

COMHAIRLE CHONTAE NA GAILLIMHE
MINUTES OF SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF GALWAY COUNTY
COUNCIL

Monday 16th February 2026 at 11.00 a.m.

- CATHAOIRLEACH:** Cllr. David Collins
Cathaoirleach of the County of Galway
- Baill:** Comh./Cllr. , S, Broderick, I Canning, D. Connolly, M. Connolly, S. Cunniffe, T. O Curraoin, G. Donohoe, P. Feeney, G. Finnerty, D. Geraghty, T. Grealish, A. Harney, L. Harney, M. Hoade, C. Keane, P. Keaveney, D. Kelly, D. Killilea, P. Killilea, M. Kinane, M. Leainde, M. Lee, E. Mannion, J. McClearn, K. McHugh Farag, S. McHugh Ryan, M. McNamara, Dr. E. Parsons, A. Reddington, M. Regan, N. Thomas, T. Welby
- Oifigh:** Mr. L. Conneally, Chief Executive, Ms. E. Ruane, Director of Services, Mr. M. Owens, Director of Services, Mr. U. Finn, Director of Services, Ms. V. Loughnane, A/Director of Services, Mr. B. Corcoran, A/Senior Executive Planner, Ms. R. Wilson, Graduate Planner, Ms. R. Dowd, Graduate Planner, Ms. J. Brann, Meetings Administrator, Ms. A. Power, Senior Staff Officer, Mr. S. Keady, Assistant Staff Officer
- Apologies:** L. Hanrahan, Director of Services; Comh/Cllr. G. King, J. Charity, P. Mac an Iomaire, O. Turner & S. Walsh

Cllr. D. Collins welcomed everyone to Meeting.

Votes of Sympathy

Cllr. M. Hoade wished to extend her sympathies to Cllr. Gerry King on the bereavement of his sister Anne in New York.

Cllr. J. McClearn wished to express his sympathies with the family of the late Michael O'Neill, who was a former member of Galway County Council from 1991-1999.

An Comh. T. O Curraoin wish to extend his sympathies to the Kearney Family on the death of Patrick.

All Members wished to be associated with the expressions of sympathy.
On behalf of the staff Mr. L. Conneally expressed his sympathies to Cllr King.

Cllr. M. Regan wished to highlight that the speakers were not working on their side of the chamber, and it was something that he had raised previously.

Cathaoirleach D. Collins reminded the Members that they were here today for Special Meeting to consider Chief Executive's (CE) Report on submissions received on Variation No. 1 of the County Development Plan 2022-2028. He referred to Workshop held on 06th February 2026 which was very beneficial for the Members. He 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 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. Cllrs. A. Reddington and M. Regan advised that they may have a Conflict of Interest during the proceedings and would leave the meeting when the relevant submissions were being discussed. The Members noted comments on Conflict of Interest.

CE. L. Conneally expressed thanks to the Forward Planning team for work done to date on Variation No. 1. He stated that the Members would be aware that housing was the Government's no. 1 priority and as such a very clear indication and direction was given that Local Governments must act to ensure that Development Plans have identified sufficient land for housing development purposes. He noted that the Variation process was instigated on receipt of Section 28 Guidelines and revised Housing Growth requirements from the Department in July 2025 necessitating amendment of County Development Plan to give effect to same. He noted that this Variation was specifically focused on residential development only. He noted the benefit of releasing strategic reserves of R2 lands in the county which were zoned as part of initial County Development Plan process, which would allow for the actioning of the Minister's July guidelines and direction.

Ms. Loughnane, Senior Planner advised the Members that they had received CE Report on 19/01/2026 and referenced a workshop which was held on 06/02/2026. Variation was on public display from 20/11/2025 – 23/12/2025. During that time, 46 no. valid submissions were received, and all the submissions were available to be viewed online. She advised that there were 3 no. appendices appended to the CE Report as follows:

Appendix A – Settlement Capacity Audit

Appendix B – List of valid submissions

Appendix C – List of late submissions

To consider the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions received to Variation No. 1 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 **4674**

Ms. Loughnane advised that they would be going through the OPR Submission first.

GLW C200-40 – OFFICE OF THE PLANNING REGULATOR

Pgs 5-7

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in these submissions and read CE Response and Recommendation.

Summary

The Office of the Planning Regulator has provided comments on Proposed Variation No.1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The submission notes that that Recommendations issued by the OPR relate to clear breaches of the relevant legislative provisions, of the National or Regional policy framework and/or of the policy of Government, as set out in the Ministerial Guidelines under Section 28. As such, planning authorities are requested to implement or address recommendation(s) to ensure consistency with the relevant policy and legislative provisions.

Overview

The submission outlines that Variation includes changes to the CDP following the publication of the section 28 NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025) (Housing Growth Guidelines) and welcomes the approach to facilitate the immediate development of Residential Phase 2 lands with regard to the Galway Metropolitan Area, the Key Towns and tier 2 and tier 3 towns. The submission also sets out that recommendations are made in relation to the Settlement Capacity Audit (SCA) and to ensure residential standards in Garraun, in particular in the vicinity of Oranmore Train Station are in accordance with the 2024 Guidelines. Two recommendations are then made under the following themes.

1. Implementation of the Housing Growth Requirements

The submission outlines that the approach taken by Galway County Council provides sufficiently zoned land in line with policy and objectives 1 and 2 of the Housing Growth Guidelines, while also ensuring a pipeline of land for development well beyond the lifetime of the plan but raises concerns with the SCA and lack of details regarding capacity of Residential Phase 2 lands in lower tiers and settlements. In this regard, the Office recommends a focus on lands within the MASP or lands in higher tier settlements which are accessible to public transport and active travel

modes, and which are without infrastructure or flood risk constraints, deliverable during the lifetime of the plan.

The submission calls for provision of additional information including extent of zoned lands (Residential Phase 1 and Phase 2); housing yield; infrastructure capacity and constraints. The submission states that this will enable the prioritisation of infrastructure investment and delivery for all settlements with Residential Phase 2 lands inclusive of Phase 2 lands in the five small growth towns and seven small growth villages. While some of this information was indicated previously within the CE's Report, it would benefit from being drawn together in a revised core strategy table and SCA.

Concerns are also raised regarding anomalies in the SCA tables and issues with the legend and colour shading for the SCA maps. These are further detailed in the recommendation below.

Recommendation 1 - Core Strategy table and Settlement Capacity Audit
<p>Having regard to the statutory requirements for the preparation of a core strategy and the implementation of the housing growth requirements, and in particular to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 10(2A) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (Act) for the preparation of the development plan core strategy;• the Development Plans, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022);• the NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (2025) (Housing Growth Guidelines), including policy objectives 1,2 and section 2.4 to incorporate the objectives of the Housing Growth Guidelines into development plans; and• NPO 101, 102 and 103 of the NPF to consider the serviceability of land zoned for development, <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the Planning Authority is recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">i. revise the core strategy, table 2.9 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 (County Development Plan) to ensure all statutory requirements under section 10(2A) of the Act are included;ii. provide details of on the quantum (ha), housing yield (units), and density of Residential Phase 2 lands for each settlement, including the lower tier towns and villages;iii. review the Settlement Capacity Audit (SCA) tables to ensure the legend and commentary is consistent and accurate in terms of accessibility to water and wastewater network, all transport modes and active travel network, road access and proximity to public footpaths and necessary social infrastructure; andiv. review the Residential Phase 2 lands in the proposed Variation to ensure the strategy prioritises serviced or readily serviceable lands in areas of high demand such as the Metropolitan Area, Key Towns and

larger settlements within the Settlement Hierarchy of the County Development Plan.

Planning Authority is advised to engage with all relevant prescribed bodies to the review of the SCA, and also to review the SCA maps to provide clarity to legend colour codes and shading applied to all the settlement maps.

Chief Executive Response

(i) Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy of the County Development Plan sets out the Core Strategy for the County. It is intrinsically linked to the evidence presented within that chapter, therefore it is considered that the Core Strategy should not be updated in isolation without a comprehensive review of the Plan and growth strategy for the County. Furthermore, the absence of an updated Regional Strategy copper fastens this opinion. However, to give effect to the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements, the Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA) has been reviewed and updated. As such, the Minister's additional housing growth figures have been incorporated into this document, while preserving the authenticity of the Core Strategy. The revised housing figures are underpinned in the HNDA. In addition, Residential Phase 2 lands have been effectively released across all zoned settlement tiers in the County to provide a greater degree of choice and flexibility for the provision of housing which is in keeping with the overall objective of the Guidelines.

Table 2.9 in Chapter 2 of the CDP has been updated in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment. This will be updated in Chapter 2 along with the Core Strategy during the CDP statutory review.

(ii) A Table titled Residential Phase 2 lands has been included in the SCA Appendix A.

(iii) The Settlement Capacity Audit now contains additional maps to show the Residential Phase 1/Phase 2 zonings. In addition, clarity has been provided with respect to the existing Local Transport Plans that are in place for a number of settlements which have a particular emphasis on Active Travel and include priority of measures to enhance pedestrian connectivity within each settlement. Other active travel projects have been referenced in the SCA.

Additional detail has been provided from Uisce Éireann with respect to Water Supply and Wastewater.

(iv) The SCA at Appendix A now highlights (with asterix) the most sequential Residential Phase 2 zoned lands in each of the settlements identified within the SCA (MASP; Key Towns; Area of Strategic Potential and Self-Sustaining Growth Towns). This prioritises serviced or readily serviceable lands in the areas of high demand.

Chief Executive Recommendation

(i) No Change

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

- (ii) See Table of Residential Phase 2 lands in SCA at Appendix A. This provides clarity to the SCA.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. Hoade and agreed by the Members.

- (iii) See additional clarification to Settlement Capacity Audit at Appendix A.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. P. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. C. Keane and agreed by the Members.

- (iv) See additional clarification to Settlement Capacity Audit at Appendix A.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. L. Harney, seconded by Cllr. J. McClearn and agreed by the Members.

2. Residential density and integration of transport infrastructure at Garraun

The OPR welcomes the recognition of the important role of the Galway Metropolitan Area and notes that the SCA identifies 21 hectares of Residential Phase 2 lands in Garraun in proximity to Oranmore train station. The submission also welcomes the revised insertions in table 15.1 but recommends specifying a higher density which align with the Compact Settlements Guidelines and specifically referencing lands in close proximity to the public transport node at Oranmore train station as outlined below.

Recommendation 2 - Residential Density and land use transport integration at Garraun

Having regard to the integration of transport orientated development with land use planning, and in particular to:

- NPO 10 of the NPF relating to compact and sequential patterns of growth;
- NPO 97 of the NPF relating to the creation of new sustainable communities at greenfield locations in association with major public transport investment;
- section 3.3.1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (Compact Settlements Guidelines); and
- the National Development Plan 2021-2030 which identifies that funding supports for the further development of commuter rail in Galway, with significant track and station works proposed for Oranmore,

the Planning Authority is recommended to update the residential densities specifying appropriate ranges based on Compact Settlements

Guidelines at section 3.3.1 Cities and Metropolitan (MASP) areas and in particular review the lands in close proximity to the Oranmore train station.

Chief Executive Response

Table 15.1 of the Proposed Variation commits to accord with relevant guidance. In addition, it is stated that all development proposals shall be assessed having regard to the above residential density table and the Guidelines which provide more flexibility in relation to density ranges. Reference to the Urban Framework Plan (UFP) lands at Garraun and Briarhill have now also been added to the table.

Chief Executive Recommendation

Update Table 15.1 to include (Text in blue)

MASP	Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield	30 or Site Specific
	Outer Suburban/Greenfield	25—30 30 - 35 (at locations adjacent to open rural countryside) Higher densities may be facilitated in the Urban Framework Plans e.g at Garraun and Briarhill

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. C. Keane, seconded by Cllr. D. Killilea and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-16 – NATIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY (NTA)

Pg 9

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Local Transport Plans and Settlement Capacity Audit

The submission references the Local Transport Plans for Ballinasloe, Tuam, Loughrea, Athenry and Gort which the NTA worked in conjunction with Galway County Council during the LAP making process. It notes that the LTPs have informed the LAPs for the towns setting out a framework for transport measures across all modes and supporting the integration of land use and transport.

The submission then refers to RPO 6.2.8 of the RSES which states that policies, objectives and measures which emerge from LTPs shall be incorporated into Development Plans/LAPs. Submission also references the NPF Implementation Housing Growth Requirements and to Section 2.4 Tiering and Phasing of Lands which state:

- Planning Authorities should prepare an SCA in order to identify zoned serviced/serviceable lands and to highlight infrastructural requirements and
- Undertake an SCA to identify zoned serviced/serviceable lands with residential development potential in all relevant settlements, specifying enabling infrastructure, for example wastewater network or treatment infrastructure, energy infrastructure, roads or public transport capacity and in the case of enabling social infrastructure, schools provision and community facilities.

The submission notes that the Proposed Variation includes an updated SCA. The NTA is of the view that the SCA should be amended and strengthened to more closely reflect the requirements identified which look to highlight infrastructural requirements and to specify enabling infrastructure for transport required to service lands. Regarding the settlements of Ballinasloe, Tuam, Loughrea, Athenry and Gort this should refer to the proposed transport measures relevant to the subject sites as defined in their LTP's/LAPs and should be broadened to cover all modes including cycling and public transport requirements to ensure that any assessment of transport requirements are not solely focused on providing access by car. NTA considers that such an approach would align with RPO 6.2.8 of the RSES as set out by ensuring that the LTP's adequately inform planning framework documents.

