>Cllr. G. Finnerty</i>		
N/A	3191	30407307	N/A	<i>Handball Alley Alloon Upper</i>	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	<i>Cllr. T. Broderick</i>	<i>Cllr. T. Welby</i>		



**Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014**

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3204	30407323	N/A	House at Carrowmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3205	30407324	N/A	House at Carrowmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3213	30408614	N/A	Killaghbeg House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. Broderick	Cllr. T. Welby		
N/A	3215	30409804	N/A	Eastwell House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3235	30410822	N/A	House at Meelick	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3274	30410026	N/A	House at Fynagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3275	30410014	N/A	Post box at Blacksticks	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Burke	Cllr. M. Connolly		
N/A	3292	30325017	N/A	Quay Wall	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3298	30404903	N/A	Bunowen Castle	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3301	30403506	N/A	House at Clifden	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3302	30403505	N/A	Quay at Drimmeen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3303	30403514	N/A	Quay at Clifden	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3304	30403516	N/A	Ballinaboy Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3307	30403517	N/A	Pier at Derrygimlagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3309	30402209	N/A	Bridge at Cleggan	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg
N/A	3311	30402211	N/A	Crocknaraw House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3312	30402214	N/A	Rectory at Moyard	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3313	30402317	N/A	Bridge at Attirowerty	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3314	30402318	N/A	Quay at Keelkyle	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
N/A	3319	30401009	N/A	House at Derryinver	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3322	30401004	N/A	Bridge at Tooreena	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3328	30402305	N/A	Tullywee Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3330	30401103	N/A	Tullyconnor Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3331	30401104	N/A	Owenduff Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3332	30403610	N/A	Cloonbeg Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3333	30403611	N/A	Cloonbeg Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby
N/A	3334	30403612	N/A	Cloonbeg Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby
N/A	3340	30403701	N/A	Bridge Owenmore/ballynahinch	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3341	30402406	N/A	Inagh Hotel	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg		
N/A	3342	30402405	N/A	Bridge at Finnisglin	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3343	30402404	N/A	Bridge at Letterbreckun	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. E. Mannion	Cllr. S. O'Tuairisg
N/A	3344	30402403	N/A	Bridge at Gleninagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3345	30401201	N/A	Pier at Glennagevagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3346	30402501	N/A	Bridge at Griffins	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3347	30401202	N/A	Bridge at Munterown Middle	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3350	30403710	N/A	St. Patricks Chapel Lissoughter	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3351	30405107	N/A	Bridge at Lettershinna	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3353	30405105	N/A	Pier at inlet at Cashel Bay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
N/A	3357	30403802	N/A	Teernakill Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3359	30403903	N/A	Bridge at Lurgan/Shindilla	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3362	30404001	N/A	Currarevagh House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3366	30407601	N/A	Mace quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3367	30407602	N/A	Mace Pier	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3368	30407604	N/A	Ard West Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3369	30407706	N/A	Carna Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3371	30407708	N/A	Ardmore quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3373	30406401	N/A	Gowlabeg Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3375	30405108	N/A	Bunnaahown/Gowlamore Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3378	30407803	N/A	U Plan Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3381	30407806	N/A	Curvilinear Causeway	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby		
N/A	3382	30407805	N/A	T Shaped Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3383	30407804	N/A	Bealadangan Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby		
N/A	3384	30407809	N/A	Curvilinear Causeway	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby		
N/A	3385	30409001	N/A	Maumeen Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3386	30409002	N/A	Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3388	30409004	N/A	Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3393	30407810	N/A	Bridge at Clynagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. S. O'Cualain	Cllr. Welby		
N/A	3394	30409012	N/A	Dog legged slipway	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3407	30405401	N/A	Bridge at barrusheen	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3412	30402601	N/A	Cornnamona Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3424	30402714	N/A	House at Cappacorcoge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3426	30402712	N/A	Bridge at Creggaree	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3436	30406811	N/A	Letter box at Tullykyne	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3437	30408103	N/A	Laughil Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3447	30341008	N/A	Johnny Walshs Bar	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3448	30341009	N/A	O'Donnells/Care for Community Welbeing	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3449	30341010	N/A	Jordans	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3450	30341011	N/A	Gallery Cafe	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3453	30341020	N/A	MJ Sports	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3454	30341021	N/A	Womans world/Babells	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3455	30341022	N/A	House at Ballyhugh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3456	30341023	N/A	House at Ballyhugh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3457	30341024	N/A	House at Gort	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3461	30341031	N/A	Rochford Insurance	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3462	30341032	N/A	O'Gradys Restaurant	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty
N/A	3465	30341037	N/A	Pat Smyth	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3466	30341038	N/A	M Barry/The Cash Shop	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3481	30339014	N/A	Houseat Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3483	30339016	N/A	Siopa Chruinniú na mBád Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. M. Fahy		
N/A	3504	30411215	N/A	House at Roo Demesne	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3510	30411306	N/A	House at Dungory East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3521	30412210	N/A	House at Gortnasteal	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fahy	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan
N/A	3523	30412802	N/A	Lisheen House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3526	30413301	N/A	Cregg House -Entrance Gates	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3527	30413303	N/A	Cregg House - Walled Garden	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3535	30412901	N/A	Prospect House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3538	30412313	N/A	House at Lavally Gort	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3595	30412403	N/A	House at Derrybrien South	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Maher	Cllr. P. Feeney	Cllr. A. Rabbitte, Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. M. Kinane & Cllr. Finnerty
N/A	3634	30413206	N/A	Tooreeny Bridge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3712	30406903	N/A	Annaghdown Quay	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. S. Cunniffe	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone
N/A	3728	30406908	N/A	House at Tonagarraun	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. J. Cuddy		
N/A	3733	30406918	N/A	House at Liscannanaun	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. F. Kearney	Cllr. J. Charity		
N/A	3748	30326001	N/A	House at Fough West	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3754	30326010	N/A	House at Canrawer East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3769	30343030	N/A	House at Clonfert Ave	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. A. Rabbitte	Cllr. G. Finnerty		
N/A	3792	30327005	N/A	Bridge at Boohoona East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3795	30327014	N/A	Quay at Boohoona East	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3801	30331010	N/A	McDonaghs - Townparks Tuam	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone		
N/A	3802	30331014	N/A	Building at Townparks Tuam	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Charity		
N/A	3807	30331028	N/A	Connaught Arms - Townparks	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Charity		
N/A	3862	30330013	N/A	House at Dunmore	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. P. Roche		
N/A	3881	30401803	N/A	Ulster Bank Glenamaddy	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice		
N/A	3882	30401804	N/A	M. Keaney - House at Glenamaddy	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice		
N/A	3883	30401806	N/A	Former Bank at Glenamaddy	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice		

