

COMHAIRLE CHONTAE NA GAILLIMHE
MINUTES OF DEFERRED REMOTE COUNCIL MEETING OF
GALWAY COUNTY COUNCIL
Friday 10th December 2021 via Microsoft Teams

CATHAOIRLEACH: Cllr.. Peter Keaveney
Cathaoirleach of the County of Galway

Baill: Comh./Cllr.. T Broderick, J. Byrne,
L. Carroll, J. Charity, D. Collins, D. Connolly, M. Connolly,
G. Cronnelly, D. Ó Cualáin, J. Cuddy, S. Curley, T. Ó
Curraoin, A. Dolan, G. Donohue, G. Finnerty; D.
Geraghty, S. Herterich Quinn, M. Hoade, C. Keaveney,
D. Kelly, D. Killilea, M. Kinane, G. King, P. Mac an Iomaire,
M. Maher, E. Mannion, J. McClearn, K. McHugh Farag,
A. McKinstry, P.J. Murphy, Dr. E. Francis Parsons, A.
Reddington, P. Roche, J. Sheridan, N. Thomas, S.
Walsh and T. Welby.

Apologies: Cllr. I. Canning

Oifigh: Mr. J. Cullen, Chief Executive, Mr. L. Hanrahan,
Director of Services, Mr. M. Owens, Director of
Services, Ms. J. Brann, Meetings Administrator, Ms. V.
Loughnane, Senior Planner, Mr. B. Dunne, A/Senior
Executive Planner, Mr. B. Corcoran, Executive
Planner, Ms. A. O Moore, Assistant Planner, Ms. E.
Keaveney, Administrative Officer & Ms. U Ní Eidhín,
Oifigeach Gaeilge

Mr. Owens reminded the Elected Members of the provisions of Part 15 of the Local Government Act and the Code of Conduct for Councillors that provides the Ethical Framework for local government including provision for the disclosure of pecuniary or other beneficial interests or conflicts of interest. It was again noted that Councillors must disclose at a meeting of the local authority any pecuniary or other beneficial interest or conflict of interest (of which they have actual knowledge) they or a connected person have in, or material to, any matter with which the local authority is concerned in the discharge of its functions, and which comes before the meeting. The Councillor must withdraw from the meeting after their disclosure and must not vote or take part in any discussion or consideration of the matter or seek to in any other aspect

influence the decision making of the Council. Mr. Owens referred to the paragraph 7 of the Protocol for Remote Meetings of Council for the guidance on the means of making a declaration at a remote meeting.

Item No. 1: To consider the Chief Executive's Report on the Submissions received to the Draft Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 under Part 11, Section 12(5) and (6) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) – adjourned meeting from 06/12/2021:- 3914

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 2 – Residential Land Supply:

RECOMMENDATION 2 – RESIDENTIAL LAND SUPPLY

In accordance with section 10(2A)(c) and (d) and 10 (2C)(b)(ii) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and having regard to the Guidance Note on Core Strategies 2010, the planning authority is required to amend core strategy Table 2.9 as follows:

- (i) to ensure that the density assumptions used to calculate the housing land requirements for the plan period are consistent with requirements of 10(2A), Guidance Notes and the section 28 Planning Guidelines for Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009) and/or are justified on an evidenced based approach and site survey analysis.
- (ii) to include the area and potential housing yield of both residential zoned lands and other lands zoned for a mixture of residential and others uses, as required by Section 10(2A)(c) and (d);
- (iii) to clearly state that a minimum of 30% of residential units shall be located within the built-up footprint (in lieu of 'up to') as required by NPO 3; and
- (iv) to include for the requirement of RPO 3.3 to provide 20% of rural housing on brownfield sites, which applies to Headford and tiers 6 and 7 of the settlement hierarchy.

Chief Executive's Response:

- (i) The comments in relation to the consistency of the approach to anticipated densities for future development in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) is noted.

In April of this year, further guidance has been issued by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage within Circular NRUP 02/2021 in relation to the provision of residential densities in Town and Villages and provides clarity on the applications of densities at edge of town/village locations in a rural context. A more proportionate approach to residential development with consideration of the character, scale and setting of the town/village is recommended. It is acknowledged in the Circular that in rural towns a lower residential density level would be considered appropriate. The Guidelines and Circular also recognise that there are many factors that could have a significant impact on the provision of a sufficient supply of residential land for the lifetime of the Plan, and that it may be necessary to adjust density levels to take account of

the existing development patterns which has potential to lower the available density.

In this context the Core Strategy Table 2.9 was reviewed, and a further examination of the settlements was undertaken, especially the Briarhill Settlement Plan, Key Towns, Strategic Potential and the two Self-Sustaining Towns.