NTA Recommendations

The NTA recommend, in the interests of sustainable development, in order to avoid car dependent development and, in order to align with RPO 6.2.8, that the Settlement Capacity Audit be amended to more adequately '*highlight infrastructural requirements*' and '*specify enabling infrastructure*' for transport as required under the Section 28 Guidelines. This should consider all transport modes.

In the case of Ballinasloe, Tuam, Loughrea, Athenry and Gort, the Settlement Capacity Audit for transport should be informed and led by the transport measures set out in LTP's.

Lands at Garraun

In this section the submission generally approves of the approach the Local Authority has taken to focus growth in the Metropolitan Area, Key Towns, Place of Strategic Potential and Self-Sustaining Towns and within existing settlement boundaries.

Submission states that additional wording to policy objective GUFFP 1 of the Garraun UFP could be at odds and that further clarity should be provided as to whether Residential Phase 2 lands at Garraun are intended for development during the lifetime of the plan. It is also noted that the Residential Phase 2 lands at Garraun are assessed as 'Orange' in the SCA against transport criteria. This implies that transport infrastructure will be required to make these lands serviceable, however, no requirements have been identified in the accompanying notes (note comments above about updating SCA regarding infrastructural requirements/specify enabling infrastructure). The NTA notes that these lands at Garraun are located around Oranmore Train Station and the 1A BusConnects service will operate along the northern boundary of the lands. Access to these public transport services will be critical to supporting sustainable development in this area.

The submission also notes that the draft Variation states '*Higher densities may be facilitated in the Urban Framework Plans*' which would apply to Garraun. It is the view of the submission that this statement should be strengthened to state that '*higher densities will be encouraged and facilitated at Garraun*'. The rationale behind

this change is Garraun's direct access to the rail network and the road network for access to bus services.

NTA Recommendations

- Further clarity should be provided as to whether the Residential Phase 2 lands at Garraun are intended for development during the lifetime of the Development Plan.
- The Settlement Capacity Audit for lands at Garraun should be reviewed and amended to adequately 'highlight infrastructural requirements' and 'specify 'enabling infrastructure' for transport as required under the Section 28 Guidelines. This should consider all transport modes.
- Further consideration should be given to the potential to maximising densities at Garraun. It is recommended that the following is included in Table 15.1: '*higher densities will be encouraged and facilitated at Garraun*' given its direct access to the rail network and the road network for access to bus services.

Chief Executive Response

The submission from the NTA is welcomed and its contents are noted.
See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(iii).

Noted.

The proposed wording of Policy Objective GUPP 1 inserted as part of the Proposed Variation is considered sufficient and appropriate to satisfy the requirements of the Section 28 Guidelines. The Variation seeks to permit appropriate development on Residential Phase 2 lands in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

The lands in question to the west of the Garraun UFP will require future road and footpath upgrades. *See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(iii).*

The wording of the Proposed Variation in combination with wording in the existing Garraun UFP is considered sufficient in this instance, where a degree of flexibility will apply.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(iii).

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-23 – TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (TII)

Pg 12

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

TII in their submission reminds the Council of the issues pertaining where Residential Phase 2 lands adjoin the national road network outside the 50 – 60 kph reduced urban zones.

The submission notes that direct access or intensification of direct access to a national road conflict directly with the provisions of official policy included in the Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines around national roads as well as the Galway County Development Plan.

TII submitted previous observations on these sites during the preparation of the County Development Plan/Local Area Plans. The submission states that the opinion of TII remains the same as the previous submissions. The submission notes that there are Residential Phase 1 lands and Residential Phase 2 lands which are adjacent to the N59 National Road, to the northwest of Clifden at a location where TII records indicate a 100kph speed limit applies. According to the submission, access to the national road to the identified lands outside the 50-60kph urban speed limit area conflicts directly with the Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines and Policy Objectives of the County Development Plan.

The submission states that TII's position is that the zoning designations should be reviewed to ensure the zoning designations and access requirements accord with the provisions of official policy.

Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission of the TII and notes the concerns raised with respect to the national road network outside where reduced urban speed limits apply.

TII's comments with respect to the Clifden land use zoning map is noted, however, changes to the land use zoning map do not form part of the proposed variation. Nonetheless, the concerns highlighted are noted and the local authority will seek further advice and guidance from TII at the appropriate juncture.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. T. Welby, seconded by Cllr. M. Hoade and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-42 – DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH

Pg 12-14

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The Department of Education and Youth notes and considered the Proposed Variation.

The submission outlines the context of future population trends and the potential of the trends to impact on school place requirements. The submission refers to the population growth in the current CDP and the increase from the 2016 to 2022 census population in the Galway County area. The submission also refers to the Housing Supply Targets proposed to be included in Section 2.3.8 of the CDP by way of the

Proposed Variation. By applying an average household figure to the targets as outlined the submission notes that a significant increase in population would result in major additional requirements for school provision in County Galway by 2040.

The submission also notes that Variation emphasises directing growth to the Galway MASP but as no settlement-level projections are provided, the Department will reassess school place needs once detailed future growth targets are published. The submission notes that due to significant growth projection, new school provision, extensions or new schools, may be required, particularly in the metropolitan area with a preference to extend existing facilities. The Department requests that land buffers be protected around existing schools and that sites for future schools be reserved and that further engagement between the Planning Authority and the Department takes place when locations of future growth projection become available.

The submission outlines key points in relation to new school sites, that schools should be located centrally within new communities, on appropriately zoned land, with enabling infrastructure (roads, utilities, active travel links) delivered in advance.

The submission notes that Table 15.1 has been amended, and that the variation notes it is considered there is sufficient lands to meet the targets in the Core Strategy and updated HNDA and Housing Strategy.

Additional Special Education Needs (SEN) provision will also be required. The Department and National Council for Special Education (NCSE) continue to plan for new special classes and special schools and may need further sites in Galway. The Department seeks explicit support in the plan for SEN accommodation.

The submission stresses the importance of ongoing engagement with the Planning Authority to ensure adequate land is zoned for future school provision, noting that unforeseen events (e.g., Ukrainian crisis) may require reassessment of school place provision.

Finally, the submission welcomes the continued engagement with the Planning Authority to ensure sufficient land is zoned for the development of new and existing schools.

Chief Executive Response

The submission from the Department of Education and Youth is noted and welcomed.

The Housing Strategy and HNDA has been revised as part of this Variation. This informs and underpins the housing requirements for County Galway. The renewed emphasis of Residential Phase 2 lands is incorporated into the Variation to ensure compliance with the Section 28 Guidelines. The Core Strategy remains in effect as adopted in 2022.

It is noted that requirements for additional school places may lead to the need for new schools or extensions to existing schools including SEN. Galway County Council will work with the Department to support the delivery of additional educational capacity. It is noted that Chapter 11 of the CDP contains Policy Objectives and supporting narrative for educational facilities in the County.

Any identification of lands for schools including land buffers could be addressed through the CDP review. This has previously been raised by the Department of Education and is noted by the Planning Authority.

It is considered that there are sufficient lands currently zoned in the County to facilitate educational development. In addition, it should also be noted that educational facilities are permitted in principle/open to consideration on multiple zonings as per the County Development Plan.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. M. Hoade, seconded by Cllr. M. Regan and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-26 – OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS (OPW)

Pg 14-15

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The OPW welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Variation No.1 and note the submission specifically concerns flood risk management.

Map Review Programme

The submission outlines that in certain areas physical changes may have occurred since the preparation of the flood maps under the National CFRAM Programme that would affect the watercourse and floodplains, and hence the Flood Zones. The submission notes new evidence may become available and the OPW reviews and updates flood maps on an on-going basis. The submission notes flood maps are currently under review in Tuam and Gort and request Galway County Council to note that mapping in these areas may change.

The submission also notes a map review had been completed for Oranmore and outlines the results from this review. The Submission requests the Council to review the impact of any increase in flood extents on zonings and developments.

Oranmore

The submission notes the proposal to rezone lands from Open Space/Recreation & Amenity to Town Centre. While these lands lie outside the updated CFRAM present-day extents, they fall within the mid-range and high-end future flood scenarios. Galway County Council are requested to outline how the potential risk will be mitigated.

Climate Change

The submission outlines that a number of residential lands in Oranmore and Garraun could be at potential risk of flooding in the mid-range and high-end future scenarios. The submission notes that any changes to zonings in the future in areas of flood risk, that an appropriate flood risk assessment is carried out and there is appropriate justification for any decision as set out in the Guidelines.

Chief Executive Response

The submission from the OPW is noted.

Map Review Programme

Noted. The lands in Oranmore subject to Variation No. 1 are demonstrated as being situated within Flood Zone C.

Oranmore

The lands in Oranmore subject to Variation No. 1 are demonstrated as being situated within Flood Zone C. Parts of the subject lands are identified as being at risk under the mid-range and high-end future scenario flood extents. Climate change considerations have been integrated into the existing provisions of the County Development Plan ¹ with which any project on these lands will need to continue to demonstrate compliance with.

Climate Change

The points raised are noted.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

Ms. Loughnane made Members aware of the existing policy objectives in the CDP regarding Flood Risk Management as per footnotes on Page 15 of the CE's Report.

Cllr. P. Feeney stated that there was a lack of clarification for Oranmore as per OPW's submission. He enquired as to whether the map used in the Variation was the most up-to-date map. In response, Ms. Loughnane advised that this was the most up-to-date map and Planning Authority work off the most updated maps available. Cllr. P. Feeney stated that for CDP review, the high-risk scenario mapping for Oranmore was scary if taken at face-value, and that it was apparent that Oranmore would be stifled for development were these high-range scenario maps to be proven accurate. Cllr P Feeney enquired how this potential scenario would be managed. In response, Ms. Loughnane advised that the OPW mapping was concerning as Climate-Change has been embedded into the High and Medium range scenario maps. Ms Loughnane advised that the OPW flooding data are used to determine the mapping rectification as part of the Variation.

Concerning the CDP Review point, Ms Loughnane noted that only the most up-to-date maps from the OPW were to be used during this process, with land zoned accordingly.

Cllr. D. Geraghty opined that the OPW were blaming Climate Change and enquired as to what the OPW were doing to prevent Climate Change. He opined that they were not installing or considering preventative flood-methods but merely writing reports and criticizing without doing anything tangible about it. He further added that the onus was being squared onto Galway County Council when it is within their remit and referred to the long-awaited flood-relief works to be installed by OPW in

Ballinasloe. In response, Ms. Loughnane noted there were flood defense schemes in place in parts of the county, including Dunkellin, Ballinasloe.

Cllr. J. McClearn enquired if land within Flood Zone C may be used as Open Space for Residential Development. Ms. Loughnane advised that Flood Zone A and B is zoned open space and, in most instances, could not be used as the only provision of open space within a development.

An Comh. O'Curraoin opined that there were a lot of low-lying areas like Oranmore in the county and the tides were coming in very high in a lot of places. He suggested that barriers needed to be installed into flood risk areas to prevent future flooding using the example of Spiddal as a place that actioned this flood-prevention effort. He noted that the preparation for flooding needed to be improved upon and used example of the Netherland's success with same. He further stated that he had read recently that flood relief works at the Claddagh, Galway could not be installed until at least 2030 due to roads issues. He opined that this was not acceptable, and that when so many properties were at risk, there shouldn't be such trivial issues preventing Elected Politicians from doing something about these issues in a timelier manner.

Cllr. Donoghue queried as to the publication frequency of the OPW maps and whether they were being updated in real-time following flood events. She opined that in the past there was a huge amount of maintenance done on drainage systems which unfortunately was not happening nowadays. Ms. Loughnane advised that maps are updated at the OPW's discretion, as often as possible. She noted that Claregalway's FRM had been finalized 18 months ago, while updating mapping was being worked on for Gort and Loughrea currently. She noted that these Flood Maps were constantly being monitored and updated, and that Galway County Council's Flood Mapping Consultants always use the most updated mapping possible. In response to Cllr. Donoghue's query, Ms. Loughnane advised that if there was a significant flood event, it would take those and include them in the maps, and they are updated constantly. Cllr. G. Donoghue sought to know whether these maps assessed why flooding events occurred, or whether a lack of maintenance may be a major factor for same. Ms. Loughnane advised that there were many types of flooding, with a broader scope of variables of what may cause specific flood events. She suggested that she consult with floodmaps.ie for further information.

Cllr. M. Regan queried the height the sea levels had to rise for the High-Risk maps to be accurate. Ms. Loughnane noted that she was not aware of the details such as sea level which featured in the modelling used by the OPW for the devisal of the maps.

Cllr. D. Geraghty opined that OPW were doing nothing to prevent flooding 10 years down the line and were not preparing to action any of the events that they are predicting. Ms. Loughnane reiterated numerous flood relief schemes that were constructed/under construction around the county, further reiterating that environmental considerations were the factors constraining progress of these schemes where applicable.

Cllr. C. Keane suggested that this important issue be addressed at another meeting.

Cllr. M. Connolly referred to the first meeting held with OPW in relation to flooding in Ballinasloe which took place over 11 years ago. He stated that Engineers had advised what the problems were at the time and 11 years on, studies were still being carried out. He acknowledged that there were flood barriers in place and queried the length of time it takes to carry out such studies.

