

COUNCILLOR PADDY McHUGH - I will propose:

- 45. That Galway County Council carry out works to prevent road surface water running onto private property (details enclosed).

COUNCILLOR MICHAEL MULLINS: - I will propose:

- 46. That Galway County Council calls on the Government to re-affirm the status of Shannon Airport without further delay in order to alleviate fears in business and tourism interests in County Galway.

MINUTES OF MONTHLY MEETING OF GALWAY COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT THE COUNTY BUILDINGS, GALWAY, ON FRIDAY, 23RD OCTOBER, 1992.

IN THE CHAIR: Clr. M. Mullins ..

ALSO PRESENT:

Members: As recorded in the Attendance Book.

- Councillors J. Brennan, J. Burke, W. Burke, T. Byrne, J. Callanan, Deputy P. Connaughton, Senator E. O'Cuiv, Councillors M. Fahy, P. Finnegan, M. Finnerty, S. Gavin, Senator T. Hussey, Councillors M. Loughnane, J. McClearn, Deputy P. McCormack, Councillors J. McDonagh, P. McHugh, C. Ni Fhatharta, S. O'Neachtain, M. O'Neill, P. O'Sullivan, P. O'Tuathail, K. Quinn, M. Regan, M. Ryan, E. Varley, and T. Walsh.

Officials: Messrs. S. Keating, County Manager; P. Flood, County Engineer; P.J. Gavin, Asst. County Manager; L. Kavanagh, R. Killeen, Senior Executive Engineers; E. Lusby, Finance Officer; T. Coughlan, Administrative Officer; C. Wallace, S.S.O. P. Carroll, Acting S.S.O. and T. Kavanagh, County Secretary.

The Opening Prayer was recited.

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE CITY & COUNTY MANAGEMENT ACT 1955, PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER : 66825 APPLICANT - MRS MARY POWER.

1018

The resolution set out on the Agenda was proposed by Councillor Loughnane and seconded by Councillor Quinn.

The County Engineer read the following report which had been circulated to each Member prior to the Meeting:

"LOCATION:

The site is located approximately 130 yards off the Galway-Dublin National Primary Road approximately 3.25 miles beyond Craughwell Village.

PLANNING HISTORY:

No previous planning application in this site - however the following applications are relevant;

62650 - permission granted on a site to the South (National Primary Road side) of the proposed site in

January, 1991. Applicant - Miss Anne-Marie Corbett.

62580 - Outline Permission refused on lands opposite the proposed site in December, 1990. Applicant - C. Cummins.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The site is located approximately 130 yards off the National Primary Road at a point where the maximum speed limit applies and in an unserviced rural area approximately 3.25 miles from the nearest town or village. There is an existing dwellinghouse including Bed & Breakfast business on the corner site at the junction of the County Road and the National Primary Road. There is an existing valid permission and also fronting the County Road (i.e. Ref. No. 62650). It is the policy of the Planning Authority as set out in the County Development Plan Chapter 7.2.8 to prevent the build up of groups of houses along rural unserviced roads whether they are applied for wholly or singly in a piecemeal manner. The applicant in this case works in Loughrea and has indicated that she must reside within 4 miles of her workplace. The entire town of Loughrea and its environs is within this radius and it should be possible to find an alternative site either in the town or its environs or a rural location where restrictions would not be imposed by the County Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed development taken in conjunction with existing and permitted development would constitute ribbon development and would be contrary to the provisions of the County Development Plan which discourages such development in unserviced rural areas remote from any population centres. Such development would impair the rural character of rural area by the introduction of inappropriate suburban type development and would create undue traffic hazard by generating an increase in traffic on a County Road in close proximity to a junction with a National Primary Road.

CONSULTATIONS:

Prior to application being lodged the Planning Officer had a meeting with applicant and subsequently advised her that the proposal if submitted as an application would be contrary to the provisions of the County Development Plan and therefore unlikely to receive favourable consideration.

Since the application was lodged, I have had discussions with Councillor Loughnane regarding same, most recently on 15th October, 1992."

The County Engineer said that the development could be the start of a nucleus of residential development in close proximity to the junction with the National Primary Road.

Councillor Loughnane said that he rejected the County Engineer's statement that the development could be the start of a nucleus of housing development but the County Engineer replied that there was already an existing B & B house on the corner site at the junction with the National Primary Road, permission for another house adjoining it and an application refused for five houses on the other side of the road. Councillor Loughnane said that the development could not be regarded as ribbonisation as there was a gap of 100 feet between the site, the subject of the application and the site on which permission exists. In regard to proximity to the National Primary Road, Councillor Loughnane said that the site was in excess of 140 yds from it. He said that in January 1991 permission was granted under reference number 62650 - 70 yards from the National Primary Road, during the currency of the present plan. He said that the application was put on further information to have a soil test carried out and the refusal seems to be a change of mind. He urged the members to pass the resolution.

Councillor McClearn said that the argument about the proximity of the site to the National Primary Route did not hold up. He said the applicant was being penalised because of the probability of other applications being lodged in the same vicinity and it was wrong to refuse permission for that reason. He said there was little possibility of getting permission in rural areas with the result that people were leaving those areas.