# Minutes of Special Council Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> September 2014 & 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014

Sub No.	RPS No.	NIAH No	Name	Description	Agreement	Proposer / Agreed	Seconder	Additional Proposers	Additional Seconders
N/A	3888	30402004	N/A	Bridge at Creggs	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. K. McHugh	Cllr. J. Charity	Cllr. D. Killilea, Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice & Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. M. Noone, Cllr. P. Keaveney & Cllr. G. Finnerty
N/A	3903	30402911	N/A	Mayfield House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. D. Killilea	Cllr. M. Noone		
N/A	3956	30405001	N/A	Bridge at Cluidrevagh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh
N/A	3958	30406501	N/A	Bridge at Turlough Ballmoe	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3959	30406504	N/A	Bridge at Glencoh	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3961	30407801	N/A	Quay at Rosmuck	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. N. Thomas	Cllr. S. Walsh		
N/A	3988	30401904	N/A	Moat House	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice	Cllr. S. Canney
N/A	3994	30403102	N/A	Kilkerrin School Dereen Lower	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. M. Fitzmaurice		
N/A	4007	30405617	N/A	Entrance Gateway at Cahermorris	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. T. McHugh	Cllr. P. Roche		
N/A	4028	30412809	N/A	House at Rathwilladoon	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	4029	30413302	N/A	Cregg House - Folly Tower	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	4030	30413305	N/A	Cregg House - Gatelodge	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. G. Finnerty	Cllr. S. Donnellan		
N/A	3482	30339015	N/A	Building at Cartron Kinvara	Agreed to REMOVE from RPS	Cllr. J. Byrne	Cllr. G. Finnerty		

Cllr. Healy referred to structure that is now derelict and asked if the owner wanted to knock and rebuild it, would its inclusion on the RPS pose any difficulty. In reply, Ms. Doddy advised that the OPW has the best conservation expertise and any advice or assistance would be given to the owner.

**Submission RPS 19 / NIAH 30335002**

Cllr. J. Byrne said, with regard to his proposals, he made an informed decision based on information received from the owners Engineers.