CE L Conneally noted that it was a good thing to have access to CFRAMs and mapping of FRAs, as it allows forecasting of flood events. He noted that the Executive's perspective was very strong in ensuring that mistakes of the past regarding flooding do not occur again, ie.avoidance of development on flood plains. He noted that flood schemes are a key priority for Galway County Council as well as every local authority.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Geraghty, seconded by Cllr. L. Harney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-24 – BROCK MCCLURE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS ON BEHALF OF ÚDARÁS NA GAELTACHTA

Pg 16-24

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Comprehensive submission received which overall supports and welcomes the proposed variation. The submission notes that Údarás na Gaeltachta are a key stakeholder of the development plan variation process and should be addressed accordingly. The first section of the submission outlines the key points of the submission, which will be summarized by topic. Overall, Údarás welcome the activation of R2 zoned lands.

Údarás na Gaeltachta

This section outlines the background, goals and objectives of Údarás na Gaeltachta. Údarás na Gaeltachta supports the Irish Language in all 8 Gaeltacht regions, including Gaeltacht na Gaillimhe. The submission outlines how Údarás na Gaeltachta aims to achieve this objective by funding and fostering a wide range of enterprise development and job creation initiatives and by supporting strategic language, cultural and community-based activities.

The Galway Gaeltacht Areas and Language Planning Areas

This section lists the 6 Gaeltacht Areas of Galway as outlined in the County Development Plan, alongside the 9 Language Planning Areas (LPAs) (also referenced as Limistéar Pleanála Teanga in the submission) within County Galway identified under the Gaeltacht Act 2012. In general terms, the primary goal of these LPAs is to increase the use and vitality of the Irish language.

Gaeltacht na Gaillimhe and Challenges Faced

This section of the submission is to be read in conjunction with Appendix 1, outlines the detailed population change analysis in the relevant LPAs.

Population Change – National & Gaeltacht Context

Submission gives a brief overview of the population increase within the country as a whole, the challenge of housing provision, noting it also has effects on the Gaeltacht. The submission also notes the increase of Gaeilge speakers above the age of 3 within the Gaeltacht areas. This section of the submission outlines the population changes and demographic changes within the overall 8 No. of Gaeltacht regions, noting a general population increase.

Population Change in the Galway County Context

This section of the submission focuses on the demographic profile in Galway County more specifically, analysing the language planning areas and county as a whole. It notes a higher increase in population than the national average. In the LPAs the age profile is generally older. Breaking down the demographics, the submission argues that the trends in the overall age profile are intrinsically linked to outward migration of the younger population within LPAs. This submission then examines the 5 settlements which are in the County Galway Gaeltacht, which include: Baile Chláir; Bearná; Maigh Cuilinn; An Spidéal and An Cheathrú Rua.

All of these settlements have had population increase, with the exception of An Cheathrú Rua. The submission emphasises that as An Cheathrú Rua is located on a peninsula; therefore, it is important that the unique geographical topography, strategic position, and land area designated by the LPA should be carefully considered in residential forecasts, infrastructure, and spatial planning efforts. The submission then examines the age profile of the key Gaeltacht settlements, noticing that these settlements have a much younger age profile. The submission states that this is likely due to a lack of infrastructure and services in these areas compared to the wider LPA areas. To avoid outward migration of this younger generation, increased housing and improved services are now fundamental requirements.

Housing Provision Gaeltacht na Gaillimhe

The submission then turns its attention to the housing market within the Gaeltacht. The submission notes that housing in these areas peaked between 2001 – 2010 and has since lagged. The submission compares the amount of housing units built post 2016 with the population increase and concludes that population increase is outpacing housing delivery. The submission notes the continuing decrease of daily Gaeilge usage within the Gaeltacht. The submission argues that the overall difficulty of housing nationally, and the unique issue of holiday homes within the Gaeltacht, is putting undue pressure on young Gaeilge speakers to emigrate from Gaeilge speaking locations, effecting the use of Gaeilge as the community language. The submission notes that in the 20 Year Strategy for the Irish Language 2010–2030, The Gaeltacht will be given special support as an Irish-speaking area, and this support must be upheld through planning laws. The submission believes that the issues of vacancy and dereliction in these areas requires significant attention. The submission asserts that it is clear from the statistics analysed housing is a challenge in the Gaeltacht, which is a critical challenge for Údarás. The submission states that it is a fundamental goal of Údarás that all opportunities for the delivery of housing are recognised and supported with adequate infrastructure and government support (to include Údarás). The release of R2 lands in the 5 key settlements is welcomed but consideration should also be given to supporting lower tier settlement in the delivery of housing along with adequate supports in tackling vacancy in the Gaeltacht region.

Use of the Irish Language

The submission states that the Galway Gaeltacht is strategically significant in terms of both the number and concentration of Irish speakers within this area and the high levels of use. This is further reinforced by the fact that the south Conamara Gaeltacht is the largest unbroken stretch of Gaeltacht. This underlines the importance of integrating Irish language concerns in planning policy within the county. Density of speakers is very important to maintain Gaeilge as the primary language, which is linked to spatial planning, the submission goes on to state that this relationship should be carefully considered so that Gaeilge speakers have realistic options to stay within the LPAs. The submission then examines Daily Gaeilge speaker densities. The submission seeks that particular attention needs to be given to maintaining communities as attractive and viable places for Irish speakers to continue living, and to mitigating the pressures which impact outward migration. Sustainable planning and housing provision is an essential tool in addressing this. The overall competence and usage of Gaeilge in Gaeltacht na Gaillimhe highlights the need for appropriate housing and services to support the language, and to increase speaker density. The submission states this supports the language nationally.

Relevant Planning Context

This section outlines in detail the extensive national, regional, and local policy context for the Gaeltacht. Submission notes that the NPF recognises both the importance of the Gaeltacht and Údarás and aims to support both for the promotion of the Irish language. The NPF also seeks to address the rural decline and encouraging rural growth. This submission aims to support Gaeltacht na Gaillimhe by supporting increased provision of housing in the area. The submission notes the additional 50% headroom required in the Section 28 Guidelines and reiterates its support for the opening of R2 land. The settlements within the Gaeltacht are noted. When making comments on the Economic Engine map found within the Development plan, the submission notes that none of the settlements identified are recognised as 'Service Towns' under the Gaeltacht Act, and as such, there exists a significant gap for spatial displacement. The importance of this map demonstrates the growth potential for compact growth aligned with the core strategy. Without investment in the smaller towns, the submission believes that unsustainable commuting and development patterns will continue, which will be the detriment of the Gaeltacht. The submission states that DM standards should be adapted to an appropriate scale when applied to residential and economic development policies within the Gaeltacht region, with particular consideration for appropriate spatial planning frameworks. The submission states that the Development Plan acknowledges the promotion and protection of the Irish Language in the Gaeltacht and as such, any change to core policy must be considered in the context of the Gaeltacht and not looked at in isolation. The submission concludes that infrastructure must be prioritised to allow for sustainable forms of spatial development for the Gaeltacht region.

Proposed Variation No. 1 – Galway County Council Development Plan 2022-

This section of the submission outlines the key considerations of Údarás around the proposed variation.

Infrastructure and Services

The submission notes the importance of the delivery of plan led infrastructure and services for the development of the Gaeltacht. It reiterates the need for increased housing due to the population increase and to prevent further outward migration to

protect the language. It emphasises the importance of developing the Gaeltacht. It requests that the Variation must bring the delivery of associated infrastructure and services to the fore alongside the release of R2 lands. The submission reiterates the objectives on a National and Regional level to improve infrastructure and services, however the submission notes that these objectives must be realised at local plan level. This fact bares importances for the Gaeltacht to meet housing need. The submission states that the variation must be coupled with deliverable local policy to provide these services and infrastructure to the Gaeltacht. The submission mentions the Accelerating Infrastructure Report and Action Plan and seeks that this report be given weight in local policy. The submission is of the opinion that there is a requirement for more focused policy related to infrastructure and services within the Development Plan for the Gaeltacht. The submission argues that current policy (such as GIED 3) is too generic. The submission requests that the Development Plan and Proposed Variation therefore requires further consideration in terms of additional policies and objectives to support increased infrastructure and services delivery specific to the settlements releasing phase 2 zoned lands. In relation to the SCA, the submission wishes to highlight that there has been no Settlement Capacity Audit prepared for small growth towns and small growth villages. These areas are also in need of increased and improved infrastructure and services to ensure the delivery of housing within the Gaeltacht. Specifically, the lands in Maigh Cuilinn, An Spidéal and An Cheathrú Rua require significant investment for the housing increases forecasted for these settlements with the publication of the variation.

Gaeltacht Service Towns

This section of the submission defines of Gaeltacht Service Towns (GST) under the Gaeltacht Act, and notes the 2 No. of GST in Galway:

- Clifden
- Galway City.

The submission notes the wide geographic area of the Galway Gaeltacht and notes that there is only 2 GST's in this large area, causing lack of infrastructure and services and unsustainable travel distances for residents in the middle of the Gaeltacht. The submissions states that significant investment in roads and infrastructure would encourage a more concentrated residential and economic development alongside nodes/villages, potentially leading to settlements such as An Cheathrú Rua becoming a GST in the future. Due to the lack of infrastructure in An Cheathrú Rua, flexibility is suggested around housing provision. The submission believes there is an opportunity to review the economic and core strategy for the Gaeltacht. As Údarás has an extensive property portfolio, a collaborative approach with the LA to support the Gaeltacht is possible. For the submission, it is imperative that consideration be given to an additional centrally located Gaeltacht Service town, with the opening of R2 land providing an opportunity to achieve this.

Core Strategy and Density Standards

This section notes the Section 28 Guidelines and the resulting increased housing targets. The submission also notes that Galway County Council has not published a revised core strategy. The absence of a revised core strategy is concerning to the submission, being of the opinion it is not currently clear how the additional baseline housing allocation figures will be allocated per settlement/in the Gaeltacht. The submission also notes the requirement for the identification of an additional 50% headroom. There is a concern that without the core strategy, this 50% headroom has not been provided for. The submission now urges the Local Authority to ensure that all opportunities available to them to deliver on housing be considered at this

time, going on to state that where the opportunity arises, consideration should be given to the release of housing in some of the key settlements of the county hierarchy. The submission is of the opinion that it is imperative to achieve Policy and Objectives 1 and 2 found within the Section 28 Guidelines to help alleviate the challenges of the Gaeltacht. The submission notes specifically that the densities within the variation are much lower than those set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines. While noting that there is no change to density allocations for small growth towns and small growth villages, the submission notes that the density ranges for Baile Chláir and Bearna are subject to change within the outer suburban/greenfield context. The submission is of the opinion that there is no consistency between the Section 28 Ministerial Guidance and the changes to density for the Metropolitan Settlements. The final Variation published must address this.

HNDA

The HNDA and new population figures is welcomed and supported by the submission.

Gaeltacht Population Growth

In this section of the submission there is various tables outlining the speed of population growth within the Gaeltacht. The submission reiterates the need for increased and improved services and infrastructure within Gaeltacht. It is vital for residential core strategy growth projection that a spatial distribution is reviewed in the context of the Gaeltacht.

Renewed Focus on Residential Phase 2 Land

The submission states its support of Proposed Variation Section 2.3.12 and 2.4.4, however there is a concern that the Gaeltacht areas must be readily available to accommodate additional housing at a rate over and above the capacity of those lands currently zoned for residential development in the area. The submission reiterates the critical shortage of housing within the Gaeltacht as outlined in previous sections, and that delivery needs to be realised on the ground. It is also important for the submission to ensure this housing is built for competent Irish speakers and it is critical that lands within the control of Údarás be positively considered for infrastructure upgrades to allow for residential development within this context.

The submission provides an overview of the 5 Gaeltacht settlements listed below:

- Baile Chláir
- Bearna
- Maigh Cuilinn
- An Cheathrú Rua, agus
- An Spidéal.

These paragraphs detail the demographics, housing make up, spatial context, related LPA, and relevant policy. Each section seeks a final housing allocation by way of a revised Core Table. The submission notes that lands owned to the north of An Spidéal are under the ownership of Údarás. The submission again supports the provision of infrastructure, specifically Objective SSGV3 to provide a road to open up the residential lands for development.

Conclusion

The submission concludes by welcoming and supporting the Proposed Variation. The increase to housing targets within the Gaeltacht specifically is considered a

positive that will also support Údarás' main objective to preserve the Irish language and ensure native speakers are housed in the Gaeltacht.

The submission concludes that the variation must secure the delivery of housing to key rural settlements. While the submission believes that the current variation does not comprehensively address all issues raised in this submission, Údarás urges that the preparation and recommendations of their report accurately reflect the relevant provisions of official policy, including national and regional objectives pertaining to spatial planning and the specific context of the Gaeltacht. It is hoped that this submission effectively illustrates the intrinsic link between housing and economic development in the region, emphasizing that all matters concerning the Gaeltacht must be considered holistically and cannot be addressed in isolation.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of this submission are noted and the support in principle from Údarás na Gaeltachta is welcomed. Galway County Council collaborate with Údarás on an ongoing basis and are committed to doing in future to support the Gaeltacht across County Galway.

Submission noted.

Submission noted. The Local Authority promotes and supports the use and vitality of the Irish language.

The contents of Appendix 1 are considered and noted.

The comments with respect to the population/demographic changes are noted. The changes proposed as part of Variation No.1 with respect to Residential Phase 2 lands apply to all zoned settlements in County Galway.

Submission noted.

The importance of An Cheathrú Rua as a Gaeltacht Small Growth Village of County Galway is noted and this has been reflected previously in the Galway County Development Plan. The Planning Authority is keen to engage and collaborate with relevant stakeholders to facilitate the delivery of critical infrastructure and services to all parts of the County, including Gaeltacht settlements. The purpose of Variation 1 is to increase options for housing delivery across the zoned serviced settlements of the County.