Councillor Loughnane said that the applicant's conditions of employment stated that she must reside within four miles of her workplace, that she was presently living in a flat with her husband and family and there was a genuine housing need. Councillor Brennan referred to the consultations which took place with the applicant when she was advised of the unlikelihood of permission being granted. He asked on what basis the two permissions were granted. The County Engineer replied that a maximum of two permissions at this location would not be too bad but this was a third application and a further application could be submitted for the site in between. In reply to Councillor Brennan, the County Engineer said that if the site was further down the road it might be more acceptable. The County Engineer also quoted Section 7.2.8 (1)(c) of the County Development Plan regarding the generation of "undesirable increases" in traffic movements along sections of County Roads close to junctions with National Routes. He also said that all

applications involving septic tanks must include the results of soil tests carried out on the site. A vote taken for or against the resolution set out on the Agenda resulted as follows:

FOR: Councillors T. Byrne, J. Callanan, Dep. P. Connaughton, Sen. E. O'Cuiv, Cllrs M. Fahy P. Finnegan, M. Finnerty, S. Gavin, Sen. T. Hussey, Cllrs. M. Loughnane, J. McClearn, Dep. P. McCormack, Cllrs J. McDonagh, P. McHugh, M. Mullins, C. Ni Fhatharta, S. O'Neachtain, M. O'Neill, P. O'Sullivan, P. O'Tuathail, K. Quinn, M. Regan, M. Ryan and T. Walsh.

(24)

AGAINST: Councillor J. Brennan and E. Varley.

(2)

Councillor J. Burke abstained.

The Chairman declared the resolution carried.

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE CITY & COUNTY MANAGEMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT 1955, PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER 67222 - APPLICANT: FRANKIE GAVIN.

1019

The following report which was circulated to each member prior to the meeting was submitted:

"Proposed Development:

Outline Permission for erection of dwellinghouse and septic tank.

Townland: Ardnasillagh.

Planning Ref. No.: 67322

LOCATION: Ardnasillagh

PLANNING HISTORY:

Ref. No. 5033 - Outline Permission grant for 4 no. houses on lands which included the current site. December, 1968. - Applicant: G. Coyne.

Ref. No. 62228 - Outline Permission refused by Planning Authority - Erection of dwellinghouse and construction of septic tank. Outline Permission refused on appeal. - Applicant: F. Gavin.

Ref. No. 65992 - Outline Permission refused for erection of dwellinghouse and septic tank. - Applicant: F. Gavin.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The site is located on the shoreline of Loughcorrib in an area which is designated as an area of Outstanding Scenic Amenity in the County Development Plan, Chapter 9, Map No. 9A. Planning Control policy, as set out in 9.2.1 of the plan is to prohibit development in these areas other than development in the "essential housing need" categories which relate to existing farmholders families.

The area has been under constant pressure for speculative holiday home development and other housing development which is unrelated to local agricultural land use, and there has been consequent erosion of a hitherto unspoilt shoreline at a number of locations around Lough Corrib. There has been a deterioration of water quality in the lower lake and the accumulation of septic tanks is regarded as a causative factor.

It is therefore necessary to apply restrictions to further housing development in the environs of the Corrib shoreline so as to protect existing visual and ecological amenity and prevent further deterioration of water quality.

In this case, the applicant lives in a house which he bought from the farm owner and which directly adjoins the site in question on its western side. He does not regard his present house as being adequate for his family's needs and requires a more modern house with better facilities. He is not a farm holder.

It was intimated to the applicant that favourable consideration would be given to the direct replacement of his old house with a new house but he indicated that he wished to sell the old house. Consequently, the proposal would be regarded as further erosion of the amenity of the shoreline of the Corrib and in conflict with the provisions of the County Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

The following difficulties would arise in relation to this application:

1. The site proposed to be developed would be located on the shores of Lough Corrib in an area of Outstanding Scenic Amenity and the development would be an obtrusive feature which would not be capable of being satisfactorily assimilated into its surroundings. The development would detract from the scenic amenity of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and development

of the area.

2. The site proposed to be developed would contravene materially the County Development Plan which limits housing development in this area to the essential housing needs of local farmholders and their families, a category of development which does not apply in this case. The provision is set out in Chapter 9.2.1 (ii) of the County Development Plan."

Do mhol an Seanadóir O'Cuiv an run seo agus duirt se nach gcuirfeadh se i gcoinne an pleain forbatha. Senator Cuiv said that the applicant wanted to build a new house for himself and his family. The Council wants the applicant to knock the old house and he said that this was unreasonable and wasteful of resources. He said that if the Council accepts that the applicant needs a new house, he could not understand why permission would not be given.

Councillor Gavin seconded the resolution. He said that the applicant is very widely known. He wishes to build a new house and live in that area. He said that there was concern in the area for the water quality in the lake. He said that the applicant could easily opt to live on the Continent but chose to live here. He referred to a large house being built in the area by somebody not from the area.

Councillor Byrne supported the resolution. He said he had visited the area and saw a lot of houses built including the mansion already referred to. He did not accept that the house would be obtrusive on the landscape and said that houses could add to an area especially if they do not interfere with a view. He said that the applicant had a house nearby and should be in a position to improve his situation.

Councillor J. Burke asked if a son or daughter of the applicant applied would permission be granted. The County Engineer replied that there was not a farmholding involved. Councillor O'Neachtain referred to the clause restricting development to essential housing needs of local farmholders and their families and said that permission should be allowed where reasonable doubt exists. He said he didn't believe that the development would be obtrusive and that the applicant would assimilate the house into the surroundings. Senator Cuiv said that the clause restricting development to essential housing need was intended to stop outsiders. He said the application under discussion was not for a holiday home. In regard to the septic tank question, he said that the site is either suitable for a septic tank or is not. The County Engineer said that the accumulation of septic tanks around the lake is a concern. In regard to the mansion of a house referred to by members, the

County Engineer said that following the granting of outline permission by the Council, the site was sold to somebody else.