**Submission RPS 28 / NIAH 30409103**

Ms. Doddy said that it doesn't mean that this structure cannot be improved and brought up to modern living standards.

**Submission RPS 81 – Iarnród Eireann Bridges**

RE NIAH 30408506, 30332006, 30408704, 30405301, 30403612, 30332034, 30332005, 30402903, 30401607 (30403707\*, 30403601\*, 30403703\*).

Ms. Doddy said that the recommendation regarding bridges is that they remain on the RPS as Iarnród Eireann has the in-house conservation expertise. She referred the Members to an administrative error in the CEO report, as part of the recommendation for Submission 81, where three bridges were proposed for inclusion, namely NIAH 30403707, 30403601, 30403703, but these Notices were inadequately served, so the Chief Executive has recommended their removal from the RPS at the end of the CEO report under the heading 'Notices not adequately served'.

Cllr. Feeney said his reason for proposing the removal of the two bridges in Caheroyan (NIAH 30332005 and 30332006) is because they are very narrow and a footpath cannot be added without moving a platform.

Cllr. Rabbitte said the Iarnród Eireann should look to preserve the culture.

**Submission RPS 106 / NIAH 30338011**

In reply to Ms. Doddy who said that this house was of particular interest, Cllr. M. Connolly said that the owners does not wish to have the property included.

**Submission RPS 116 / NIAH 30400203**

Cllr. Fitzmaurice said that the owners have renovated the inside of the house. Ms. Doddy said that this house has historical interest and its inclusion on the RPS allows it to be eligible for Conservation Grants. Cllr. Fitzmaurice said that the amount of grant aid should be outlined to the owners prior to the notices being issued.

In reply, Ms. McConnell advised that an information booklet was issued with the notices which set out the implications and grants available and it also included the phone numbers of Council officials and the Architectural Conservation Officer also met with persons who requested visits.

**Submission RPS 118 / NIAH 30409902**

In reply to Cllr. J. Byrne, Ms. McConnell said that the Chief Executive recommended that this property not be included based on a further detailed verification process.

Eyrecourt Castle - RPS No. 3246/ / NIAH 30338019

***On the proposal of Cllr. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. Maher, it was proposed to remove RPS 3246/ NIAH 30338019 'Eyrecourt Castle' from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures.***

***This proposal was not agreed and it was withdrawn.***

Ms. Doddy said that this Castle was a major importance of architecture in the County. Cllr. McClearn said that he wished to advise the Meeting that while it has historical significance this history is recorded. He said this is no longer a castle and said that the walls have fallen down and the farmer has underpinned them with concrete. He said it is now a concrete structure only.

Ms. Doddy read the Appraisal from Appendix III (a) Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures as follows :

*"Built for Colonel John Eyre, who was granted the lands following the Cromwellian conquest, Eyrecourt Castle was an early country house built on a symmetrical plan. It is one of the key houses of Irish architectural history, being one of the earliest undefended proper country houses. The surviving detailing of the building is superb, including remains of moulded timber window frames and elaborate scroll brackets to the eaves. Although ruinous for over a century, and blocked from view by later farm buildings, the remains of the house nonetheless form an important group with the entrance gates and the ruined chapel in the grounds"*

Cllr. McClearn said that the entrance had merit only.

Cllr. Killilea asked perhaps that the people of the area be consulted. Cllr. Kearney said that if the castle was protected and it was rebuilt, he said that the remaining stone maybe not be suitable to use again. In response, Ms. McConnell said that it is a ruin of historical and architectural merit.

Cllr. McClearn said he would withdraw the proposal but that other buildings with architectural merit have been removed from the RPS list which is inconsistent. He said that the castle's historical information is recorded and that there currently isn't anything to protect.

### Bridges

In reply to Ms. Doddy, Comh. O'Tuairisg advised that every bridge on the proposed additions to the Record of Protected Structures in Connemara was proposed for removal. He referred to Clynagh bridge which is a very dangerous bridge and needs widening as a matter of urgency and inclusion on the RPS could affect these works.

In reply to Comh. O'Cualain, Ms. Doddy said that conservation is about managing change that is, keeping the basic character of the structure while carrying out change. She added that Causeways were built to incorporate the Islands onto the mainland.

Ms. McConnell advised the Meeting that all bridges have served the communities quite well and said that their inclusion on the RPS does not mean works cannot be carried out and clarified that any emergency works would supercede this. She explained that inclusion on the RPS only required that the Architectural Conservation Officer (ACO) is consulted for her advice prior to works being undertaken and the ACO would provide an advisory service. She



said it doesn't prohibit works and if the repair works are not feasible then the bridge can be replaced in full.