Submission noted. Variation No.1 seeks to facilitate the increased annual housing allocation as set out in the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements. The importance of housing delivery in Gaeltacht settlements is noted and this is reflected in supporting Policy Objectives within the Galway County Development Plan.

The scope of Variation No.1 applies to all zoned settlements within the County including the Small Growth Towns and Small Growth Villages. The scope of the Vacant Homes Officer in the Local Authority includes the entire County including Gaeltacht areas, which may assist in addressing vacancy in Gaeltacht areas.

The strategic importance of the County Galway Gaeltacht is recognised and noted.

Noted. The Planning Authority collaborates with Údarás na Gaeltachta during any County Development Plan review and the narrative and policy objectives pertaining to Gaeltacht areas would be informed in part by the NPF and RSES.

DM standards apply to the Gaeltacht region as other parts of County Galway.

The Planning Authority supports the delivery of appropriate infrastructure to all parts of County Galway.

Noted. The Planning Authority supports the delivery of infrastructure in tandem with the release and development of R2 lands.

The Planning Authority supports the delivery of appropriate infrastructure in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

The Planning Authority will engage with Údarás na Gaeltachta during the CDP review which will have a much broader scope. Further information with respect to infrastructure capacity in the Small Growth Towns and Small Growth Villages will be available to perspective applicants through the Pre Planning Advice service.

Noted.

Noted.

Variation 1 provides for greater choice with respect to housing delivery. While the Local Authority agrees with the principle of investment in the Galway Gaeltacht, it falls outside the scope of Variation 1.

An Economic Development Strategy is currently being prepared jointly by Galway City and County Councils.

The HNDA has been revised and updated as part of Variation No.1. The Planning Authority will engage with Ú na G as necessary on site specific projects. See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(i) with respect to the Core Strategy.

Noted. See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(i) with respect to the Core Strategy.

Noted.

The release of Residential Phase 2 lands as appropriate for housing will be underpinned by the updated Housing Need and Demand Assessment. A sufficient quantum of residentially zoned lands are in place across the County to provide appropriate Headroom. A degree of flexibility applies with respect to densities. Regarding the Core Strategy, see Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40.

Noted.

Noted.

Submission noted. Variation 1 seeks to provide additional choice for housing delivery.

Noted.

Noted. See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 Recommendation 1(i) with respect to the Core Strategy.

Noted. The Core Strategy Housing allocation remains unchanged.

As advised previously Variation No.1 is underpinned by the reviewed HNDA. The Planning Authority will continue to collaborate and engage with Údarás Na Gaeltachta and support the Gaeltacht region as appropriate and necessary.

Noted. The Planning Authority recognise the link between housing and infrastructure development and will continue to collaborate with Ú na G on such matters into the future.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

Cllr. T. Welby stated that this was an extensive submission which seemed to be more relevant to the Review of the Development Plan process. He noted that as a representative of Gaeltacht and Conamara, that this submission ought to be discussed at Municipal District level.

Cllr. M. Lee echoed Cllr. T. Welby's comments and suggested that the Municipal District meet with Udaras na Gaeltachta to discuss it. He noted the lack of housing and infrastructure in the South Conamara area. He then noted his agreement with the Minister's comments on Uisce Eireann needing to press on and develop infrastructure, as without their progress, Conamara would continue to be left behind.

Cllr. M. Leainde agreed with previous comments and stated that these huge issues are affecting rural Ireland and that places such as Lettermullen and Letterfrack were being left behind. He stated that they really needed to press ahead on that and that the lack of adequate sewerage infrastructure was a major issue.

An Comh. O Curraoin stated that Udaras requires full support and lamented the situation of housing in Conamara and the poor quality of sewerage schemes.

Cllr. E. Mannion stated that this was not the forum for this discussion and agreed with Cllr. T. Welby's suggestion and further added that a workshop type of meeting with Planners and Udaras na Gaeltachta should be held in advance of Review of CDP. Cllr. T. Welby agreed with suggestion of Workshop.

CE L Conneally noted that wastewater facilities and road access were critical infrastructure in all areas of Galway, and that Galway County Council held regular dialogue with Uisce Eireann and TII and noted their significant budgetary constraints. He then stated that Uisce Eireann's notification of rollouts of Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs), as smaller plants in rural areas or even private WWTPs was being discussed currently. He suggested that it would be important for the Members to discuss these options at MD level. He then noted that Galway County Council were granting planning in Conamara, but that the demographic of those applicants living in Conamara was worth further analysis. He noted that an assessment of this demographic at MD level, during the Workshop, is a good idea.

Ms. Loughnane stated that Galway County Council had reached out to Udaras na Gaeltachta prior to the commencement of the Variation process in order to engage with them but had received no response.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. T. Welby, seconded by Cllr. T. Grealish and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-39 – UISCE EIREANN

Pg 25-27

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Variation and notes the primary purpose of the Variation. The submission notes that Uisce Éireann (UÉ) are preparing a summary of key investment in water services infrastructure in Galway County via the Revenue Control 4 (RC4) plan to 2029 and the plan for additional growth funding to 2030. It is noted that this is to be sent to the Local Authority.

Parts A and B of Proposed Variation No. 1

The submission notes that the Proposed Variation does not update the Core Strategy and states it relies on population estimates when assessing future water and wastewater capacity. Any significant increase in demand, especially in constrained settlements, may require reassessment of available capacity.

The renewed focus on developing Residential Phase 2 lands is welcomed, provided it follows proper planning, sustainable development, and sequential growth. Previous submissions already outlined information on the serviceability of these lands across relevant Local Area Plans of Ballinasloe, Tuam, Athenry, Loughrea and Gort.

Increased residential densities in the MASP, Key Towns, and Strategic/Self-Sustaining Towns may place higher demand on water and wastewater infrastructure and may require site-specific capacity assessments.

A high-level review indicates that many Residential Phase 2 sites lack nearby water or sewer networks, though they are close to recently built or ongoing developments. Third-party agreements may be needed where networks are not yet taken in charge and further comments are provided as follows:

Watermain upgrades may be required where existing mains are small ($\leq 80\text{mm}$); if no Uisce Éireann project exists, upgrades must be developer-funded.

Sewer and/or pumping station upgrades may be needed, especially with higher densities or small sewer diameters ($\leq 150\text{mm}$); developer-funded where no UÉ project exists.

Existing Uisce Éireann assets within zoned lands must be protected or diverted, requiring diversion agreements where necessary, with greater separation distances

near trunk infrastructure. Further information is provided at an included link in the submission.

Settlement Capacity Audit Comments

The submission notes that the Settlement Capacity Audit uses data from the August 2025 Capacity Register but emphasises that these registers only indicate capacity for wastewater treatment and water supply for settlements and not the capacity/availability of sewers and water main networks within settlements.

The submission outlines that the 'Notes' for Athenry advise that '... applications to UÉ to connect to the wastewater network will be assessed on a case-by-case basis' and outlines that this is the case for all settlements whereby all new residential, commercial, and industrial developments must be assessed case-by-case through Uisce Éireann's New Connections process. New connections are subject to the Connections Charging Policy, and third-party agreements are required where developments rely on private property or private water services infrastructure.

Small Growth Towns and Villages were not included in the Audit, despite many containing Residential Phase 2 lands. Uisce Éireann is willing to engage further with Galway County Council on the serviceability of these sites.

Chief Executive Response

Galway County Council note the submission and welcome the indication that the summary of key investments will soon be circulated to the Local Authority. The LA are also engaged with the Housing Activation Office with respect to water/wastewater infrastructure and have identified the requirements to remedy any barriers associated with same.

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

It is noted Uisce Éireann have previously provided consultation feedback on Residential Phase 2 Lands and this has been taken into account as part of this process.

While increased densities have now been proposed in some settlements, Galway County Council note the use of the Capacity Registers from August 2025 in the SCA and that high demand on water and wastewater infrastructure may require site specific capacity assessments. This has been highlighted in the SCA (See Appendix A).

It is noted that UÉ have done a high-level review of Residential Phase 2 lands and note many sites currently do not have water or sewer nearby but are adjacent to/near housing developments currently under construction or have been completed. It is considered that third party agreements, and diversion agreements are items to be considered during preapplication and the Development Management stage. Where UÉ note that some upgrades may be required through developer funding it is considered that this is a matter for consideration at specific project stage.

The case-by-case new connections process is a matter for consideration at specific project level.

The comments regarding the small growth towns and small growth villages Galway County Council are noted. The Local Authority would welcome further with Uisce Éireann on these settlements.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Recommendation to GLW-C200-40

Additional comments have been included in the SCA which has been appended to this report and a clarification that applications to UÉ to connect are on a case by case basis. See updated SCA (Appendix A).

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. J. McClearn and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-14 HEALTH AND SAFETY AUTHORITY (HSA)

Pg 27

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission sets out the prescribed status of the authority under Article 13 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001-2015 and sections 11-13 & 24 of the Act. The submission links to the HSA guidance document for Land Use Planning, and outlines 4 No. items the HSA would expect to see contained in Planning Guidelines:

1. Policy in relation to major accident sites which reflects the intentions of Article 13 of Directive 2012/18/EU.
2. The consultation distances and generic advice, as indicated on maps of major accident sites.
3. A policy on the siting of new major hazard establishments.
4. Mention of the following notified establishments:
 - a. Colas Bitumen emulsion, Oranmore, Co Galway, H91D934
 - b. Circle K Galway Terminal, Galway harbour, Galway, H91X030
 - c. Tynagh Energy Ltd, Tynagh, Derryfrench, Loughrea, Co Galway, H62XY3

The submission also contains a note on the HSA approach towards the Provision of Land-Use Planning advice.

Chief Executive Response

The Chief Executive welcomes the submission of the HSA, and the submission is noted.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. M. Hoade, seconded by Cllr. D. Killilea and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-43 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARD (ESB)

Pg 28

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The summary welcomes and acknowledges each part of Variation No.1 while noting that providing a secure, reliable and efficient energy transmission and distribution infrastructure is fundamental to powering and heating homes and businesses, as well as supporting the decarbonization of transport. The submission highlights that the Government's new housing plan called "Delivering Homes, Building Communities" recognises that each new home constructed today requires roughly double the electrical capacity as those built before 2019. The submission notes that electricity networks must be expanded and reinforced in the future to support the delivery of 300,000 homes.

Overview of ESB Strategy

The submission outlines that ESB are embracing new technologies and investing in sustainable energy solutions with an objective to develop and connect renewables to decarbonize the electricity system by 2040. ESB's progress towards carbon net zero operations is consistent with the NPF and RSES for the Northern and Western Region.

ESB Networks

The submission outlines how ESB are committed to expanding the electricity network across Ireland and notes physical upgrades as well as smart, flexible and digitally enabled solutions for future growth.

Energy Infrastructure - Planning Policy

The submission also outlines relevant planning policy while noting that ESB Networks' PR6 Business Plan proposes a €13.4 billion programme.

Energy Infrastructure – Transmission and Distribution

ESB is actively monitoring and assessing electricity network capacity in County Galway to ensure it can support current and future residential, commercial, and industrial growth. The submission emphasises the need for early coordination with Galway County Council to zone and secure suitable sites for essential electricity infrastructure. The submission also outlines the importance of early engagement on public infrastructure projects for cost effective delivery and minimal disruption.

The electricity grid in County Galway is currently constrained, limiting its ability to accommodate new development, including renewable energy projects. ESB operates 21 high-voltage substations in the county, but significant reinforcement of both transmission and distribution networks is urgently required. The submission

outlines key projects to strengthen network resilience and accommodate future demand.

The submission notes recent national policy changes, including the revised NPF and new Section 28 Housing Growth Guidelines, and ESB are committed to working closely with Galway County Council to align future zoning and infrastructure planning with updated housing targets and ensure timely delivery of electricity infrastructure.

Chief Executive Response

The submission from ESB is noted. Galway County Council will continue to work with the ESB and welcome the engagement and future collaboration with the ESB on key infrastructure projects in the County. The Local Authority will coordinate closely with the ESB to identify suitable sites for delivery of key infrastructure and also will endeavour to address constraints in the network in the future.

The submission refers to specific projects in Galway, and it is noted that there are a number of Policy Objectives and associated narrative text in the County Development Plan in relation to Electricity Infrastructure, Climate and Renewables. Policy Objective EG 1 for example is to *Support and promote the sustainable improvement and expansion of the electricity transmission and distribution network that supply the County, while taking into consideration landscape, residential, amenity and environmental considerations.*

Only matters raised that relate directly to the contents of the Proposed Variation can be considered and therefore it is not appropriate during this process to identify sites for electricity infrastructure, however any future relevant consultation will include early engagement with ESB.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

Cllr. S. Cunniffe queried the idea of resource constraints at Uisce Eireann, as they are the key enablers who are advising they cannot action anything due to a lack of funding. He then lamented the Government blaming local authorities for not zoning adequate swathes of land, while the key stakeholder Uisce Eireann is claiming a lack of resources. Cathaoirleach D. Collins suggested that he could further discuss that topic during meeting with ESB after lunch.

Cllr. D. Connolly queried the limited capacity of Ballinasloe within the SCA, noting that although housing delivery assistance was the goal, that services simply were not adequate and the situation in Ballinasloe had been dragging on for many years.

CE L. Conneally stated the Council was doing its part of the job in terms of assisting housing delivery now in bringing the County's strategic reserve of R2 lands into R1. He further advised that this Council decision will put pressure on infrastructure providers to service zoned residential land.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. I. Canning and agreed by the Members.

LOCAL COUNCILLORS AND TD'S

GLW C200-28 – CLLR DONAGH KILLILEA

Pg 30

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests to extend the existing Industrial Park known as "Glenascaul Industrial Park" to be zoned 'Industrial' in line with present-day on-site activity.