A vote taken for or against the resolution set out on the Agenda resulted as follows:-

FOR: Cllrs. T. Byrne, J. Callanan, Dep. P. Connaughton, Sen. O'Cuiv, Cllrs M. Fahy, P. Finnegan, M. Finnerty, S. Gavin, Sen. Hussey, M. Loughnane, J. McClearn, J. McDonagh, P. McHugh, M. Mullins, C. Ni Fhatharta, S. O'Neachtain, M. O'Neill, P. O'Sullivan, P. O'Tuathail, K. Quinn, M. Regan, M. Ryan and T. Walsh.

(24)

AGAINST Councillors J. Burke and W. Burke.

(2)

Councillors J. Brennan and E. Varley abstained.

The Chairman declared the resolution carried.

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE CITY & COUNTY MANAGEMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT 1955. PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER 66589 - APPLICATION : CHARLIE MOONEY.

1020

The resolution as set out on the Agenda was proposed by Councillor Loughnane and seconded by Councillor Regan.

The County Engineer read the following report which had been circulated to each member prior to the Meeting:

"LOCATION:

The site is located on the Woodford Lough Attorick Road on the edge of Woodford Village.

PLANNING HISTORY:

No previous planning applications.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The site is located on the edge of Woodford Village in a rural area. The Planning Authority require that the design quality of all buildings in rural areas shall conform to acceptable architectural standards so as to harmonize with their immediate surroundings. (Ch. 7.2.3(VI)). In addition, the County Development Plan states that single mobile homes or caravans in such locations will only be permitted in cases of substantiated housing need. Applicant was requested by way of

Further information on 1.7.1992 to indicate if there were exceptional social/personal circumstances which would warrant a grant of permission in this case and also to submit dimensions, plans, elevations, etc. of the proposed mobile home. The information requested was not submitted and the Planning Authority, therefore, must assume that there are no social/special housing circumstances which would be taken into consideration in determining his application.

Mobile homes are generally permitted naturally in purpose built caravan parks and also on a temporary basis on housing sites where permission has been granted but the dwellinghouse is not yet completed. However, by their nature, mobile homes are temporary, prefabricated structures and can be unsightly particularly if located close to a town or village, where they are visible from the public road. In addition, such structures require a high level of maintenance to avoid rapid deterioration which can make them even more unsightly. It is for these reasons that there are restrictions in the granting of planning permissions for mobile homes.

In this regard, it is worth noting that the Town Development Committee in Woodford requested the County Council on a number of occasions to have a County Council demountable dwelling which is in occupation and is close to the proposed site, moved to an alternative location, as it is regarded as an unsightly feature on the edge of the village.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. The proposal is to locate a mobile home in a rural area where it is the policy of the planning authority to permit such structures only where a housing need claim case is substantiated. No such need has been substantiated in this case and the proposed development, if permitted therefore would be contrary to the provisions of the County Development Plan and to the proper planning and development of the area.
2. The proposal to locate a mobile home on an exposed site with no natural screening close to the village of Woodford would be an obtrusive feature which would detract from the visual amenities of the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and development of the area."

The County Engineer said that the application in this case was for a mobile home and not a house and this was the main problem. The County Engineer said that the applicant was requested by way of further information to indicate if there were any exceptional social/personal circumstances which would warrant the granting of permission but no reply was received.

Councillor Loughnane said he was not aware that further information had been requested. He said there was a housing need and in normal circumstances the applicant would be asking the Council to provide a house for him. He said the applicant requires to live close to the village of Woodford and it was a very genuine case. The site was not particularly obtrusive and the development could only be seen when passing it. There was no septic tank as the mobile home would be connected to the sewage scheme. Councillor Loughnane said that the applicant had the resources to purchase a mobile home and that temporary permission would be acceptable and it was not intended to blight the landscape.

Councillor McClearn said he was not aware that further information had been requested and whatever information was requested should be supplied. Councillor Loughnane said there would be no difficulty about supplying the further information and he would withdraw the resolution. The resolution was not put to the Meeting.

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE CITY & COUNTY MANAGEMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT 1955, UNDER THE NAMES OF COUNCILLOR JOE BURKE, PEADAR O'TUATHAIL AND MICHAEL O NEILL:

1021

"That in accordance with Section 4 of the City and County Management (Amendment) Act, 1955, Galway County Council require the County Manager to publicly invite proposals from competent property developers in Ireland and abroad for the provision of adequate office accommodation on its lands at Prospect Hill, Galway. Such proposal shall set out the financial implications of the development for the Council and shall provide for the development of all the Council's properties at Prospect Hill and Cluain Mhuire including the possibility of the sale, lease, lease back or either options for the areas of land owned by the Council and not required for the provision of a Council Headquarters."

The resolution set out on the Agenda was proposed by Councillor J. Burke. Councillor Burke said that at the previous meeting the will of members was influenced by the threat of surcharge and that the best interests of the Council were not served by the move. He said there were two properties involved and

the members were entitled without threat to serve the County best. Councillor Burke said that two years ago the Council was told that for £1.4 million it was getting a magnificent building with all facilities except a library headquarters on a self financing basis. He said the Council was told that for under £1 million extra, all facilities and accommodation would be made available in the new premises with staff agreement. He said Cluain Mhuire would now cost £4 million or £8 million including interest. He said if all had been aware that Cluain Mhuire would cost £4 million, the original decision would not have been made. He said he believed that the Council would be compounding the mistake by going to Cluain Mhuire. He said it would be better to develop the County Buildings site and worth suffering the loss the County Manager said would result.