It is considered that in line with Garraun, the density for the Briarhill area will be increased from 30/ha to 35/ha. In relation to the Key Towns it is considered that the density for both Ballinasloe and Tuam will be increased from 30/ha to 35/ha. The density for Athenry will be increased from 20/ha to 25/ha. It is considered that the density for both Gort and Loughrea should be increased from 20/ha to 25/ha.

In this regard the Core Strategy of the Plan has been amended. From examining the Small Growth Towns and Small Growth Villages it is considered that the density of 16/ha for Small Growth Towns, and 11/ha for Small Growth Villages respectively, is appropriate based on the structure, content and existing pattern of residential development in the settlements.

- (ii) The Core Strategy Table (2.9) has been amended, to reflect recommendation No.1. The area and potential housing yield of both residential and other uses are reflected.
- (iii) The quantum of housing yield on brownfield/infill lands reflects the requirement as per NPOS.
- (iv) It is recognised that there are vacant and derelict properties throughout the countryside and in Level 6 and 7. The promotion of the rehabilitation and extension of vacant residential properties in the rural area, as well as the development of replacement dwellings, can help to re-establish rural communities by redeveloping long established buildings, which may also have the benefit of being proximate to existing services. It is considered that policy objective **RH6 Replacement Dwelling** and **RH7 Renovation of Existing Dwelling** will support the promotion of brownfield sites. In Headford there are opportunity sites identified that would encourage redevelopment of key brownfield sites. The 20% target is considered to be realistically achievable and will be monitored. In an effort to ensure that the Plan further aligns with the RSES, and to further strengthen the existing level of brownfield development in rural areas, it is considered that the Draft Development Plan would benefit from the inclusion of a policy objective relating to this.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Please see separate section on page 64 at the end of the OPR Section with changes to the Core Strategy Table, Recommendation No's 1, 2, 7 and 15 relating to the removal/addition of Residential Phase 1 lands.

- (i) See Core Strategy Table
- (ii) See Core Strategy Table
- (iii) See Core Strategy Table

CGR 12 Opportunity Sites

- a) It is a policy objective of the Council to facilitate, promote and encourage the re-development of Opportunity Sites identified in Volume 2 of the Plan and Local Area Plans for appropriate development that contributes positively to good placemaking within the settlement.
- (b) Support the ongoing monitoring of new rural housing to ensure that 20% of all new rural housing is located on brownfield sites.

Cllr. Hoade submitted the following Motion:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

(i)

- Amend **Policy Objective SS7 Development of Small Villages Rural Settlements and Rural Nodes in Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy**
- Amend Section 4.5.2 Residential Development Potential in **Level 7 (a) Rural Settlements and 7(b) Rural Nodes- Serviced /Un-Serviced Villages and Countryside in Chapter 4 Rural Living and Development**

A number of the villages in this category of the settlement hierarchy are small villages that consist of a cluster of houses and limited level of services available. Some of these villages are served by public mains water and/or wastewater supply, whilst there are others that are un-serviced. It is recognised in this Plan that there is capacity in these villages to accommodate a small level of growth, with the capacity to accommodate growth dependant on the size of the village. **There are two categories of rural villages indicated on Table 2.10 Settlement Hierarchy; Rural Settlements and Rural Nodes.** Placemaking within the rural villages as outlined in **Chapter 3 Placemaking, Regeneration and Urban Living** are key components to enhance the rural vitality and rural experience.

- Amend/Split Level 7 of the Settlement Hierarchy Table 2.10 as follows:

Level 7 (a):

Rural Settlements: Rural Settlement dwellers not to be classified as urban generated

Craughwell, Corofin, Clarinbridge, Ardrahan, Kilcolgan, Cor an Dola, New Inn, Lackagh, Turloughmore, Abbeyknockmoy, Cluain Bú, Monivea, Eyrecourt, Menlough, Williamstown, Milltown, Woodford, Killimor, Ballinderreen, Na Forbacha, Ros an Mhíl, Cill Chiaráin, Cill Rónáin, Roundstone, Carna, An Fhairche, Leenane, Cleggan, Letterfrack, Woodlawn

Level 7 (b):

Rural Nodes:

An Tulaigh/Baile na hAbhann, Woodlawn, Kilconnell, Ballymacward, An Carn Mór, Eanach Dhúin, Ahascragh, Attymon, Banagher, Aughrim, Caltra, Clonfert, Kiltormer, Lawrencetown, Fohenagh, Killoran, Castleblakeney, Ballinamore Bridge, Gorteen, Cappataggle, Kilkerrin, Barnaderg, Belclare, Kilbennan, Briarfield, Newbridge, Ballymoe, Kilconly, Caherlistrane, Brownsgrave, Sylane, Lavally, Foxhall, Newbridge, Cashla, Kiltevna, Glinsk, Ballyglunin, Laragh More, Ballymana, Esker, Carrabane,