Cllr. Thomas said that important structures should not be removed but expressed his apprehension at some of the structures that were recommended by the Minister.

Ms. McConnell said that the Elected Members need to consider blanket removals very carefully. She said if the structure/building cannot meet its current requirements or is not fit for purpose, then it can be considered for exclusion but said practically all of these proposed deletions are fit for purpose. Comh. O'Tuairsig said that some bridges are not functional as they are very narrow and in some cases they are the areas only method of entry.

Cllr. Rabbitte said that we all have a duty of care to our heritage but also to our Electorate and suggested that agreement be reached regarding the functioning bridges. She suggested that the Connemara Elected Members meet with the executive team and work with them to solve any issues and examine the possibility of applying for funding to repair them.

Cllr. N. Byrne said that the public display period could be used for the Elected Members to further consider their actions. Cllr. Walsh said that when the Plan goes on public display, the Minister can make her comments and in the interim, the Connemara Municipal District will arrange a meeting with Ms. Doddy, Architectural Conservation Officer, to discuss this issue.

The Chief Executive said that there were a significant amount of removals from the RPS. He advised that the DAHG (Department of Arts, Heritage & the Gaeltacht) may make a submission in conjunction with the recommendations of Minister and said that the more the Elected Members seek to remove, the more it undermines the process. He requested the Elected Members be conscious of the implications of what they are doing. Ms. McConnell advised that the Minister expressed her recommendations and if they are not being taken on board, she may comment on the validity of reasons for the removal of structures.

In reply to Cllr. Cuddy, Ms. McConnell said that the Minister could issue a Ministerial Direction in respect of the RPS.

**The Quiet Man Bridge - RPS 3361 / NIAH 30405305**

***On the proposal of Cllr. Thomas, seconded by Cllr. Walsh, it was proposed to remove RPS 3361/ NIAH 30405305 'Quiet Man Bridge' from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures.***

***This proposal was not agreed and it was withdrawn.***

Ms. Doddy asked for consistency in approach and advised that the Quiet Man Bridge is a discovery point in Fáilte Ireland's Connemara Infrastructure and Interpretation Plan.

Cllr. Walsh said following reconsideration, it can be left in and this was agreed.

**RPS 3481 / NIAH 30339014**

***On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed to remove RPS 3481/ NIAH 30339014 from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures.***

Cllr. J. Byrne advised that this building was recently damaged by fire and total refurbishment took place. He said that the owner does not intent to change the front facade which they believe has architectural heritage interest.

Kinvara Harbour RPS 3477/ NIAH 30339007

***On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was proposed to remove RPS 3477/ NIAH 30339007 from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures.***

***This proposal was not agreed and it was withdrawn.***

Cllr. J. Byrne advised that there is a need to carry out a traffic management plan for Kinvara and the current tender documentation for Kinvara sewerage scheme is perhaps contradictory to some of the aspirations of the proposed RPS.

Cllr. J. Byrne said that he would reluctantly withdraw his proposal, at the request of the Executive, which requested the removal of Kinvara Harbour from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures, on the basis that one year from now, he would not be advised that works were prohibited on the harbor due to its inclusion on the RPS. Ms. McConnell said that there may be an opportunity where public structures on the RPS may qualify for funding from Leader programmes.

Pollagh Quay – RPS 3500 / NIAH 30410350, and  
Killeenaran Quay – RPS 3499 / NIAH 30410338, and  
Tarrea Pier – RPS 4023 / NIAH 30411301

---

***On the proposal of Cllr. J. Byrne, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was proposed to remove RPS 3500/RPS3499 and RPS4023 from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures.***

***This proposal was not agreed and it was withdrawn.***

Cllr. J. Byrne again said that he would reluctantly withdraw his proposal regarding Polalgh Quay, Killeenaran Quay and Tarrea Pier, at the request of the Executive, from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures, on the basis that one year from now, that he is **not** advised that works were prohibited on the harbor due to its inclusion on the RPS.