Councillor Burke said that during the last two years expert advice to the Council was absent. There was no fire report on Cluain Mhuire or a report under the Safety, Health and Welfare at Work Act and many people questioned the figure of £2.25 million as adequate for the cost of refurbishing Cluain Mhuire. He said he was requesting these reports now. Councillor Burke said the County Manager told the Council that he was advised by two Auctioneers that there would be a loss of £400,000 on the resale of Cluain Mhuire and Councillor Burke said he was entitled to see that report. Councillor Burke said that at the last meeting when the proposal to raise the loan was going to be lost, the County Manager used a legal implement. Cllr. Burke said this was grossly unfair and illegal. He said that based on Section 20 of the Local Government Act 1902, negligence and misconduct must be proved and he was not negligent and he did not misconduct himself. He said that it was grossly unjust for the Manager to do that when the Council believed the wrong decision would result. Councillor Burke said that there was an unexplained delay in putting the loan proposal before the Council and that he (Councillor J. Burke) did not delay it. He said the matter was badly handled. Councillor Burke referred to a material contravention used to rezone Cluain Mhuire and said the City Plan does not want office accommodation of more than 1000 sq. ft. away from the City Centre. Councillor Burke said that the Council was wrongly refused independent legal advice and that the Council was entitled to the best advice. He said the Council was improperly advised. Councillor Burke referred to page 9 of Minutes of Meeting of 28/9/1992 in regard to the potential loss of £400,000 on the resale of Cluain Mhuire. He then posed the question that in the event of the Council not getting the expected price for the County Buildings, Prospect Hill, would the County Manager be surcharged? - No.

At this point Councillor Byrne intervened and said that Councillor Burke had not spoken one word about the motion. The County Manager said that Councillor Burke had stated so many untruths that he would have difficulty in refuting them all and it was totally unacceptable. Councillor Joe Burke said that he believed Councillors had the right to represent the people. The County Manager said that he was not going to refute what Councillor Burke was stating and asked Councillor Burke not to libel him in what he was saying. Councillor J. Burke said that the County Manager said that Cluain Mhuire was a good purchase and a good location. The Chairman reminded Councillor Burke that he was one of the people who agreed to the purchase. Councillor Burke said that he was moving the motion to protect the interests of Galway County Council.

Councillor O'Tuathail seconded the resolution and asked for a rational discussion. He said that situations had changed since Cluain Mhuire was purchased and costs had escalated. When Cluain Mhuire was purchased it was felt that it was only a question of moving out there. He said there was great talk about the drop in the value of Cluain Mhuire but nothing about the drop in the value of the County Buildings site. He said that he was willing to re-examine the whole situation and to look at all the possibilities.

Councillor O'Neill referred to the vote at the previous meeting and he said that he found it unsatisfactory and it raised the question of democracy and freedom. He said it was distasteful and he felt intimidated. He said that the Council should not have to vote under threat. He said he was amazed that this type of surcharge would apply to Councillors and not to the Government. He said he had a difficulty with a proposal which was supported by only 9 out of 30 councillors. He said that a petition had been signed by 135 members of the staff and he felt that staff could not be ignored. He said that if the Council was faced with industrial action it would be a far more serious problem. He said the Council should look at all the alternatives and if it turned out that the move to Cluain Mhuire should go ahead, he would accept it.

Councillor Finnerty referred to report dated 3/9/1991, and the question of interest rates. He said that interest rates had now gone up by 3% and asked if the loan was still available at 10 1/2% interest rate. The County Manager said that this item had been checked on the morning of the previous meeting and there was no change in the rate of interest.

Councillor Byrne said that the attitude of his party at the last meeting was that they were supportive of

raising a loan for Cluain Mhuire. He said they did that on the basis of information supplied by the County Manager and not under any threat. He said his party members were being accused of being anti staff and pro manager and he did not consider the reading of the statutory notice by the Manager to be a threat. Referring to the number of members who abstained from voting, he said that abstention was part and parcel of democracy and there was nothing wrong with it. He said his party members were neither anti staff or pro manager. He said it was put to the members that there would be a loss of funds if Cluain Mhuire was not proceeded with and for that reason they supported the raising of the loan. Councillor Byrne then read the Section 4 resolution which was before the Meeting. He said that to ask a developer to do everything set out in the resolution free gratis was expecting too much. It would place no obligations on the developers as tenders would have to be sought in the future. He said the proposal was very complicated and he did not know how a developer could respond to it and it could result in further losses. A shorter proposal would be better. Councillor Byrne said that the members were casting doubts on the integrity of those who prepared the figures presented to them. Referring to Councillor Burke's mention of the large interest payments, Councillor Byrne said that this was the way all loans turned out. He asked the Council to reject the motion. In reply to Councillor Finnerty as to whether the interest rate was still 10.5%, the County Manager said that it was his understanding that it was and if a change had been notified, the members would have been told.

Councillor Finnegan said he would like to know if the Section 4 resolution was in order. The County Manager replied that he did not understand the motion or what it asked him to do and said it was confusing. Councillor Finnegan said it seemed to him that the motion would negative the previous decision. He said the motion was like what his party members had in mind.

Councillor O'Neachtain said that he could not understand the motion. He did not know what proposals were asked for or whether they could be relied upon. He said he would like to have this information before voting. Councillor J. Burke then read out the motion and said there were competent Irish developers abroad. He said that the Council had 10 acres altogether. He said offices could be built on all or part of the County Buildings site and in Cluain Mhuire. He said that Galway was the fastest growing city in Europe. He said the Council would end up with good office accommodation. Councillor O'Neachtain said that in his opinion the only offer which could be accepted would be a formal tender. Councillor Gavin asked what was the position about the

motion and where did it leave the members. Councillor Walsh asked what were the members voting on. The Chairman said the position was unclear.