Kiltullagh, Derrydonnell Beg, Kilchreest, Ballinakill, Moyglass, Peterswell, Killeenadeema, Drim, Kilconieran, Labane, Tynagh, Kilreekil, Abbey, Bullaun, Castledaly, Coose, Newcastle, Cooloo, Shanaglish, An Cnoc, Na Minna, Rosscahill, Tulaigh Mhic Aodháin, Leitir Móir, Tully/Renvyle, Glinsk, Leitir Meallán, Béal an Daingin, Tullycross, Rosmuc, Casla, Corr na Móna, Ballyconneely, Sraith Salach, Claddaghduff, An Mám, Maam Cross, An Aird Mhóir, Maree, Kilbeacanty, Cloghanover, Camas, Nobre

Cllr. Hoade proposed to include Woodlawn under Rural Settlements, Nobre under Rural Nodes and amendment to wording of Level 7a, Rural Settlements outlined in red. This was agreed after some discussion.

Cllr. Byrne said that someone living in Ardrahan village should be entitled to rural housing need as they do not have the opportunity to build in the village

Cllr. Murphy raised a concern that in making rules for rural settlements there is no definition of how boundaries will be defined.

In reply, Ms. Loughnane said that there are guidelines in policy already for cluster housing which will be going back before Members again.

The Motion was proposed by Cllr. Hoade, seconded by Cllr. Byrne and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. D. Connolly submitted the following Motion:

That in relation to Level 7 (a) Rural Settlements/7(b) Rural Nodes

Amend (iii) (b) on Page 16 – change from Level 7(a) to Level 7(a) and 7(b)

This motion was proposed by Cllr. D. Connolly, seconded by Cllr. Broderick and agreed by the Members.

An Comh. O Cualáin submitted the following Motion:

An Tulaigh/Baile na hAbhann be moved from Rural Nodes Level 7(b) to Rural Settlements Level 7(a)

This motion was proposed by An Comh. O Cualáin, seconded by Cllr. Thomas and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. McClearn submitted the following Motion:

To include Mullagh in Level 7(b) – Rural Nodes

This motion was proposed by Cllr. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. Maher and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. Dolan queried re CE response as Athenry LAP not being prepared until 2022 and queried if densities can be changed. In response, Mr. Dunne said that density is part of Core Strategy and the LAP will reflect the CDP.

Cllr. Byrne asked how can 20% of housing be applied to brownfield sites if the limit of one-offs is removed. Cllr. M. Connolly queried re brownfield in Headford and why is Headford in a different category. Mr. Dunne said that 20% brownfield was replacement dwellings.

Cllr. Mannion queried in relation to houses being built by non-locals, was this 20% being taken out of local housing need numbers. Ms. Loughnane stated that any proposal to make changes to the figure in the Core Strategy may undermine what the Members were trying to achieve.

In reply to Cllr. Mannion who queried if 20% of brownfield sites would be taken from the 911 rurals proposed, Ms. Loughnane advised that it wouldn't.

Cllr. Welby requested clarification in relation to RHO 7, semi ruinous dwellings as to whether they required proof of housing need. Mr. Dunne said they were assessed on a case-by-case basis. Cllr. Welby said one was refused recently on housing need.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation No. 3 – Traveller Accommodation.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION

Having regard the requirement of section 10(2)(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, (as amended) the planning authority is required to include objectives in the plan for the provision of accommodation for Travellers, and the use of particular areas for that purpose in accordance with the legislative requirements under section 10(2)(i) of the Act.

Chief Executive's Response:

Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy and Chapter 11 Community Development and Social Infrastructure of the Draft Plan includes policy objectives which support the provision for accommodation for Travellers. The housing of mixed type and tenure as well as housing to accommodate the needs of specific user groups is supported in the Draft Plan.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No Change.

Cllr. McKinstry proposed the following Motion:

That the Council acknowledge the need for culturally appropriate accommodation for Travellers, including the provision for horses, (added to chapter 3, housing need assessment)

Cllr. McKinstry said that it has been deemed a fundamental right and he would like it stated publicly.