This submission, made by Cllr Donagh Killilea, includes a previous submission made to the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 Draft to extend the Glenascaul Industrial Park in Oranmore.

The request seeks to zone approximately 2.79 hectares of land to Industrial to accommodate a new bus garage and parking depot. There is a shortage of lands available to purchase in the area and the extension of an existing industrial estate would be in keeping with the activities on site. The landowner intends to move operations from Galway City in anticipation of the outer bypass, providing a facility that could also serve other private coach companies.

Key arguments for the proposal include the strategic location of the lands near the M6 Motorway and R381, the lack of environmental, archaeological or cultural heritage constraints, there is no recognised flood zone or recorded flood events. The lands are also fully serviced with both water and electricity services.

To support this, the applicant requests the reinstatement of past planning policies (Policy ED3 and ED9) that favoured the consolidation and expansion of established rural enterprise nodes. By facilitating this expansion, the development aims to prevent unnecessary heavy vehicle traffic through Oranmore village while supporting the growth of a private public transport provider that currently operates four licensed routes in Galway City.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands is noted.

However, the lands in question do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

Note that the existing County Development Plan contains a suite of policy objectives that support rural enterprise. The addition of policy objectives relating to rural enterprise again cannot be considered as part of Variation No.1.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-29 – CLLR DONAGH KILLILEA

Pg 31

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission proposes that all lands marked Residential Phase 2 in the current Tuam Local Area Plan should be upgraded to Residential Phase 1.

This submission, made by Cllr Donagh Killilea highlights the significant growth in the need for more lands to become available for residential development in Tuam Town.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands is noted.

However, the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Variation 1 results in both Residential Phase 1 and Residential Phase 2 zonings being assessed in a similar manner, should any planning application be forthcoming.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-30 – CLLR DONAGH KILLILEA

Pg 31

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests that lands be re-zoned from Agriculture to 'Residential Phase 2' within the current Tuam Local Area Plan.

This submission made by Cllr Donagh Killilea, includes a mention of Cllr Killilea's previous submission (GLW-C200-29), which called for all 'Residential Phase 2' lands to be upgraded to 'Residential Phase 1' within the Tuam LAP. Furthermore, this

submission states that additional rezoning should occur, whereby lands zoned under 'Agriculture' should be rezoned to 'Residential Phase 2' within the current Tuam LAP.

This submission suggests that the proposal to rezone along with the previous recommendations (set out in GLW-C200-29), would ensure that enough land is secured in order to future proof the rapidly expanding needs for the delivery of residential development in Tuam.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands from Agriculture to Residential Phase 2 are noted.

However, the rezoning of these lands in Tuam does not form part of this proposed variation. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

Notwithstanding the scope of the Variation, it is considered that a sufficient quantity of housing lands have been identified in Tuam to meet the new housing requirements.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. M. Hoade and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-32 – CLLR DONAGH KILLILEA

Pg 32/33

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission proposes amendments to the variation of Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.

This submission offers to propose amendments to residential density with the specific requests for settlement reclassification and infrastructure-led growth.

The proposed amendment to Chapter 15 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 seeks to refine residential density targets and reclassify settlements based on existing infrastructure capacity.

Regarding density, the proposal recommends ranges such as:

- Amend MASP Density Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield/Greenfield to 30-48 or (site specific). Outer Suburban/Greenfield to 30-48

- Amend Key Towns - Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield to 35-45 or site specific. Outer Suburban/Greenfield to 30-45
- Amend Strategic Potential/Self Sustaining Towns - Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield 25-35 (or site specific). Edge of Centre/Greenfield to 25 (or site specific).
- Amend Small Growth Towns - Town Centre/Infill/Brownfield 25 (or site specific). Edge of Centre/Greenfield to 20
- Amend Small Growth Villages - Village Centre/Infill/Brownfield to 20 -25. Edge of Centre/Greenfield to 15-20

Submission also requests that any Small Growth Village, such as Milltown, Tuam, be elevated to the status of a Small Growth Town if it possesses verified capacity in both water and wastewater infrastructure. Submission wishes to support the growth of these rural areas that have serviced lands for future growth. It is also stated that any village that has a water and wastewater capacity be specifically mentioned in the revised County Development Plan as an area that can be allowed to grow with increased housing densities under an elevated category.

Chief Executive Response

The increased density levels set within Table 15.1 of the Development Management Standards are considered sufficient to address the requirements of the Section 28 Guidelines. In addition, there is a degree of flexibility with respect to density levels at appropriate locations. Tuam is designated as a Key Town in the RSES and Galway County Development Plan. The status of settlements such as Milltown will be considered as part of the review of the County Development Plan as this would not fall within the scope of this Variation.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. C. Keane and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. D. Killilea welcomed increasing densities in MASP areas and stated it would also be welcomed for Key Towns. In response Ms. Loughnane clarified that the flexibility regarding densities at appropriate locations had been addressed with the update of table 15.1 within DM Standards of the CDP. She then advised that Milltown's classification as a settlement area would be considered during the CDP Review process but was not possible during this process.

In response to a query from Cllr. D. Geraghty in relation to RZLT, Ms. Loughnane advised that there would be liability for farmers for RZLT only if their farming activities occurred on residentially zoned land and advised that no additional land had been zoned in this Variation.

Cllr. A. Harney interjected querying whether there was further engagement with the Department over the issue of farmers actively farming their land being liable for RZLT. Ms. Loughnane advised that the public consultations for the RZLT's Draft Annual Map 2027 and RZLT Final Map 2026 were now open for submissions. She advised that only the townland of Gort appeared on the Annual Draft Map and that all other settlement areas were affected by the Final Map. She advised that she had

spoken a number of times to the Department on the subject of RZLT previously and had made some suggestions with respect to the application of RZLT.

GENERAL SUBMISSIONS

GLW C200-4 – ARDANT PROPERTY INVESTMENT LTD

Pg 34

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Ardent Property Investment Ltd is requesting a zone change from “Town Centre” to “Residential 1” in Maigh Cuilinn. The submission sets out a case for residential zoning.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands from Town Centre to Residential 1 development is noted.

However, the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive’s Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Notwithstanding the above, the site in question is zoned “Town Centre”. The proposed use of “Apartments” is “Permitted in Principle” on this land use zoning subject to compliance with the relevant policy objectives, standards and requirements set out in this plan and the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. D. Geraghty and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-5 – BRACKENSIDE INVESTMENTS LTD.

Pg 34/35

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Brackenside Investments Ltd is requesting a zone change from “Residential Phase 2” to “Residential Phase 1” at lands comprising approximately 1.6 hectares located

at Kilgarve, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway. Submission advises that this would ensure prompt delivery of housing, with development commencing within 5 years, in line with CDP Policy Objective CS5 (Core Strategy) and the variation's focus on accelerating Phase 2 lands where feasible.

Also seeking to apply a site-specific maximum density of 40 dwelling units per hectare on the site given its favorable location and accessibility to Ballinasloe Town Centre and local amenities, the sites current level of infrastructure, the sequential nature of the site to adjoining existing estates, and precedent of developments with higher densities within Ballinasloe.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands from Residential Phase 2 to Residential Phase 1 is noted.

However, the rezoning of the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Therefore, only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered.

Part of the site outlined is zoned Residential Phase 1 and Residential Phase 2. Variation No.1 results in both zonings being assessed in similar manner, should any planning application be forthcoming.

The density set for Ballinasloe is for 35DPH, with additional flexibility through the DM Standards.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-6 – DAVID JELLY

Pg 35

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Submission welcomes the proposed variation's emphasis on improving housing delivery.

Submission requests a land use zoning change from Town Centre to Residential Phase1 at lands comprising approximately 0.87 hectares located at Teampall Éanna, Church Road, Ballyquirke West, Maigh Cuilinn.

It is stated that this would support a planning application to amend an existing permission (currently for commercial units) to residential use. It is stated that this amended permission would facilitate the delivery of 4, 1-bedroom apartments at the site, within a development already under construction. The planning rationale behind

such a change is to relieve pressure on the housing system in Maigh Cuilinn, the existing high demand for 1- and 2-bedroom units in the town, and the high amount of commercial vacancy. The submission also argues that this rezoning and subsequent planning application would align with objectives HS4 and SH1.

Chief Executive Response

The rezoning of the subject lands do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Notwithstanding the above, the site in question is zoned "Town Centre". The land use zoning matrix indicates that a proposal for Apartments is "Permitted in Principle" on this land use zoning. This use is one that the Local Authority accepts in principle, subject to compliance with the relevant policy objectives, standards and requirements set out in the County Development Plan and the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. D. Geraghty and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-8 – URBAN ARQ ON BEHALF OF GEORGE FRANCIS MCGRATH

Pg 36/37

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Submission includes:

- Site Location map
- Site Layout Map
- Land registration map
- An extracted land use zoning map of Oranmore.
- Minutes of a Special Council meeting held on the 9th of May 2022 in which the aforementioned mapping error was discussed.

This submission relates to the zoning map rectification within Oranmore. Submission states that the lands in question are again subject to a continued mapping error,

effectively not applying Town Centre zoning to the full extent of the site. Submission gives overview of the planning history of the site and advises that although the elected members voted to rectify the mapping error, to remove the open space designation and replace it with town centre across the full extent of the site, this instruction was not implemented by the planning authority. Meeting minutes are also included with the submission (May 2022).

Submission requests that the Planning Authority consider taking this opportunity to address this legacy matter. Submission further notes that sites immediately to the north and south of the subject site are likewise zoned town centre, however the zoning extends to the full depth of same sites down to the tributary stream.

It is again re-iterated in the submission that full Town Centre zoning would be in the public interest, directly addressing the housing emergency via the Government's 2025 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines.

Submission also requests that the site is removed from the Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). The rationale behind the sites removal from the ACA is the sites poor architectural and streetscape quality and impact on site viability.

Chief Executive Response

The submission is noted.

This zoning rectification from Open Space/Recreation and Amenity to Town Centre is the means in which Galway County Council is amending this mapping error. This submission also proposes changing the zoning in the surrounding area. The additional area is at elevated risk of flooding. Zoning this area for town centre uses would be inappropriate and would not pass the Justification Test as set out in the Ministerial Guidelines on Flood Risk Management (2009). As a result, the proposal would not be in compliance with the Ministerial Guidelines – which must be complied with.

The request to remove the site off the Architectural Conservation Area is not warranted in this instance and it does not fall within the scope of Variation 1. The council does not agree that the sites are of poor architectural and streetscape quality inherently. Any negative impact they currently have is due to a lack of maintenance. As outlined the in Objective AH5 the council seeks to maintain the existing stock:

“Promote the maintenance and appropriate re-use of the existing stock of buildings with architectural merit as a more sustainable option to their demolition and redevelopment.”

A brief description of the Oranmore ACA is placed within Appendix 7 of the County Development Plan 2022 - 2028:

“The core of the town demonstrates a strong sense of enclosure, created by a loosely knit arrangement of plots and buildings. This is created by terraces, pairs and detached houses, with occasional gaps, providing glimpses to outbuildings to the rear. The typical plot widths are narrow, with buildings fronting directly onto the footpath in the core of the town, and large rear gardens”

While the two buildings fronting onto the main street are in disrepair, this does not exclude them from inclusion on the ACA. The buildings have not degraded to such a point to dampen their adherence to the character of the prevailing street layout, and they still contribute positively to the sense of enclosure on Main Street. A further key objective of the ACA is the enhancement of the existing architectural character as can be seen in objective AH4:

“Protect, conserve and enhance the special character of the Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA) included in this plan through the appropriate management and control of the design, location and layout of new development, modifications, alterations or extensions to existing structures, surviving historic plots and street patterns and/or modifications to the character or setting of the Architectural Conservation Area.”

Therefore, as the form of the two buildings clearly align with the description of the Oranmore ACA, and the only negative impacts of the sites are due to a lack of maintenance, the objectives of the ACA and the proper planning and sustainable development of Oranmore would be better served by the timely maintenance and enhancement of the site, not from the sites removal from the ACA.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

Cllr. P. Feeney opined that the submission concerned a mapping error which was not picked up on during the CDP process and this was the first opportunity for the Members to rectify it. He stated that the landowner had felt very disadvantaged by the error during the previous process, as the OPW and Flooding Consultants have since confirmed that the land is within the flood plain. He noted the tendency to not zone lands in flood plains made sense, but that such a blanket approach would negatively affect some landowners.

CE L. Conneally stated that as a general point, Galway County Council would not apologise for flood risk maps and flood plain identification, as Galway County Council uses this information to inform landuse zoning which in turn informs good decision-making regarding flooding and flood risk assessment.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Geraghty, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-12 – DNG MARTIN O’CONNOR ON BEHALF OF ARDENT PROPERTY INVESTMENT LTD

Pg 38

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Submission request rezoning from Town Centre to Residential Phase 1 in Maigh Cuilinn. The submission sets out a case for residential zoning.

Chief Executive Response

Submission noted. However, the zoning of the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that

relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Note that in certain circumstances a proposed mix of town centre commercial and residential (apartments) may be acceptable on Town Centre zoned lands.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-17 – CORB WELL DESIGN ON BEHALF OF SIMON CARNEY

Pg 38

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission relates to a zoning request for a site in Ballinasloe. The site is currently zoned community facilities and is sought to be changed to Residential Phase 1. The submission outlines the rationale for rezoning.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. However, the rezoning of the lands in question do not form part of the proposed variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. A. Harney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-19 – URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN SERVICES ON BEHALF OF MARK COFFEY OF COFFEY CONSTRUCTION LTD

Pg 39/41

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission received relates to two parcels of land in Oranmore and Athenry.