A vote taken on the resolution set out on the Agenda resulted as follows:-

FOR: Councillors J. Burke, J. Callanan, Senator E. O'Cuiv, Councillors M. Fahy, P. Finnegan, M. Finnerty, S. Gavin, M. Loughnane, P. McHugh, C. Ni Fhatharta, S. O'Neachtain, M. O'Neill, P. O'Sullivan, P. O'Tuathail, K. Quinn, M. Regan, and E. Varley. (17)

AGAINST: Councillor T. Byrne, Deputy P. Connaughton, Councillor J. McClearn, Deputy P. McCormack, Councillors J. McDonagh, M. Mullins, M. Ryan, and T. Walsh. (8)

Councillors J. Brennan, W. Burke, and Senator T. Hussey abstained from voting.

The Chairman declared the resolution carried.

IRELAND WEST TOURISM - COUNTY AND CITY ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP BOARD:

1022

Deputy Connaughton referred to the setting up of the Galway County and City Enterprise Partnership Board which would result in Ireland West Tourism being disbanded. He said that the abolition of Ireland West would have serious ramifications and it was done without any reference to the Staff employed there. He said it was always accepted that the three County concept was the best for tourism in the region as individual Counties would not have the resources to go it alone. He said that the Council had a long association with Ireland West as did other tourism groups, but these would no longer have any input into tourism. This would also result in a loss of funding. Deputy Connaughton proposed that telegrams be sent to the Taoiseach, Minister for Tourism and Transport, and Minister of State at the Department of Finance deploring the abolition of Ireland West Tourism. This was seconded by Councillor Gavin.

Following a discussion, it was agreed on the proposition of Councillor McHugh that the Taoiseach and Ministers in question be notified of the Council's concern and informed that the Council's views would be forwarded to them when the subject has been fully discussed. It was agreed that the setting up of the County Enterprise Partnership Boards would remain on the Agenda for the next Meeting.

At the request of Councillor McHugh, it was agreed

that an item be put on the next Agenda relating to Guaranteed Irish Promotion.

WATER SUPPLY - INISHMORE/INISHERE:

1023

With the Permission of the Chairman, Councillor Gavin raised the question of the quality of the water on Inishere and also the provision of extra storage facilities for Inishmore. Mr. Gavin, Assistant County Manager, replied that the Council proposes to make provision in next year's Estimates for automatic chlorination of the Inishere Water Supply. Mr. Gavin said that the Council is pressing the Department of the Environment for funds and for approval to the preparation of Contract Documents for the provision of a Reservoir on Inishmore.

MINUTES:

1024

On the proposition of Councillor Ryan, seconded by Councillor McDonagh, the Minutes of Special Meeting of the Council held on 11th September, 1992, were approved and signed by the Chairman.

In reference to Minutes of Monthly Meeting of the Council held on 28th September, 1992, Councillor Varley said that part of her statement in relation to Cluain Mhuire was not included in the Minutes, and she asked that the following be included -

"The present County Council site is the best and largest in the centre of Galway as the name "Prospect Hill" suggests. It is now proposed to sell this priceless site to fund the redevelopment of Cluain Mhuire. Had the County Council been situated in Cluain Mhuire heretofore and if Prospect Hill became available, moving in would be a move of wisdom since the Bus Station is 2 minutes walk from here. The public who do not have cars, to mention some, the needy, the old, County Council tenants, the numerous people who do not drive or even own a car. Many will come from long distances throughout the County who do not have time or money to make four separate journeys, remember time is a major factor for these people.

Dublin County Council now have a full headquarters at O'Connell Street. Previously, they leased some new offices at Park House near the Phoenix Park with a bus service. Public dissatisfaction forced them to relocate to O'Connell Street site.

The present site here could have large parking areas available either in underground or multi-storey units. These car parking facilities can also be used on a commercial basis to augment present public parking in the city.

I suggest moving from Prospect Hill is a sad day for the entire County and for future generations."

On the proposition of Councillor Ryan, seconded by Councillor Callanan, the Minutes of Monthly Meeting of the Council held on 28th September, 1992, were approved and signed by the Chairman subject to the inclusion of Councillor Varley's statement.

In reply to Councillor Callanan, the County Engineer said that the Council had written to the Department for approval to rumble strips at Kilrickle. In reply to Councillor Gavin, the Secretary stated that no reply had been received from the Western Health Board in relation to the Council's request for the attendance of a Western Health Board Official. It was agreed to write again to the Western Health Board.

On the proposition of Deputy Connaughton, seconded by Councillor Ryan, the Minutes of Special Meeting of the Council held on 9th October, 1992, were approved and signed by the Chairman.

On the proposition of Councillor O'Neachtain, seconded by Councillor Ni Fhatharta, the Minutes of Islands Committee Meeting held on 26th August, 1992, were approved and signed by the Chairman.

On the proposition of Councillor J. Burke, seconded by Councillor Byrne, the Minutes of Arts Committee Meeting held on 14th September, 1992, were approved and signed by the Chairman.

SALE OF PLOT OF LAND TO GALWAY JUDO CLUB:

1025

On the proposition of Councillor Loughane, seconded by Councillor Quinn, it was resolved:

"That Galway County Council approve of the sale of plot of land measuring 27.6 sq. metres approx. at Townparks (Galway Fire Station, Galway City), to Galway Judo Club in accordance with notice dated 12th October, 1992, under Section 83 of the Local Government Act, 1946, which had been circulated to each Member of the Council."