Cllr. Roche said it was a dangerous precedent in a time of housing crisis, that land would have to be bought for the accommodation of horses. Cllr. McClearn expressed a concern that this would have unintended consequences and that it would rule out the possibility of travellers getting housed in social housing in built up areas, and that travellers could end up worse off. Cllr. Broderick said that while the motion was well founded, he felt with homelessness etc that he couldn't support a provision for horses. Cllr. Murphy was also concerned about the cost and said that provision is not made for hobbies of any other group. Cllr. McHugh said that she would be afraid that horses may not be microchipped and also mentioned the cost implication. Cllr. Charity said that the motion was well intended but he said he had experience of problems with abandoned horses on the Headford Road wandering in front of traffic. He said he had made attempts to engage with the Galway Traveller Movement to no avail.

Cllr. McKinstry said that the motion did not require land be purchased and that land would have to be paid for by the tenant. He wanted recognition that Travellers and horses are interlinked.

Cllr. Thomas expressed the opinion that such a policy could not work and that high standard of social housing is provided, and no other group is catered for in such a way. Cllr. Byrne requested feedback from the Director of Housing

Mr. Hanrahan said that the Local Traveller Accommodation Plan contains support for horse projects, and this did not need to be included in CDP.

Cllr. Carroll asked Cllr. McKinstry to clarify if he meant all accommodation as he said this could not be accommodated in private estates where 20% was for social housing. Cllr. McKinstry said details could be left to Housing SPC.

Cllr. Mannion said that she felt a Part 8 proposal with a provision for horses would not get approval, and she could not support the motion. Cllr. M Connolly said that there is already a lot of trouble with out of control horses and that the JPC spent a lot of time trying to sort the problem. He said that the Travellers he deals with never look for space for horses but look for bigger houses. Cllr. Hoade expressed serious concern with the motion and said it would not be in line with trying to improve integration.

Cllr. Welby queried whether OPR had been notified of an error in their submission relating to Traveller accommodation which actually referred to the City Council. Mr. Owens confirmed that it had been raised at a meeting and they had been afforded opportunity to submit a clarification, but none had been received to date.

As the Motion was not agreed, the Cathaoirleach called for a vote. The Vote was taken, and the following was the result:

For (3)

Cllr. McKinstry

Cllr. D Connolly

Cllr. Welby

Against -24

Cllr. Broderick	Cllr. Byrne	Cllr. Carroll
Cllr. Charity	Cllr. M. Connolly	Cllr. Cronnelly
Cllr. Cuddy	Cllr. Curley	Comh. O Curraoin
Cllr. Dolan	Cllr. Donohue	Cllr. Hoade
Cllr. P. Keaveney	Cllr. Killilea	Cllr. King
Cllr. Maher	Cllr. Mannion	Cllr. McClearn
Cllr. McHugh/Farag	Cllr. Murphy	Cllr. Roche
Cllr. Sheridan	Cllr. Thomas	Cllr. Walsh

Abstain 8

Comh. O Cualáin	Cllr. Geraghty	Cllr. Herterich-Quinn
Cllr. Kelly	Cllr. Kinane	Comh Mac An Iomaire
Cllr. Parsons	Cllr. Reddington	

No Reply - 4

The Cathaoirleach declared the Motion not carried.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Observation from OPR to be considered was Observation 2 – Age Friendly Housing.

OBSERVATION 2 – AGE FRIENDLY HOUSING

The Planning Authority is requested to include a more proactive strategy in relation to the provision of nursing homes and sheltered housing in order to ensure consistency with RPO 7.14.

Chief Executive's Response:

Chapter 3 Placemaking, Regeneration and Urban Living and Chapter 11 Community Development and Social Infrastructure of the Draft Plan includes policy objectives which support the provision for housing of mixed type and tenure as well as housing to accommodate the needs of specific user groups. Specialised housing is actively supported, and it is considered that distinct zoning class for specific types of housing or healthcare facilities is not required and has the potential to restrict and indeed limit the level of facilities and the locations at which they could be provided. **Policy Objective PA3 Accommodation for Older Persons** and **Policy Objective PA4 Retirement Villages and Sheltered Housing for older persons** in **Chapter 11 Community Development and Social Infrastructure** reflects the strategy proposed by Galway County Council. The settlement plans in Volume 2 of the Draft Development Plan 2022-2028 contain Land Use Matrix Table where there is a category “Retirement Home” and in general this category is “Permitted in Principle” or “Open For Consideration” on Town Centre/Village Centre, Residential or Community Facilities zoned lands. However, for the purpose of clarity it is considered the wording “Nursing Home/Sheltered Housing” would replace the terms “Retirement Home”.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Volume 2:

Amend the Land-Use Zoning Matrix Table for County Metropolitan Area, Small Growth Towns and Small Growth Villages

Residential Uses	C1/T C/VC	R	CF	OS	T	I	BE	BT	N	PU	TI
Apartments ¹	P	O ¹	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Halting Site	N	O	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Residential (Excluding Apartments) ¹	O	P ¹	N	N	N	N	N	N	N*	N	N
Retirement Home Nursing Home/Sheltered Housing	O	P	O	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Short term holiday accommodation	O	N	N	N	p	N	N	N	N	N	N

Cllr. Geraghty said he disagreed with taking out Retirement Home- Nursing Home/Sheltered Housing and Cllr. Welby asked what the rationale for removing it was.