Oranmore

The Oranmore lands comprise of just over 26 hectares of land located outside of the settlement boundary for the Town.

In the first instance the submission seeks to extend the Oranmore settlement boundary and zone (9.64Ha) of the landbank zoned either Residential Phase 1 or Residential Phase 2. Alongside this, the submission is seeking to have this landbank included within the Settlement Capacity Audit to assess the sites current level of infrastructure provision. The submission also requests that policy objective 'GCMA 1 Residential Development' (and others related to the Residential Phase 2 lands in the GCDP and in the Local Area Plans) be amended to align with the intention of the Proposed Variation to allow all Residential Phase 2 lands to be developed within the lifetime of the GCDP. The submission claims there could be a risk of a lack of clarity and guidance around development of Residential Phase 2 lands if this is not done. The submission goes on to extensively list the details of the proposed site. It outlines the following:

- Site Location and Context
- Site Assessment and Development Potential
- Planning History
- Planning Policy Context; Density
- Planning Assessment and Motivation

Submission also suggests uses for the subject lands to include Residential; Open Space/Recreation (Flood Risk areas) and Future Reserve.

The submission argues positively and highlights need for the sites rezoning to R1, and if not R1, to R2. It also highlights the residential zoned lands that are developed. In Chapter 7 of the submission, the subject lands are assessed under the Proposed Variation. In this section the submission notes how the revised Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment requires higher housing targets focused on the Metropolitan area, which this proposed zoning change could help to achieve. Table 7.1 outlines how the submission aligns with the new updated narrative and policy objectives in the Proposed Variation. This submission suggests that the above policy objective GCMA 1 (and others related to the Residential Phase 2 lands in the GCDP and in the Local Area Plans) should be amended to clearly align with the intention of the Proposed Variation to allow all R2 lands to be developed within the lifetime of the GCDP. The submission then examines the SCA and notes that much of the R2 lands currently identified are further away from the Town Centre than the subject lands and also notes that much of the R1 land is already developed and no longer capable of more development. According to the submission, the amount of developable greenfield land is lacking to support the updated targets of the revised NPF and is also lacking to support the 50% additional provision found in the Section 28 Guidelines. The submission suggests that the Proposed Variation should not just focus on the R2 lands currently identified within the GCDP but should also identify other suitably located lands that can also be zoned for residential development.

Athenry

The submission makes reference to approximately 7.2 hectares of lands zoned Residential Phase 2 in Athenry and the case is made for these lands to be zoned

Residential Phase 1 within the lifetime of the Athenry LAP. The case made for the rezoning of these lands again comprises of the following sections: Introduction; Planning Policy Context; Planning Assessment and Motivation; Assessment Under Proposed Variation No. 1 and Conclusion. These lands are located within the lands identified for the Caheroyn UFP.

Submission requests that if these lands remain Residential Phase 2 under Variation 1 that the lands be prioritised for development in recognition of their suitability for development. Submission references that the lands relate to Policy Objective ASP 6 of the Athenry Local Area Plan and the revisions to Section 2.4.7 of the GCDP under Variation 1. Submission supports the intention of the Variation. Requests additional Guidelines with the Variation and repeats that Policy Objectives which restrict the development of Residential Phase 2 lands including GCMA1 and other Policy Objectives in Local Area Plans be amended. Submission states that there is a risk that there will be a lack of clarity and guidance regarding the ability to develop the Residential Phase 2 lands with respect to planning applications/appeals that are submitted for residential development.

Submission also references adjoining lands (Parcel B) that are zoned existing residential. Submission requests that this parcel be considered as part of the Caheroyn Urban Framework Plan. Submission considers that the lands in question could qualify for a density range of 25- 40 Dwellings per hectare. Submission highlights the potential of Athenry to accommodate additional growth and notes that the Core Strategy Population allocation in the County Development Plan is based on the NPF 2018 and notes that the population allocation in the NPF for the Region have increased, but that this has not been reflected in the RSES or GCDP. It is requested that the population growth targets are reviewed, and that consideration be given to increasing the housing allocations and amount of zoned land for residential development within Athenry.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted, however zoning of additional lands does not fall within the scope of Variation No.1. It is considered that sufficient zoned lands have been identified across all zoned settlements in the County to support the delivery of the revised housing targets as set out in the Section 28 Guidelines including headroom. In addition, the edits to the policy objectives and narrative are considered to be sufficient in allowing Residential Phase 2 lands across the County to be brought forward for development as appropriate including lands at Caheroyn. Other zoned lands such as Town Centre; Mixed Use Commercial, Residential infill and other Brownfield sites will also contribute to the provision of housing in the County.

The Housing Need and Demand Assessment has been revised and updated to take account of the increased housing targets for County Galway.

Additional clarification has been added to the SCA at Appendix A.

In relation to the request to include lands in the Caheroyn UFP, the Caheroyn UFP forms part of the Athenry LAP 2024 – 2030 and does not form part of Variation process.

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 in relation to the Core Strategy

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Recommendation to GLW-C200-40 with respect to the Core Strategy and Settlement Capacity Audit.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. T. Grealish, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-21 – CORB WELL DESIGN ON BEHALF OF PAT MCDONAGH

Pg 42

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests the zoning of currently unzoned land at Renville West, Oranmore to R1 Residential.

The rationale for this request is based on the site's immediate proximity to existing "The Bramley" residential development, with the submission highlighting that rezoning would allow for a logical, orderly, and compact extension of the established neighbourhood while utilizing existing and planned infrastructure. The submission asserts that this proposed zoning would align with the National Planning Framework's goals for sequential growth (NPO 3C) and increased housing supply (NPO 33), as the lands are capable of being serviced and benefit from nearby social infrastructure, such as schools and public transport. Ultimately, the submission concludes that the proposal supports sustainable development goals and provides a clear, plan-led framework for delivering housing.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the zoning of lands for residential development is noted.

However, the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Notwithstanding the scope of the Variation, it is considered that a sufficient quantity of housing lands has been identified across the County to meet the new housing requirements. In addition, there are currently no zoned lands at Renville West.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. P. Feeney, seconded by Cllr. D. Geraghty and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-25 – CORB WELL DESIGN ON BEHALF OF PAT MCDONAGH

Pg 42

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests in the first instance a preplanning consultation for a proposed offline motorway service station to serve Junction 19 of the M6 motorway at Oranmore. Drawings and graphics of the proposal have been submitted.

Leveraging the site's strategic location adjoining the national motorway network, the proposal outlines a purpose-built plaza designed to provide essential refuelling, rest, and food facilities for both private and commercial motorists. The proposed scheme features architectural design details fuel forecourt, HGV service areas, food court, retail, (EV) charging points, and landscaping. The applicant asserts that this development aligns with the National Planning Framework 2040, the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, and TII Service Area Policy by enhancing regional connectivity and ensuring driver safety. Ultimately, the submission serves as a request for a pre-planning consultation meeting with Galway County Council.

The submission also requests the Local Authority to consider rectification of the land use zoning map (or advise the appropriate mechanism/timing) to provide for a Motorway Service Area/Commercial zoning objective on these lands.

Chief Executive Response

It is suggested that the Planning Departments Preapplication Advice service is utilised in this instance.

It is also noted that only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time as the lands do not form part of this Variation process. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. P. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. P. Keaveney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-27 – PHE ENGINEERING ON BEHALF OF KEVIN MORAN

Pg 43

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests a rezoning of approximately 1.45 hectares of land in Baile Chláir from Residential Phase 2 to 'Un-zoned' lands suitable for six serviced sites for single dwelling houses.

It is stated that the primary argument for this change is the land's unsuitability for large-scale development due to severe infrastructural constraints, specifically the poor access via a side road off the L-71105 (Lakeview) which lacks the capacity for increased traffic and cannot be widened because of existing homes built close to the road. It is noted the Local authority and An Coimisiún Pleanála have refused two developments within this area due to poor road access. Furthermore, it is stated that the site is currently disconnected from the Uisce Éireann sewer and water mains. The significant costs associated with these infrastructural upgrade works make any development, including a high-density development economically unfeasible for a plot of this relatively small size.

The submission also highlights that these concerns were reinforced during a pre-planning meeting where it was indicated that larger developments would be refused based on insufficient access. The submission also references a subsequent on-site meeting, where it was agreed the existing road could not support the traffic or required infrastructure such as footpaths and cycle lanes.

By rezoning the land for six serviced sites, the applicant intends to provide housing for residents under Rural Housing Policy Objectives RH1 to RH3, including an enurement clause, while arguing that this shift will not negatively impact overall housing targets due to other ongoing developments in the area.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands is noted. However, the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. P. Keaveney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-36 – BRIAN CURRAN

Pg 44

Cllr. M. Regan left the meeting while this item was being discussed due to a Conflict of Interest.

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission (Presumed Incomplete) entitled 'Mount Pleasant 31131 - Submission on "Proposed Variation No 1 to the County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 December 20th, 2025" Re zone land outside settlement boundary'

This submission does not provide any details but includes the instruction to 'See enclosed pdfs.' However, no files other than a map site outline to the east of Loughrea town.

Chief Executive Response

While this submission is somewhat unclear, it may be the case that the site outline is requesting a residential zoning. However, the lands in question do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. P. Feeney, seconded by Cllr. J. McClearn and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-37 – CYRIL J KELLY & ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF BRIAN CURRAN & JOHN CURRAN

Pg 44

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests the rezoning of land in Mount Pleasant, Loughrea, from unzoned to Residential.

The submission makes the case for the reinstatement of residential zoning that was removed during the 2024 Loughrea LAP Plan making process.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the zoning of lands for residential development is noted.

The zoning of the lands in question does not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. However, Residential Phase 2 zoned lands in Loughrea can now effectively come forward for development. Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they

relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. L. Harney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-38 – BRIAN CURRAN & JOHN CURRAN

Pg 45

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission does not expressly request a rezoning. However, it appears that the case is being made for unzoned lands to the west of Loughrea town to be zoned for residential development. The submission advises that if the lands/property were included in the SCA they would meet all the criteria for Tier 1 lands.

The request is framed as a response to the revised NPF.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted.

However, the zoning of these lands in question do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. P. Killilea and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-41 – NOEL AND SHARON LALLY

Pg 45

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission includes an expression of interest letter in relation to a zoning request.

It seeks to zone 7.1 hectares (17.5 acres) of land at Kingsland, Athenry off the L3112, as Residential Phase 1 on the L3112.

The submission provides a planning history of the lands in question and sets out a case for the zoning of these lands.

Submission requests the inclusion of additional Guidelines within the Proposed Variation to support the release of Residential Phase 2 lands for development within the lifetime of the GCDP in order to align with the revised NPF. Submission requests that the policy objectives that restrict the development of Residential Phase 2 lands, including 'GCMA 1 Residential Development' in Section 1.10 of Volume 2 of the GCDP and 'Residential Phase 2' in Section 1.7 of the Athenry LAP (and others related to the Residential Phase 2 lands in the GCDP and in the Local Area Plans), be amended to align with the intention of the Proposed Variation to allow all Residential Phase 2 lands to be developed within the lifetime of the GCDP and Athenry LAP.

Chief Executive Response

The submission requesting the rezoning of lands for residential development is noted. The contents of the Expression of Interest letter are also noted.

However, the lands in question do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan.

Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

As part of Variation 1, Residential Phase 2 lands are available for development once the Variation is complete. This principle applies to all Residential Phase 2 lands across the County. Members of the public or others can seek additional advice and clarity through the S.247 Preapplication advice service.

The proposed amendments to narrative and policy objectives in the Variation as considered to be sufficient and in accordance with the Section 28 Guidelines.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. J. McClearn and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-2 – MARTIN LAVELLE

Pg 46

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Item 1: Submission comments on a number of items including a perceived trend of submissions on farm housing applications originating from owners of renewable energy proposals, which will increase housing demand for towns and villages if such farm housing is denied planning permission.

Item 2 The second item relates to Oranmore Railway station broadly, seeking to develop the site according to historic plans, to include a multi-story car park, to develop a pedestrian link to the Oranmore Industrial area, and to develop traffic upgrades on the R466.

Item 3: Suggestion is to identify a possible location of a second street in Oughterard, from the west bridge running parallel to the river, for the purposes of creating critical mass in the Town.

Item 4: seeks 3 No. of Zoning changes:

1. Milltown: Area around the Train Station to be zoned industrial.
2. Tuam: The medieval graveyard around St. Mary's Cathedral to lose its Town Centre zoning.
3. Oranmore: A site on the Maree Road to be zoned residential.

Chief Executive Response

The various topics in question in this observation do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. This Variation is limited to only consider observations which directly relate to Variation 1 as advertised.

Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. D. Killilea, seconded by Cllr. M. Lee and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-7 – MARTIN LAVELLE

Pg 47

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission advises that further to a previous submission it is asked that the following issues be addressed also:

- Realignment of the N84 Headford to Shrulue road.
- The submission expresses dissatisfaction at the quality of street lighting along Main Street, Headford town.
- Realignment of the Tinkershill junction with L6112 and N83 Dunmore to Tuam.