Cllr. J. Byrne said that his understanding is that as the town of Gort is covered as an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA), the facades of buildings do not need to be listed. He said that that inclusion in the ACA gives adequate protection to Gort and he asked that it be noted that the proposal to remove some buildings in Gort from the Proposed Additions to the Record of Protected Structures was undertaken in compliance with Galway County Council's own Chief Executive Officer's Report and he referred the meeting to the Chief Executive Officer's response with regard to Submission RPS 166 – RPS 3103 /NIAH 30333026 "*The protection offered by the Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) is considered to be sufficient to offer protection to the exterior of the building*" and the Chief Executive response was that the building is within an ACA and asked that it be removed from RPS.

***On the proposal of Cllr. M. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. G. Finnerty, it was agreed that Minor amendments such as number changes and changes consequent could be made to the Draft Plan.***

***On the proposal of Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Noone, it was agreed to accept the Chief Executive Officers Report, as amended by the Members, and put the Draft County Development Plan with the agreed amendments back on public display.***

The Chief Executive advised the Meeting that following a three week period the Material Alterations to the Draft Plan will go on display, unless one or more of the Material Alterations require an Appropriate Assessment. He advised if this is not the case, the Material Alterations will go on display for a four week period. He said that within four weeks following this display period, the Elected Members will receive the Chief Executive Officers report on the Submissions received on the Material Alterations and the Elected Members will have six weeks for consideration of this Report. He said the Development Plan should be agreed by the end of January 2015 and the Plan will formally be in place four weeks after its adoption.

The Chief Executive thanked the Elected Members for the detailed consideration of the Draft Plan and thanked sincerely Ms. Catherine McConnell, A/Director of Service and all her staff for the work put into this Draft Plan.

Cllr. Walsh complemented the staff for their work on the Draft Plan.

The Mayor also expressed her thanks to Cllr. T. McHugh and his staff for providing the Ard Rí Hotel to the Council to hold the Special County Council Meetings.

**SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

**1882**

It was proposed by Cllr. T. McHugh, seconded by Cllr. Killilea, and agreed, to suspend Standing Orders to allow for consideration of the following Items.

**TO CONSIDER AND IF DEEMED APPROPRIATE TO AUTHORISE THE ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 142(5) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2001 (AS AMENDED)**

**1883**

Report dated 3<sup>rd</sup> October, 2014 was circulated to each Member.

It was proposed by Cllr. Feeney, seconded by Cllr. E. Mannion and agreed, that the attendance of the Members named hereunder, at the *The Great War Roadshow* - Loughrea Great War Conference to be held at the Loughrea Hotel & Spa, Loughrea, Co. Galway, on 10th & 11th October 2014, as per the Report, be authorised:

Comh. Ó Tuairisg, Cllrs. E. Mannion, Maher, Charity, M. Finnerty, G. Finnerty, McClearn and Donnellan.

It was proposed by Cllr. Feeney, seconded by Cllr. Welby and agreed, that the attendance of the Members named hereunder, at the Ace Training – Productivity & Time Management Conference 2014 to be held at the Clonakilty Hotel, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, on 18th October, 2014, as per the Report, be authorised:

Cllr. Hynes, Cllr. Fahy.

**TO CONSIDER AND IF DEEMED APPROPRIATE TO AUTHORISE THE ATTENDANCE AT TRAINING IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 142(5A) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2001 (AS AMENDED)** **1884**

*Report dated 3<sup>rd</sup> October, 2014 was circulated to each Member.*

It was proposed by Cllr. T. McHugh, seconded by Cllr. Killilea, and agreed, that the attendance of the Members named hereunder, at the LAMA Autumn Training Seminar 2014 to be held at the Inishowen Gateway Hotel, Buncrana, Co. Donegal, on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> of October 2014, as per the Report, be authorised:

Cllr. T. McHugh, McClearn, Feeney, Roche, Keaveney, M. Connolly, Mannion, Maher, Killilea, Comh. Ó Tuairisg.

On the proposal of Cllr. T. McHugh, seconded by Cllr. McClearn, it was agreed that Cllr. S. Walsh be included to attend the LAMA Autumn Training Seminar 2014 to be held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> October 2014.

**SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

**1885**

It was proposed by Cllr. Kearney, seconded by Cllr. Killilea and agreed to suspend Standing Orders to allow the Meeting continue after 6.00 pm.

Cllr. M. Connolly advised the Meeting that the closing date of the public consultation period for the Strategic Investment for Land Transport is 16<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and he proposed that the Council include a Motion regarding Woodlawn, Attymon, New Inn etc. This proposal was seconded by Cllr. S. Walsh and agreed.

**CHRÍOCHNAIGH AN CRUINNÍÚ ANSIN.**

---