Mr. Dunne replied that it was in line with the OPR submission. Cllr. Welby proposed that Retirement Home – Nursing Home/Sheltered Housing should be left in and Cllr. Cuddy seconded that proposal and it was agreed.

Amendment to include wording “**Retirement Home – Nursing Home/Sheltered Housing**” was proposed by Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Cuddy and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 4 – Co-ordination with Galway City Council.

RECOMMENDATION 4 – CO-ORDINATION WITH GALWAY CITY COUNCIL

1. Development Approach

Having regard to section 9(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and to the requirement for a sustainable settlement and transportation strategy under section 10(2)(n), the planning authority is required to coordinate the objectives of the development plan with those of Galway City Council to:

- (i) Review land use zonings on the edge of and contiguous to the boundary of the city council in accordance with the principles of compact growth; and sequential approach to development, and tiered approach to zoning; and
- (ii) Prepare a joint Local Area Plan or at least a joint strategy to form part of the Draft Plan, including a transport strategy and /or local transport plan for the connected metropolitan settlements of Garraun, Ardaun (City) and Briarhill. This should also involve engagement with all other relevant stakeholders, particularly TII, NTA, IW and OPW.

Chief Executive’s Response:

- (i) Galway County Council have engaged with Galway City Council throughout the process of the drafting of the new Draft County Development Plan, and there had been a number of meetings with our city counterparts at both Management and Technical

level during this process. As part of the public consultation process and the drafting of the CE report on the submissions, Galway County Council met with Galway City Council in recent weeks and agreed a mechanism for future engagement to ensure collaboration and coordination between the two authorities with respect to Planning and Transportation matters particularly where it impacts on the interface between the jurisdictions. Given that the City and County Councils are joint owners of the former Galway airport site, the proposed approach in the Draft County Development Plan is recognized and agreed upon in the City Council submission to the Draft Plan. The two councils have also agreed a timeframe to engage on and prepare a Joint Retail Strategy and a joint Topologies/Building Heights Study/framework. This work will commence in early 2022 and will dovetail with both the County Development Plan and the Draft City Development Plan.

(ii) Volume 2 of the Galway Metropolitan Area Plan includes the settlements of Baile Chláir, Bearna, Oranmore, Garraun and Briarhill. The population allocation as outlined in the Core Strategy Table (2.9) in **Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy** reflects the population allocation as per Variation No.5 to the Galway City Development Plan and the RSES. As outlined under response to point (i) above there was close collaboration and presentations with Galway City Council especially around the Eastern Environs and emerging plans for this area of the county. Both Councils are at different stages of the planning making process and based on the close collaboration it is considered that a Joint Local Area Plan for these connected metropolitan parts of Garraun, Ardaun (city) and Briarhill is not required. In relation to the transport element the Galway Transport Strategy (GTS) was prepared and endorsed by both Galway City and Galway County Council. Both the Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) and the National Transport Authority (NTA) raised concern regarding the lands around Briarhill. It is considered warranted and after discussions with Galway City Council, TII and NTA that an Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA) will be commenced for this area.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Insert new Policy Objective in Volume 2, Section 1.10 Land Use Zoning for the Metropolitan Areas of County Galway as follows:

GCMA24 Area Based Transport Assessment

It is a policy objective of Galway County Council to prepare an *Area Based Transport Assessment for the Briarhill Urban Framework* and surrounding growth areas with close collaboration and engagements with key stakeholders such as Galway City Council, National Transport Authority (NTA) and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII).

CE Recommendation was proposed by Cllr. Carroll, seconded by Cllr. Cuddy and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 5 – Development Approach to settlements in tiers 2-4 of the settlement hierarchy.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – DEVELOPMENT APPROACH TO SETTLEMENTS IN TIERS 2-4 OF THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

The planning authority is required to supplement section 2.4 of the plan, the settlement hierarchy and /or volume 2 of the plan (settlement plans) to provide greater clarity and transparency in the delivery of the core strategy objectives for the towns in tiers 2-4 of the settlement hierarchy and to clearly set out how the objectives in section 10(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) are to be achieved in the interim and pending the adoption of Local Area Plans for these settlements. At a minimum the planning authority is required to prepare maps and strong policy objectives, identifying strategic objectives for each settlement consistent with NPOs 3,6, 7 and RPOs 3.1,3.2 and 6.27. In this regard, the settlement plans should include a settlement boundary, compact growth area, core retail area, key regeneration sites, strategic employment sites, constraints such as flooding, sustainable mobility objectives and relevant key future priorities.