- Widening & realignment of the L51516 Monument Road from Ballindooley Cross to the Galway City Boundary.
- Widening & realignment of the N67 road from Kinvara to the County Boundary for pedestrians, cyclists & buses as the road are heavily trafficked from tourists.
- Development of a cantilevered footpath from Kinvara village to Dunguaire Castle along the N67 with beach construction.
- Proposed Yacht Marinas in Kinvara, Bearna, An Spideal, Roundstone, Clifden, Kilronan & Leenane.
- Improvements to road access to Silverstrand, Bearna.
- Completion of Loughrea Bypass road from R446/R349/R380 Roundabout to R380 via Tullahill.
- Pedestrianisation of Piggott's Street, Church Street, King Street, Kelly's Street, Castle Street & Abbey Street to Dolphin Street in Loughrea Town.
- Development of a multi-story carpark at existing Loughrea Center Parking site & include vehicular entrance/exit over Moat to Station Road.
- Development of a new pedestrian Street from Loughrea Centre Parking site to Abbey Street, south of the Moat.
- Pedestrianisation of Burke's Lane and Northgate Street in Athenry.
- Development of the area around St. Mary's Church in Athenry into a Town Square. This will involve exhumation of bodies from graveyard and reinterment elsewhere.
- Completion of the carpark at R347/L3112 junction In Athenry.
- For the council to acquire the Old Protestant Church in Kilronan to be developed into a third level remote access library.
- A proposed exemption of development management standards around farming developments which generate small amounts of traffic in cul de sacs.
- A number of technical and planning procedure suggestions around the operation of Biogas projects.
- A number of technical, planning procedure, and health and safety suggestions around wind turbine projects.

Chief Executive Response

Submission noted.

However, the points raised do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. This report considers observations which relate to the stated Variation No.1 as per the newspaper advert.

Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, submissions can only be considered if

they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-20 – MKO ON BEHALF OF RONAN BARRETT OF CASTLESTAR PROPERTY GROUP

Pg 48-52

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission can be summarised under the headings of Housing Needs Demand Assessment, Density Standards, Settlement Capacity Audit, Residential Phase 2 lands and Site-Specific Policy.

Housing Needs Demand Assessment

The submission raises concerns that certain figures which have been calculated are incorrect. The submission notes that the formula applied and presented in Table 39 applies a measure of met/unmet demand from the past 5 years which was already accounted for in the NPF Total Projections. The submission further notes that the ESRI projections identify a need for approximately 41,000 new dwellings per annum until 2040 based solely on future population growth. The submission outlines what the Guidelines estimate noting 55,000 dwellings p/a up to 2034. This figure was used for the basis of calculating figures for each Local Authority with Galway County Council having a target of 2,008 units p/a from 2025 – 2034. The submission further notes that subtracting unit completions between 2020-2025 from population growth projections during 2025 -2034 is incorrect. The submission considers that this results in an underutilization of the NPF total projections

The submission also raises concerns in relation to the housing need calculations used in the unvaried GCDP 2022–2028 and the original HNDA. The plan's total housing allocation of 10,738 units was incorrectly divided over seven years instead of the statutory six, producing an understated annual target of 1,534 units. National Section 28 Guidelines have since corrected this to 1,790 units per year and outlines issues with the approach taken in the HNDA. The submission notes that Proposed Varied HNDA claims that 2,987 units were delivered between 2020–2025, however, this level of delivery would not even satisfy the Core Strategy targets for 2023 and 2024.

The submission further notes the corrected annual allocation under the unvaried GCDP exceeds the allocation produced by the Proposed Varied HNDA which the submission notes as illogical. The submission notes that the Proposed Variation appears to be based on the flawed assumption that NPF housing targets are surplus to need in Galway while in reality, there is a shortfall.

Density

The submission also raises concerns in relation to Table 15.1 of the GCDP and has outlined that density is still too low and is not fully in accordance with the ranges set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024). The submission outlines discrepancies between the proposed table and the 2024 Guidelines and requests it to be addressed as well as the associated text to ensure there is no ambiguity. The submission also outlines that the density ranges for locations with subjective National Density Policy are too low. The submission outlines reasons and guidance for increased density ranges and requests this change. The submission further notes that Section 15.2.3 of the GCDP states that “Chapter 2 Core Strategy, Settlement Strategy and Housing Strategy sets the standard density at 35 Dwellings Per Hectare” but that this is not reflected in the Core Strategy or anywhere in Chapter 2 and this creates uncertainty.

Finally, the submission requests the Local Authority to revise residential density standards in both Chapter 2 and Chapter 15 of the County Development Plan to reflect the requirements of national policy and where appropriate to apply subjective density, a density of 35 Dwellings Per Hectare should be applied.

Settlement Capacity Audit

The proposed Settlement Capacity Audit (SCA) is welcome, but it is requested that it should be undertaken for smaller towns and villages within the County. The omission of smaller settlements, especially in West County Galway and the Gaeltacht, undermines effective forward planning and prevents the identification of critical infrastructure and land-supply constraints.

Residential Phase 2 Lands

The submission welcomes the renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands however notes that for all levels outside the MASP there is a restrictive policy either in the County Development Plan or the appropriate Local Area Plan which states

“c)Where it is apparent that Residential (Phase1) lands cannot or will not be developed for residential purposes within the plan period, residential development may be considered in limited cases in a phased manner on suitable Residential (Phase2) lands, **in exceptional circumstances; •Development on Residential (Phase 2) lands will normally only be considered where 50% of the lands in Residential (Phase 1) are committed to development.**”

The submission outlines this is inflexible and provides planning history from An Coimisiún Pleanála. The submission asks for the text in bold above to be struck out from the CDP and where LAPs are relevant a new policy should be put forward that explicitly identifies that exceptional circumstances have been reached, and the 50% bar is no longer applicable due to the revised population targets in the NPF

The submission further notes that the SCA and the Policy Objectives regarding the renewed approach for Residential Phase 2 lands have not been extended to small growth towns and small growth villages and request that this policy be revisited so these areas are not deprived of access to new housing.

Site Specific Policy

In this section the submission makes a rezoning request for lands in An Spideal Thiar (Residential Phase 2 to Residential Phase 1) and outlines the site context and planning history as well as the planning reasons. A housing layout and confirmation

of feasibility for connections is appended to the submission to support the proposed rezoning. The submission also outlines issues with other R1 sites coming forward in the settlement.

The submission further requests rezoning of the lands at the Former Naomh Einde Convent in An Spidéal, from Community Facilities to Village Centre. Again, the submission outlines the context, history, infrastructure, and proposed internal layout taken from a planning application for the lands. A letter of connection to the Wastewater Treatment Plan is also provided in support.

The final rezoning request is for lands at Kylebroghlan, Maigh Cuilinn, and it is requested to rezone Agricultural zoned lands to Residential Phase 1 lands. The context and history of the site is outlined, and it is noted that the site is now an infill site. Submission notes proposed plans are ready for the site, confirmation of feasibility has been provided by Uisce Éireann and other services can be provided via the constructed estate.

The conclusion of the submission reiterates the issues brought up by the submission and finally reiterates the requests made within the submission.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission received are noted.

Housing Needs Demand Assessment

It is noted and acknowledged that the 'actual new housing supply' should not have been included in Table 39 and as such, this is proposed to be removed from the Housing Strategy and HNDA. Table 39 now only outlines the figures within the published Section 28 Guidelines and ESRI methodology.

While Table 39 of the Housing Strategy and HNDA has now been updated to remove the new housing supply, it is noted and emphasised that this has not had any subsequent effect on the material or conclusion of the Housing Strategy and HNDA. These updated figures are those available in the Section 28 Guidelines and ESRI methodology with page 106 and Section 7.1 now updated to reflect this.

Noted.

The HNDA has been reviewed and give effect to the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements.

Density

In relation to the request for changes to densities, it is noted that the proposed new table 15.1 does increase densities in certain settlements and site types. Furthermore, Table 15.1 advises that all development proposals shall be assessed having regard to the Density Table and the Guidelines which provide more flexibility in relation to density ranges. While the submissions reference to section 15.2.3 is noted, densities will be assessed against the core strategy as contained in Chapter 2, Table 15.1 and against the Guidelines which provide flexibility. It is further noted that Chapter 15 of the County Development Plan provides for a degree of flexibility at appropriate locations in relation to density where the quality of the proposal merits a higher density.

There is a tiered density range in the Core Strategy Table ranging from 35 in the Urban Framework Plan areas and Key Towns to 11 in the Small Growth Villages. However, a degree of flexibility applies in this regard which permits flexibility with respect to density at appropriate locations.

Settlement Capacity Audit

The request in relation to the SCA is noted. However, the Settlement Capacity Audit has been carried out in accordance with the Section 28 Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines. Information in relation to smaller settlements is available and the Local Authority will assist with this information in any pre planning application for a development. See *Chief Executive Response to submission GLW-C200-40*.

Residential Phase 2 Lands

In relation to the request to strike out the bold text in the County Development Plan it is considered that the proposed Policy Objectives in the Proposed Variation are in accordance with the goals of the Section 28 Guidelines and the proposed Policy Objectives will consider the release of Residential Phase 2 lands to provide more flexibility and more lands for development as well as supporting the provision of housing on zoned land where appropriate and in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development. It is considered that the Policy Objectives have been amended with a view to supporting the provision of housing on zoned land in these settlements where appropriate including Residential Phase 2 lands. Again, this offers flexibility and releases lands for housing development in accordance with the Section 28 Guidelines. The request for new objectives in the case of settlements with LAPS is noted, however it is considered the Proposed Variation would facilitate the development of housing on Residential Phase 2 lands within the LAP towns.

An amendment has been made to Policy Objectives SGT 1 and SGV 1 as part of the Proposed Variation to facilitate appropriate development of housing on zoned land where appropriate.

Part of this submission requests land zonings in An Spideal Thiar, An Spideal Village Centre and Maigh Cuillin. However, the lands in question do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. In accordance with Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See *Chief Executive Recommendation to submission GLW-C200-40*.

Update Table 39 and narrative of HNDA as follows:

On the supply side, a total number of 5,683 units had been delivered over 2020-2025Q1, as recorded on CSO StatBank. This demonstrates a quarterly growth rate of 2% over 2020-2025Q1. Not accounting for one-off houses, a total of 2,987 units had been delivered over 2020-2025Q1.

Applying these figures to the following formula:

$$\text{Housing Demand 2025-2034} = (\text{Total Projection 2034} - \text{Unit Completions 2020-2025Q1}) + \text{Total Unmet Demand}$$

The overall housing demand up to 2034 is expected to be 15,409 units, which equates to 1,712 housing units per annum.

Table 3.9 Housing Demand Estimation over the Plan Period Utilising ESRI Methodology as per Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

	County Council	Annual Avg. Households	Total Households
A	NPF scenario projected new household demand to 2034	2,008	18,072
B	Actual new housing supply 2020 to most recent available year or quarter period (i.e., 2020-Q1-2025)	478	2,987
C	Homeless households (latest data), and unmet demand as at most recent Census	N/A	182
D	Plan Housing Demand = A - B + C	1,712	15,409

This indicates a difference of 178 456 no. units per annum when compared with the previous method (which estimated a requirement of 1,543 additional units per annum), which can be explained through factoring in the two elements of housing supply and unmet demand in the ESRI method, resulting in a more accurate housing target.

overall housing demand up to 2034 is expected to be ~~15,409~~ 18,072 units, which equates to ~~1,712~~ 2,008 housing units per annum. Studying the income profile of the county and calculating

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. A. Harney, seconded by Cllr. T. Welby and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-1 – COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNER DAVID BARTON

Pg 53-55

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission relates to the built heritage of Galway County Council, specifically with the intention to champion key stakeholders with a view to supporting their economic growth through the merits of High-Quality style Conservation. The submission also hopes to support wider constructive and restorative support of Built Heritage through positive and constructive working. This submission is supported by an extensive appendix of best-practice documents and Guidelines. The submission is split into the following sections:

Design Codes:

The submission makes a wide range of suggestions under this topic, encouraging the adoption of design codes, for Local Authorities to engage with key consultation groups, the creation of volunteer labouring assemblies, and to streamline the planning process for groups that are working to preserve historic buildings. There are also a number of procedural suggestions. The submission also suggests on how better to conduct public consultation and the monitoring of demolition activity around historic buildings.

Designated & Non-Designated Heritage Assets:

Here the submission calls for the enhancement of historic areas through funds and investment, pooling of historic items, and to create financial incentives to develop these historic areas in a sympathetic way.

Conservation Area

The submission argues for a simplified process for alterations to protected buildings, more incentives for development of protected buildings, for a relaxing of using modern imitation materials, and tighter design consistency within ACAs. There are also suggestions for establishment for a directory of TVA approved architects and for the establishment of new ACAs.

Climate Change

The submission states the importance of retrofitting, to ensure embodied energy and carbon must remain a central priority to influence new construction techniques, and to create an approved contractor directory for contractors who work with sustainable materials. Also requests steps to maximize biodiversity gain, to ensure there is adequate flooding defences, and to create a fund to decommission of glass towers.

Historic Buildings

In this section, the submission suggests the adoption of a number of policies, design suggestions, and funds so as to protect and maintain historic buildings. Including a scheme to reconstruct long lost buildings of historic value. There is also a suggestion that Local Authorities should work in close conjunction with foundries to produce raw materials for such developments.

Traditional Vernacular Architecture

Building on suggestions in previous sections of this submission, this section suggests the inclusion of smart buildings methods when working on historic buildings, to simplify the process of protecting a building, and to provide specialist training programmes. There is also a suggestion that new housing estates should adopt historical layouts i.e. Georgian, Victorian, or Edwardian layouts.

Making an application

This section begins with the suggestion of creating a list of bad actors who have repeatedly harmed civic heritage, including new enforcement penalties for people who allow their civic heritage properties fall into disrepair, and to create an action plan to deter organisations and people from demolition of historic buildings. There is also a number of suggestions on how to better conduct public consultation and public engagement.