TOWN TWINNING - CLIFDEN AND SARZEAU:

1026

Report dated 23rd September, 1992, which had been circulated to each Member was submitted. The Secretary stated that an application had been received for assistance from Clifden Twinning Committee towards the cost incurred by them in the recent twinning with Sarzeau in Brittany. He said that the first leg of the twinning took place in Clifden in 1991, and the second leg took place in Sarzeau in April 1992. A sum of £1,500 had been provided in the 1992 Estimates for twinning, out of which two grants of £500 each had

been made leaving a balance of £500. On the proposition of Councillor McDonagh, seconded by Councillor O'Neill, it was agreed that a twinning grant of £500 be made to Clifden Twinning Committee out of the 1992 Estimates.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT: 1027

It was agreed that this matter be deferred and considered in conjunction with the discussion on the setting up of the County Enterprise Partnership Boards.

HOUSING (MISCELLANEOUS) PROVISIONS, ACT, 1992: 1028

It was agreed to defer this item.

COASTAL EROSION: 1029

It was agreed to defer this item.

REPORT BY INSTITUTE OF FISCAL STUDIES ON RATE SUPPORT GRANT DISTRIBUTION: 1030

The County Manager recommended that the submission of the Finance Committee as circulated by the Finance Officer be forwarded to the Department of the Environment. This was proposed by Councillor Loughnane and seconded by Councillor McHugh. Senator O'Cuiv felt that the report should be discussed. It was agreed that the report be submitted to the Department and the matter be put on the Agenda for the next Meeting after which further submissions may be made.

DEPUTATION FROM WESTERN ALLIANCE ASSOCIATION: 1031

The Chairman welcomed Senator Pol O'Foighil and Fidelma Healy from the Western Alliance Association. Both Senator O'Foighil and Ms. Healy then addressed the Meeting. They gave the up-to-date position in relation to the Western Alliance Association and the question of Regionalisation. They asked Galway County Council to take part in a Forum during 1993 to consider the question of regionalisation. The Forum would be representative of all local authorities and groups in the region. They also gave details of the overall cost for the year and the cost to Galway County Council, and agreed to distribute additional information to each of the Members. The Chairman thanked Senator O'Foighil and Miss Healy and said that the matter would be considered at a further meeting.

CONFERENCES: 1032

On the proposition of Councillor Ryan, seconded by Councillor Byrne, it was agreed to nominate the Chairman, Councillor Mullins and Councillor McDonagh

for attendance at a Social Housing Conference in Tralee from 29th to 31st October, 1992. On the proposition of Senator Hussey, seconded by Councillor Callanan, it was also agreed to nominate Councillor Quinn for attendance at this Conference.

On the proposition of Councillor McDonagh, seconded by Councillor McClearn, the attendance of Councillor Ryan and Mannion at a Sheep Dipping Meeting in Belmullet on 15th October, 1992, was approved. On the proposition of Senator Hussey, seconded by Councillor Callanan, the attendance of Councillor M. Fahy at this meeting was also approved.

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY: 1033

Resolutions of sympathy were adopted with the following:

- Mrs. Kathleen Reilly, Beaghmore, Belclare, Tuam.
- Ms. Brid Burke, Caher, Recess.
- Mr. Thomas McDonagh, Ballinderry, Kilconnell, Ballinasloe.
- Mrs. Lydon (Snr.), Ballygaddy Road, Tuam.
- Mrs. M. Maloney & Family, Kinichia, Gort.

COUNCILLORS' NOTICES OF MOTION

N.O.M. NO. 14: ROAD - CLR. J. McDONAGH: 1034

The following written reply was given to Clr. J. McDonagh:

"It is hoped to have broken white line at above location renewed as soon as possible."

N.O.M. NO. 15: CEMETERY - CLR. J. McDONAGH: 1035

The following written reply was given to Clr. J. McDonagh:

"I have referred your N.O.M. request to Galway Corporation as this Burial Ground is now their responsibility."

N.O.M. NO. 16: CEMETERY - CLR. M. FAHY: 1036

The following written reply was given to Clr. M. Fahy:

"The Council has identified land adjacent to the existing burial ground at Drumacoo for the provision of an extension and the suitability of this land is being investigated at the moment."

N.O.M. NO. 17: G.W.S. - CLR. M. FAHY: 1037

The following written reply was given to Clr. M. Fahy:

"I wish to inform you that the Council will make the necessary arrangements to examine the Killoughter/Angliham Group Water Scheme to see if it is in order for takeover."

N.O.M. NO. 18: LEVEL CROSSING - CLR. M. FAHY: 1038

The following written reply was given to Clr. M. Fahy:

"The Council has again requested Irish Rail to respond to letter of the 8th February, 1991. On receipt of same a further reply will issue."

N.O.M. NO. 19: LIGHTING - CLR. M. CUNNINGHAM: 1039

The following written reply was given to Clr. M. Cunningham:

"The Public Lighting Programme for 1992 has already been approved by the Council. There are no funds available for the provision of additional public lighting."

N.O.M. NO. 20: LIGHT - CLR. M. CUNNINGHAM: 1040

The following written reply was given to Clr. M. Cunningham:

"The Public Lighting Programme for 1992 has already been approved by the Council. There are no funds available for the provision of additional public lighting."

N.O.M. NO. 21: GREEN AREA - CLR. J. McCLEARN: 1041

The following written reply was given to Clr. J. McClearn:

"The taking in charge of the green area is not recommended by the Council for insurance reasons."

Councillor McClearn said that he was not satisfied with the reply. He said some years ago, the developer was asked to carry out improvements to the open space and did so in the belief that it would be taken over by the Council. The County Engineer said that the Council does not have the finances to maintain these open spaces, and it was a question of trying to fill potholes or cutting grass in open spaces. He said that in many instances, the local residents maintained the open space. Some members felt that this was a change of policy by the Council and asked for permission to raise the matter again. The Chairman said he would allow this.