Chief Executive's Response:

It should be noted that in Volume two of the Draft Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 there are 17 settlement plans ranging in various size and structure and are listed accordingly in line with the Settlement Hierarchy. It is correct to state that there are no settlement plans included for Level 2-4, however, the Ballinasloe Key Town is currently on Draft display (on display 22nd October 2021) and it is expected that the other Key Town of Tuam will be on display Q1 of 2022. The other remaining towns under levels 3-4, are expected to be on display in mid-2022. All current LAPs shall be read together with the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, where a conflict arises between plans, the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 shall take precedent. All of the existing LAPs will be reviewed and adhere to the specifications of the County Development Plan. Galway County Council is wholly committed to preparing these plans to ensure the regeneration, consolidation, and economic development of these towns. It is considered premature as part of the County Development Plan process to identify settlement boundaries, compact growth areas, or strategic employment sites among others, outside the statutory LAP process and the associated public consultations.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No Change.

The CE Recommendation was proposed by Cllr. Maher, seconded by Cllr. Cuddy and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Observation from OPR to be considered was Observation 3 – Active Land Management.

OBSERVATION 3 – ACTIVE LAND MANAGEMENT

3. Compact Growth, Regeneration and Tiered Approach to Zoning

Having regard to NPO 6 and RPO 3.2, RPO 3.3 and RPO 3.6 on Regeneration, Brownfield and Infill Development within the RSES, the Planning Authority is requested to:

- (i) Set out a clear timeline and strategic approach to carry out the Active Land Management approach identified in policies CGR 11-12 of the plan, including measurable targets and timelines against which the implementation can be monitored and measured; and
- (ii) Stipulate that database established under CGR 11, will include briefs specifically for brownfield sites zoned for development, which will be continually renewed and updated as opportunities arise through active land management process.

Chief Executive's Response:

(i) The Council acknowledges the importance of Active Land Management in promoting and facilitating the re-use and redevelopment of vacant and under-utilised lands. It is considered that this is demonstrated in the Draft Plan in both the narrative and the policy objectives. **Chapter 3 Placemaking, Regeneration & Urban Living**, section 3.6 supports the concept of compact growth and regeneration. **Policy Objective CGR 11 Strategic Sites** and **CGR 12 Opportunity Sites** relate to the Active Land Management mechanism. There is also strong support for any project funded under the Urban or Rural Regeneration and Development Fund in addition to support for the rejuvenation of town centres through the section on Town Centre Living (section 3.7) and the support for Town and Village Centre Management Plans under policy objective PM3. It is anticipated that the introduction of a Vacant Site Levy as set out in section 3.6.1 will assist in incentivising the use and development of vacant and under-utilised lands. It is acknowledged that the Plan could benefit from a specific policy objective on Active Land Management. Whilst the benefits of measurable targets and timelines in the implementation of an Active Land Management Strategy are acknowledged, it is often the case that securing the redevelopment of sites is dependent on a range of external factors beyond the control of the Local Authority. This includes funding, land ownership, site investigation works, and infrastructure constraints. These factors can also result in delays in the delivery of projects. Taking the above into account, it is considered that a specific policy objective on Active Land Management is included in **Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy**.

(ii) It is considered that the reference to briefs in relation to brownfield sites would be appropriate.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

(i) **Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy**

Section 2.3.14 Core Strategy Policy Objectives:

CS 6 Active Land Management

To promote, support, and facilitate the re-use of under-utilised or vacant lands, or lands identified for regeneration, through a co-ordinated approach to active land management between the Council and stakeholders.

(ii) **CGR 11 Strategic Sites**

(a) It is a policy objective of the Council to establish a database of strategic brownfield and infill sites so that brownfield land re-use can be managed and co-ordinated across multiple stakeholders as part of an active land management process.

(b) Development Briefs for lands identified in the database will be prepared and reviewed accordingly and where required.

CE Recommendation was proposed by Cllr. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Maher and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 6 – Tiered Approach to Zoning.

RECOMMENDATION 6 – TIERED APPROACH TO ZONING

Having regard to NPO 72a, NPO 72b and NPO 72c, the planning authority is required to elaborate and expand upon its infrastructural assessment, as necessary, to fully address the status of all lands proposed to be zoned under the plan in accordance with the methodology for a tiered approach to land zoning under Appendix 3 of the NPF, relating to existing development service, i.e. road and footpath access including public lighting, foul sewer drainage, surface water drainage, water supply and /or additional service capacity. It must also include a reasonable estimate of the full cost of delivery of the required infrastructure to the identified zoned lands and which lands at draft and final plan stages of the plan making process.

The written infrastructure assessment is required to determine which lands are tier 1 service zoned lands and which lands are tier 2 serviceable zoned land (i.e. they can be feasibly be serviced during the plan period to accommodate development).

Lands which cannot be serviced during the period should not be zoned or taken into account in the core strategy for calculation purposes.

Chief Executive's Response:

The tiered approach as advocated by the NPF sought to differentiate between zoned land that is available for development and zoned land that requires significant further investment in infrastructure services for development to be realised. This approach was a central consideration when determining the land use zonings set out in the Draft Plan. As indicated in the Draft Plan lands have only been identified for development where they are able to connect to existing development services i.e., road access, foul sewer drainage and water supply and where service capacity is available, and can therefore accommodate new development. Footpath access was also assessed and while not a primary requirement, connectivity was taken into account in an effort to promote more sustainability in developments. These lands are also positioned within the existing built-up footprint of established settlements or contiguous to existing developed lands. Whilst it is noted that NPO 72b requires a 'reasonable estimate' of the full costs of the specified services to be included in the assessment and the OPR has requested this information to be included, the Council would have a number of concerns in providing such information. Firstly, in the absence of detailed guidance on the methodology for carrying out the assessment, there is no definition of what a 'reasonable estimate' of the costs is.

For the larger projects there are a number of steps from design concept to preliminary design, preferred options, then detailed design before an actual ‘reasonable estimate’ of delivering the project can be identified. Given that the majority of projects are not at this detailed design stage the Council is not in a position to provide a set of costs that it would consider to be reasonable. In addition, other issues such as inflation and potential increases in construction costs also have to be considered, particularly for larger projects which may not commence for a number of years or extend into the next development plan. No guidance has been given as to how this should be factored into the ‘reasonable estimate’. Irish Water were also consulted with regard to providing costs. The utility provider indicated that they are not in a position to provide these costs and have previously indicated this to the Department and the OPR. Taking the foregoing into account an estimate of the costs of the delivery of the infrastructure will not be included in the assessment as the Council is not in a position to provide a ‘reasonable estimate’ given the number of uncertain variables in this information.

The submission also requested that any lands which cannot feasibly be serviced within the plan period in accordance with NPO 72c should be excluded. All lands identified for immediate development have the capacity to develop with a number of upgrades to networks required. All lands identified for development (Town Centre/Village Centre and Residential Phase 1) have the ability to come forward.

In order to further demonstrate adherence to the tiered approach to zoning, a Planning and Infrastructure Assessment has been prepared and is contained in Appendix A of this report.

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

Include the Planning and Infrastructure Assessment which is provided in Appendix A of this report as an Appendix to the Plan.

CE Recommendation was proposed by Cllr. Welby, seconded by Cllr. Killilea and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 7 – Residential Zonings – it was agreed to defer a decision on this until Core Strategy table was being agreed.

RECOMMENDATION 7 – RESIDENTIAL ZONINGS

Having regard to the national and regional objectives for compact growth NPO 3c and RPO 3.2, the requirement under the “Development Plan Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (2007) that a sequential approach to the zoning of lands is applied and the tiered approach to zoning outlined in NPO 72 the planning authority is required to:

- (i) Oranmore - omit the inclusion of a substantial parcel of land for residential phase 2 to the south of the town on the Maree road;
- (ii) Oughterard - omit the inclusion of lands to the east of the town accessed from the Pier Road, for residential phase 1;

(iii) Adjust the zoning of lands to the north of Oranmore, accessed via Carrowmoneash road, and revert to the existing established residential land use zoning, unless there is evidence to corroborate that the site is flood zone A or a sound planning justification for this amendment

Chief Executive's Response:

At the Plenary Council Meeting in May the Elected Members, proposed the zoning of lands in Oranmore and Oughterard for residential development. It is considered that there was no justification for the lands zoned for Residential Development and the officials expressed that view. In addition, in Carrowmoneash, Oranmore the Elected Members removed Residential Phase 1 lands on the premise of flooding and re-allocated this quantum of Residential Phase 1 lands to Garraun and Briarhill. It should be noted that the SFRA carried out on the plan did not support this and this view was expressed by the Officials at the Council Meeting.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

- (i) Please see separate section on page 64 at the end of the OPR Section with Core Strategy Table, Recommendation's No1,2,7 and 15 relating to the removal/addition of Residential Phase 1 lands.
- (ii). Please see separate section on page 64 at the end of the OPR Section with Core Strategy Table, Recommendation's No1,2,7 and 15 relating to the removal/addition of Residential Phase 1 lands.
- (iii). Please see separate section on page 64 at the end of the OPR Section with Core Strategy Table, Recommendation's No1,2,7 and 15 relating to the removal/addition of Residential Phase 1 lands.