N.O.M. NO. 22: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING - CLR. J. McCLEARN: 1042

The following written reply was given to Clr. J. McClearn:

"There are no funds available for the provision of a pedestrian crossing at above location in the current year."

N.O.M. NO. 23: RESOLUTION - CLRS. J. McDONAGH, M. CUNNINGHAM, AND M. FINNERTY: 1043

It was proposed by Councillor McDonagh, seconded by Councillor Ryan, and agreed:

"That Galway County Council resolve to call on the Minister for the Environment to make an order under Section 14 of the Local Government (No. 2) Act, 1960 substantially increasing the limits set for the annual contributions which Councils may pay to the funds of the County Councils' General Council. This Council ask the Minister to make this order in sufficient time to enable Councils to provide for the increased contributions in the 1993 Estimates of Expenses.

The additional funds, which the increased contributions will provide, to be used by the General Council to equip itself with the staff and premises necessary to provide a professional service to its constituent Councils.

This enhanced service to member Councils to include:

(i) representing the views of its constituent Councils to Government on policy matters affecting local government at national level in line with the work programme outlined in the General Council's Policy Document.

(ii) representing its constituent Council's views at international level at the following international fora:

- a) the Council of Europe - Standing Conference of Local & Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE)
- b) the EC Commission - Consultative Council of Regional & Local Authorities (CCRLA) and its successor the proposed "committee of the Regions" to be established under the Treaty on European Union, if ratified by the EC member states.
- c) the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) and the Union's European regional section the Council of European Municipalities and

Regions (CEMR)

(iii) providing, or arranging for the provision of, an adequate EC intelligence and information service to its constituent Councils focusing on developments at EC level, particularly in relation to EC programmes with funding potential for local authority projects from the community's existing Structural and proposed Cohesion Funds.

(iv) co-ordinating the international Twinning activities of its constituent Councils and administering the allocation of EC Commission twinning grants in Ireland.

That this resolution be sent immediately to the Minister for the Environment, the Government's secretariat and the General Council of County Councils."

N.O.M. NO. 24: WATER - CLR. S. GAVIN: 1044

The following written reply was given to Clr. S. Gavin:

"I wish to inform you that the Council is awaiting approval from the Department of the Environment for the preparation of Contract Documents for the provision of a reservoir on Inishmore. A Contractor will shortly be appointed for the construction of the Fire Station."

N.O.M. NO. 25: ROAD - CLR. S. GAVIN: 1045

The following written reply was given to Clr. S. Gavin:

"This matter is being investigated and it is hoped to have a reply available for the next meeting."

N.O.M. NO. 26: LIGHT - CLR. S. GAVIN: 1046

The following written reply was given to Clr. S. Gavin:

"There is already one public light on the public road opposite the car park in front of the church. This private car park belongs to the Church authority. The provision of lights along the public road opposite the car park will not be effective for car park users due to its distance from the Church."

Councillor Gavin asked that a second light be considered in 1993.

N.O.M. NO. 27: WALL - DEP. P. McCORMACK: 1047

The following written reply was given to Deputy P.

McCormack:

"Galway County Council submitted an application to the Department of Marine for a grant of £75,000 for the carrying out of repairs to Gurteen Burial Ground. However, the Department in letter dated 4th July, 1991, informed that there were no funds available for the carrying out of the above works. The Department of the Environment has no responsibility in this matter."

N.O.M. NO. 28: FLOODING - DEP. P. McCORMACK: 1048

The following written reply was given to Deputy P. McCormack:

"The matter is being investigated and a report will be available for the next meeting."

N.O.M. NO. 29: CLUAIN MHUIRE - CLR. J. BURKE: 1049

The following written reply was given to Clr. J. Burke:

"I wish to inform you that the provisions of Section 2 of the City and County Management (Amendment) Act, 1955, were complied with prior to the purchase of Cluain Mhuire."

N.O.M. NO. 30: ROAD - CLR. T. WALSH: 1050

The following written reply was given to Clr. T. Walsh:

"The section in question is bumpy as the surface is a series of connected repaired pot holes."

There are no funds available to carry out these repairs in the current year. However, the road will be considered along with others in the preparation of the 1993 Road Works Programme."

N.O.M. NO. 31: ROAD - CLR. E. VARLEY: 1051

The following written reply was given to Clr. E. Varley:

"Roadworks will be carried out at the above location following your recent allocation of N.O.M. funds."

N.O.M. NO. 32: FOOTPATH - CLR. E. VARLEY: 1052

The following written reply was given to Clr. E. Varley:

"A wall is being provided at the above location by a Social Employment Scheme. The footpath will be provided towards the end of the current year."

N.O.M. NO. 33: BUSHES -- CLR. E. VARLEY: 1053

The following written reply was given to Clr. E. Varley:

"Hedge trimming will be carried out at the above location towards the end of the current year."

N.O.M. NO. 34 ROAD - SEN. E. O'CUIV: 1054

The following written reply was given to Sen. O'Cuiv:

"The matter is being investigated and a reply will be available for the next meeting."

Senator O'Cuiv asked that favourable consideration be given to his request.

RUN UIMHIR 35: COMHARTHAÍ - AN SEANADOIR EAMON O'CUIV: 1055

Tugadh an freagra seo leanas don Seanadóir Eamon O'Cuiv:

"Nil aon airgead ar fail i mbliana le haghaidh an obair thuas luaite."

N.O.M. NO. 36: FOOTPATHS - SEN. E. O'CUIV: 1056

The following written reply was given to Senator Eamon O'Cuiv:

"There are no funds available for the provision of footpaths at the above location in the current year."