It was agreed to defer decision on this Recommendation

Ms. Loughnane advised that the next Recommendation from OPR to be considered was Recommendation 8 – Development Management Standards.

RECOMMENDATION 8 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT STANDARDS

Having regard to NPO 3,6,13 AND 35 the planning authority is required to:

- (i) Amend Table 15.1 residential density so that it is fully consistent with the residential densities set out in the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Area Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) and Circular NRUP 02/2021 Residential Densities in Towns and Villages;
- (ii) Amend policy CGR7(building height) such that it is specific and measurable and makes reference to engagement with the City Council; and
- (iii) Review the car parking standards in Table 15.5 in consultation with the National Transportation Authority and clarify that the standards (which maybe revised) are maximum.

Chief Executive's Response:

- (i) In relation to Table 15.1 and the concern regarding the consistent approach in relation to residential densities as set out in the Guidelines and Circular is noted. The table will be amended to reflect the Circular.

- (ii) In relation to Policy Objective CGR7 (Building Height), the concern regarding specific and measurable timeframes is noted. As outlined under Recommendation No: 4 there has been engagement and close consultation with Galway City Council. It is considered that the wording will be amended to include the points noted.
- (iii) Table 15.5 illustrates the car parking standards for different types of development. A footnote will be added to this table to indicate that the table refers to the maximum quantum of car parking standards.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

- (i) Amend Table 15.1 as follows:

Residential Density	Dwelling Units/Ha	Dwelling Units/Acre	Possible Appropriate Locations
Medium to High	35-50	14-20	Town centre or immediately adjacent to public transport hubs.
Low to Medium	15-35	6-14	Neighbourhood centres (typically within 400m walking distance of centre point), inner urban suburbs.
Low	5-12	2-6	Urban periphery, outlying lands, areas with capacity/ environmental constraints

(i)

Settlement	Location for New Residential Development	Density – Units per Hectare
MASP	Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield	30 or Site Specific
	Outer Suburban/Greenfield	25 – 30 (at locations adjacent to open rural countryside)
Key Town	Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield	35 or Site Specific
	Outer Suburban/Greenfield	15 – 25 (at locations adjacent to open rural countryside)

Strategic Potential/Urban Centres	Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield	25 or Site Specific
Centre/Greenfield	Edge of	15 – 25 (at locations adjacent to open rural countryside)
Small Growth Towns	Town/Village Centre/Infill/Brownfield	16 or Site Specific
Centre/Greenfield	Edge of	10 – 12
Small Growth Villages	Village	11 or Site Specific
	Edge of Centre/Greenfield	10

(ii) Amend Policy Objective **CGR7(Building Height)**.

Chapter 3 Placemaking, Regeneration and Urban Living

CGR 7 Building Heights

It is a policy objective of the Council to undertake an analysis and study of Building Heights in consultation with key stakeholders such as Galway City Council in order to identify appropriate locations for increased building heights which will be considered as appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

(iii) Insert footnote in Table 15.5, in **Chapter 15 Development Management Standards** as follows:

The maximum quantum of car parking requirement

Cllr. C Keaveney queried the definition of a brownfield site and an infill site. Ms. Loughnane clarified that brownfield sites were usually town centres sites where for example an old house was being redeveloped and infill sites may be greenfield or brownfield. Cllr. C Keaveney expressed dissatisfaction and requested a legal definition of brownfield site and said he had concerns about repeated zoning of land which was not being built on. Mr. Owens confirmed that what was contained in the draft was already agreed by the Members and that the advice was based on the National Planning Framework. Cllr. M Connolly stated that some landowners had concerns about their land being zoned and that such sites may never come to the market. He felt that the Council should try and facilitate what will come to the market.

The CE Recommendation was proposed by Cllr. Maher, seconded by Cllr. Welby and agreed by the Members.

The Meeting then adjourned to 13th December 2021

Chriochnaigh an Cruinniú Ansin

Submitted, Signed and Approved



Cathaoirleach: _____

Date: _____ 07/03/2022 _____