RUN UIMHIR 37: SOLATHAIR UISCE - AN COMHAIRLEOIR SEAN O'NEACHTAIN: 1057

Seo leanas an freagra a tugadh don Chomhairleoir Sean O'Neachtain:

"Ta an fadhb seo socraithe anois. Freisin beidh muid ag chuir chlorinator nua ar fail go gairid."

RUN UIMHIR 38: REILG - AN COMH. S. O'NEACHTAIN: 1058

Seo leanas an freagra a tugadh don Chomhairleoir S. O'Neachtain:

"Nil aon airgead ar fail i mbliana le haghaidh an obair thuasluaite a dheanamh."

Clr. O'Neachtain said that this road was a disgrace and the gate and pillar was falling down. He said that the repairs should be carried out from emergency funds.

N.O.M. NO. 39: BOTHAR -- CLR. C. NI FHATHARTA: 1059

The following written reply was given to Clr. C. Ni Fhatharta:

"Nil aon airgid ar fail i mbliana le haghaidh an bothar seo a dheisiú. Ach mar sin fein cuirfear an gnath obair ar fail."

RUN UIMHIR 40: SPEED LIMIT - CLR. C. NI FHATHARTA: 1060

The following written reply was given to Clr. C. Ni Fhatharta:

"This location will be considered under the 1992 speed limits review which is presently in progress."

N.O.M. NO. 41: WALL - CLR. C. NI FHATHARTA: 1061

The following written reply was given to Clr. C. Ni Fhatharta:

"There are no funds available to carry out the above work in the current year."

N.O.M. NO. 42: ROADS - CLR. C. NI FHATHARTA: 1062

The following written reply was given to Clr. C. Ni Fhatharta:

"Repairs have already been carried out to the Camus and Baile an tSleibhe roads. It was not possible to include the remaining locations in the 1992 Road Works programme due to lack of funds."

N.O.M. NO. 43: ROAD - CLR. P. MCHUGH: 1063

The following written reply was given to Clr. P. McHugh:

"The above location will be considered along with others in the preparation of the 1993 Road Works Programme."

N.O.M. NO. 44: SIGN - CLR. P. MCHUGH: 1064

The following written reply was given to Clr. P. McHugh:

"Statutory signs will be provided at the above location as soon as possible."

N.O.M. NO. 45: ROAD - CLR. P. MCHUGH: 1065

The following written reply was given to Clr. P. McHugh:

"There is no road flooding at the above location. Flooding on private property is a matter for the land owner involved."

Councillor McHugh asked that this be reconsidered.

N.O.M. NO. 46: SHANNON AIRPORT - CLR. M. MULLINS: 1066

On the proposition of Councillor Michael Mullins, seconded by Councillor McHugh, it was resolved:

"That Galway County Council calls on the Government to re-affirm the status of Shannon Airport without further delay in order to alleviate fears in business and tourism interests in County Galway."

THE MEETING THEN ENDED

SUBMITTED, APPROVED & CONFIRMED:

Michael Mullins
CHAIRMAN

23/11/1992

DATE

PRESENT: COISTE GAEILGE
Peadar Mac Fhlannchadha
Brendan O Tuairisg
Seosamh O Cuaig
Padraig O Cosgordha

COMAIRLEOIRE

Sean O Neachtain
Jarlath Mac Donnchadha
Seamus O Gabhain
Peadar O Tuathail
Eamon O Cuiv
Connie Ni Fhatharta
Tomas O Beirne
Seanadoir Eamon O'Cuiv

OIFIGI

T. O Caomhanaigh, Runai
M. Nolan, Oifigeach Foirne
C. De Bhailis, Oifigeach
Foirne Sinnsear

Chuir an Cathaoirleach faillte roimh oifigi o "Gaillimh le Gaeilge" agus thug se cuireadh do Maire Mhic Uidhir labhairt leis an gcrunniu.

Ghabh Maire Mhic Uidhir buiochas leis an gCathaoirleach agus thug si cur sios ar imeachtaí an grupa go dtí seo, agus freisin na h-aidhmeanna ata acu. Dúirt si go raibh tuarascáil le h-eagrú acu cun cuir faoi bhráid an Coiste Gaeilge Gaeltachta, amach anseo.

Comharthai Gaeilge in Oispideil na h-ollscoile, agus Pairc Meirlinne

Chuir na baill a díoma, in iúl de bhri nach raibh comharthai dha theangach ag na h-ionadaí thuas luaite. Díarr siad go bpleafar an tábhar seo le udarais na h-oispideil comh maith leis an gá ata ann, eolas oibrithe a bheith ag foireann leighis agus rl, na h-oispideil.

Comharthai obair bhóthair Sealadach

Chuir na baill in iúl go raibh áthas ortha as ucht na Comharthai obair bhóthair sealadach a bhí curtha ar fáil as gaeilge ag an gComhairle Chondae: Díarr an Seandoir O Cuiv, cen fáth nach raibh na comharthai dha theangach ar fáil ar fud an Chontae, mar cheap se go raibh se sin socraithe cheana féin ag an gcoiste. Dúirt an Runai Chondae gurb e curam an coiste ná iad siúd a cur ar fáil 'sna ceanntair Gaeltachta. Mar sin féin dúirt se go scrudódh se an cás aris.

Córas Aistriúchan

Rinne Muriel Nolan cur sios ar costais seirbhis mar seo a cur ar fáil. Díarr na baill tuile eolas a fháil i dtaobh costais cothú agus freisin tuile eolas a fháil o gníomhaireachtaí eile mar comhairle na n-oileain, a bhfuil seirbhis mar seo ag obair acu cheana fein. Daontaigh na baill go gcuirfear iarratas airgid chuig an roinn comhshaoil, agus cóip den iarratas do Roinn na Gaeltachta.