Miscellaneous

To finish the submission, there are a number of miscellaneous suggestions around parking, historic street furniture, infrastructure provision and audit, and further stake holder engagement improvement.

Chief Executive Response

The issues raised in the submission are noted.

However, the various topics in question in this observation do not form part of the Proposed Variation to the County Development Plan. This Variation is limited to only consider observations which directly relate to the review and update of the existing Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment of the Galway County Development Plan with associated updates to the County Development Plan, the proposed updates to existing Policy Objectives and narrative in the County Development Plan which will place a renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands in the County, and the Rectification of Land use Zoning Map for Oranmore.

Only submissions that relate directly to the Proposed Variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the Proposed Variation and any submission that does not relate to the Proposed Variation will not be considered.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. M. Hoade, seconded by Cllr. T. Welby and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-3 – JOE SHERIDAN

Pg 55-56

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Part A. 1

The submission begins with seeking to change small settlement building caps to be based on infrastructure, rather than population. The submission further states that it should be reflected in the capable density allowed within these statements to reflect the current need for housing. Submission references Milltown which, it is stated has a non utilised effluent plant capacity of 500 pe, potable water, road capacity and bus routes with viable train halt placement in 5 years.

Submission seeks to increase 'house cap' from 8 to 40 to take up slack of house non delivery by larger settlements and towns.

Part A. 2

This submission also suggests a system under a "Don't use it . . . you lose ½ of it" philosophy where any higher tier settlements which fail to deliver their housing core strategy allocation, the 50% of the shortfall in figures is added to the overall

development cap of lower tier settlements. This would enable greater use of under-utilised infrastructure in these small settlements.

Part c 1

Reference made to Oranmore, and zoning changes needed that highlights the slightly flawed county wide aspects to non domestic zonal or legacy allowable zone allocations for industrial and commercial areas in Galway County and the present CDP

Submission seeks an adjunct to the Rural Green Industry exemption for rural industry to include 'and already brown field legacy serviced sites'. Milltown Business Park is referenced as an example and the case is made for its expansion.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. A holistic view of towns for zoning is taken rather than merely infrastructure. In the case of Milltown, policy objective SS7 applies which allows for consideration of development on the basis of connectivity, capacity, Core Strategy Compliance, Settlement Hierarchy, good design, community gain and proper planning and sustainable development. This is considered appropriate and sufficient in this instance.

Variation No.1 allows for a greater degree of flexibility with respect to Residential Phase 2 zoned lands.

Noted. The Planning Authority update zoning during plan reviews as necessary.

Submission comments in relation to Milltown Business Park and legacy zoning are noted, however fall outside the scope of the Variation.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. S. Cunniffe, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-9 – BROCK MCCLURE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTS ON BEHALF OF SATHL LTD

Pg 56-57

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Submission relates to a parcel of land in Tuam. It requests the publication of a revised Core Strategy to understand how the baseline housing allocation figures or additional 50% headroom figures will be allocated per settlement. They seek that the Planning Authority consider their position to ensure that the development of Key Towns is done in a planned and integrated manner, with a focus on Tuam.

The submission gives an outline of a site in Tuam. The site is predominantly zoned Residential Phase 1, with a portion of the site zoned Open Space with a Constrained Land Use.

Density

The submission raises concern with the proposed densities, and the amendment to Table 15.1, 'Residential Density', as the changes affects their client's site in Tuam. The submission considers that the 25 – 30 units density range within the variation for Urban Extension locations within Key Towns does not align with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, which gives a density range for such a location for 30 – 50 dph. The submission notes that alignment with a higher range would ensure adherence with Policy Objective 3.1 of the Settlement Guidelines. It is requested that the density ranges are reviewed to reflect the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted.

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

Noted. These lands do not fall within the scope of this Proposed Variation.

The Tuam Local Area Plan 2023 – 2029 gives a density of 35 dwellings per hectare. Chapter 15 of the County Development Plan provides for a degree of flexibility at appropriate locations in relation to density where the quality of the proposal merits a higher density. The density ranges are considered appropriate. In addition, Table 15.1 advises that all development proposals shall be assessed having regard to the Density Table and the Guidelines which provide more flexibility in relation to density ranges.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. C. Keane and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-10 – BROCK MCCLURE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTS ON BEHALF OF CLADDAGH VENTURES LTD

Pg 57-58

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission includes an outline of the former Haydens Hotel site in Ballinasloe, highlighting its Town Centre zoning and its Opportunity Site status in the Ballinasloe LAP.

Density

The first issue of this submission relates specifically to Section 3 of the Variation Document Publication, and the amendment to Table 15.1, 'Residential Density', as the changes affects their client's site in Ballinasloe. The submission notes that 35 or Site Specific dph density range within the Variation for Centre and Urban

Neighbourhood locations within Key Towns does not align with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024, which gives a density range for such a location for 40 – 100 dph. The submission notes that a higher range would ensure alignment with Policy Objective 3.1 of the Settlement Guidelines. Submission requests increasing the density range to align to the Guidelines.

Core Strategy

The submission makes note that the current draft Variation published has not included a revised core strategy, and they make note it is not currently clear how the baseline housing allocation figures or additional 50% headroom figures will be allocated per settlement. They seek that the Planning Authority consider their position on matter to ensure that the development of Key Towns is done in a planned and integrated manner, with a focus on Ballinasloe.

Chief Executive Response

The Ballinasloe Local Area Plan 2022 –2028 sets a density of 35 dwellings per hectare. Chapter 15 of the County Development Plan provides for a degree of flexibility at appropriate locations in relation to density where the quality of the proposal merits a higher density. The density ranges are considered appropriate. In addition, Table 15.1 advises that all development proposals shall be assessed having regard to the Density Table and the Guidelines which provide more flexibility in relation to density ranges.

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Recommendation to GLW-C200-40

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-11 – THE PLANNING PARTNERSHIP ON BEHALF OF ELEANOR SHERIDAN

Pg 58-63

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission directly relates to c. 1.12 hectares of land in Milltown, currently in a mixture of agricultural use (with a live planning permission for four dwellings). The submission wishes to develop this land, and thus requests that the final Variation adequately reflect the existing and future land use context of these lands, and the role of Milltown as a whole, specifically that level 7 settlements such as Milltown be appropriately recognised in the Core and Settlement strategies. The submission outlines the key planning facts of the site, the site's location and description, and the Site history. The submission also outlines the merits of this site for further residential development. To build the argument for this site's suitability, the submission makes a number of notes and critiques of the proposed variation, which are outlined below:

Purpose of the Variation:

In this section of the submission, the following is noted:

“The reason for the Proposed Variation No. 1 is in response to ‘The National Planning Framework’s First Revision 2025’ and the ‘Section 28 Guidelines on NPF Implementation – Housing Growth Requirements’ ...”

However, in the opinion of the submission, the Proposed Variation is not consistent with either statement. The submission argues that the Proposed Variation is not consistent to National Policy Objectives 11 and 48 (for clarity, the submission seems to be referring to Objective 47) as outlined in the First Revision of the National Planning Framework.

The submission also claims the Proposed Variation contravenes Policy and Objective 1 and 2 of the Section 28 NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements.

As succinctly summarised in the submission, the submission claims that the Proposed Variation plans for a three-year period, with no headroom allowance, whereas it should be planning for a fifteen year period, with a substantial headroom allowance. The omission of these elements impact the ability of the core strategy to fulfil its function.

Elements of the proposed Variation, and issues arising:

Issue with proposed Variation Part A, as outlined in the submission:

- The Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment does not project to 2038 as required by the Guidelines,
- The Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment does not acknowledge the likelihood of an extension to the current County Development Plan past 2028,
- The Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment does not review, and adapt to, the failure to date of the core and settlement strategy to deliver its targets,
- The Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment does not acknowledge the Housing Delivery Action Plan 2022-2026,
- The associated updates to the County Development Plan as seen in the proposed Variation does not consider the functioning of the settlement hierarchy and the role of smaller settlements, such as Milltown;
- The associated updates to the County Development Plan as seen in the Proposed Variation does not consider national policy which promotes the delivery of housing in village settings.

Issue with proposed Variation Part B, as outlined in the submission:

- Core Strategy Table 2.11 has not been updated to meet the requirements of The National Planning Framework’s First Revision or the Guidelines.

- No provision for headroom is made,
- Residential Density Table 15.1 has not been updated to reflect the function of Rural Settlements,
- Policy CS 5 Population within Tiers has not been addressed, albeit the halfway point has passed,
- The role of Rural Settlements in delivering on the requirements of the Guidelines does not appear to have been considered,
- The Proposed Variation considers the volume of zoned land but not the deliverability of zoned land, and monitoring outcomes are not apparent.

Amendments of the proposed Variation sought:

- That the Proposed Variation recognises that the current core and settlement strategy is not working, and make further amendments accordingly,
- The results of the monitoring should be demonstrated and acted on accordingly,
- The Proposed Variation should enact the halfway clause of by Policy CS 5 Population,
- There is a lack of evidence to show activating Residential Phase 2 lands is an effective approach to reach targets,
- The Variation should broaden the scope of settlements which can contribute to the targets to includes villages,
- There is no evidence of the review of the Housing Need and Demand Study informing any change in approach. The Proposed Variation should be amended to rectify this,
- Page 8 of the Proposed Variation references that "It is considered that this approach will be applied to all serviced, zoned settlements across the County", the word zoned should be omitted and replaced with 'zoned (or within CSO boundaries of)',
- That the Proposed Variation recognise that not all rural settlement housing needs are for large, detached houses, but also smaller units for smaller households and or 'rightsizing',
- The Proposed Variation should clarify and align the Table 15.1 density Guidelines with the Compact Settlement Guidelines,
- Align the Proposed Variation and the County Development Plan with the Council's Housing Delivery Action Plan 2022-2026,

Elevate Milltown from Level 7, or change Level 7 to a different classification, such that there is a clarity that Milltown and similar settlements are capable of, and clarify which developments are suitable for Level 7 settlements,

Establish a development envelope for Level 7 Settlements (by reference to CSO settlement boundary pending individual zoning plan), subject to a case-by-case basis,

Policy Objectives Settlement Hierarchy SS7 should be amended as follows:

SS7 Development of Rural Settlements and Rural Nodes (Level 7)

In the case of smaller settlements for which no specific plans are available, development shall be considered on the basis of its connectivity, capacity (including social, cultural, and economic, infrastructural and environmental capacity), good design and community gain. The Planning Authority will support the provision of housing (for various household types, including providing older / rightsizing housing opportunities) on land within the CSO boundaries of Rural Settlements where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development, and national planning policy including the National Planning Framework and Compact Settlement Guidelines.”

Housing Context

Also in this submission is a section on the overall context of housing within Galway County. This section outlines the new and old annual figures and how Galway is doing in achieving it's targets so far, noting the under provision of housing units and the large quantity of one-off rural housing units granted. The submission takes issue with the overprovision of one-off rural housing. The submission states that the Proposed Variation is not radical or at scale, despite the need for such action and the clear Government policy set out in the Guidelines which are exceptional and radical. The submission also seeks to look beyond just the Settlement Capacity Audit to establish the availability of suitable land for development, following the provisions as set out in the Guidelines. The submission finally claims that smaller settlements have been overlooked in favour of larger settlements for housing provision, and this should be reevaluated.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted.

The provisions of Policy Objective SS7 apply to Level 7 settlements such as Milltown whereby development shall be considered on the basis of connectivity, capacity and compliance with the Core Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. This wording is considered appropriate. Variation 1 is in relation to the current Development Plan 2022-2028. The revised Housing Strategy and HNDA projects up to 2034 which is for the remaining period of the Development Plan plus a further 6 years.

No CDP extension is proposed.

The purpose of the Housing Strategy and HNDA is to outline the updated Census figures, present the facts of the emerging housing trends and statistics since 2022, to then project the figures up to 2034. The new HNDA underpins the revised housing

allocation as per the Section 28 Guidelines. Development will still be in accordance with the Core Strategy. See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 with respect to the core strategy.

Sufficient zoned lands to accommodate housing across County Galway have been identified to satisfy revised housing requirements.

The Planning Authority supports the provision of sustainable residential development in the zoned and serviced settlements across the County. Variation 1 applies to all zoned settlements across the County. The density ranges are considered appropriate, and these ranges offer a degree of flexibility.

The HNDA will be updated to include reference to the Housing Delivery Action Plan.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Recommendation to GLW-C200-40 on the core strategy.

The HDNA will be updated to include reference to the Housing Delivery Action Plan as below:

2.3.5 Housing Delivery Action Plan (HDAP) 2022-2026

Published in April 2022, The Housing Delivery Action Plan 2022-2026 was prepared in response to Housing for All, which required each local authority to set out clear housing delivery targets and the delivery pathways that would be used to achieve them. The HDAP is intended as a "live" implementation document over the plan period, aligning housing delivery with national and regional policy priorities, particularly compact growth, while identifying key constraints and actions required to increase output.

In terms of delivery mechanisms, the HDAP identifies that social and affordable housing delivery in Galway County (2022-2026) will be advanced through a suite of pathways, including Local Authority direct build (LA Build), turnkey developments from private developers, Buy & Renew acquisitions and refurbishment, Part V requirements for social and affordable housing, and delivery by Approved Housing Bodies (AHBs). Affordable housing delivery is further supported through Local Authority affordable housing construction (LA Purchase), advance purchase by the Council of turnkey units from developers, the provision of Cost Rentals, and demand-side supports such as the First Home Scheme and the Home Loans Scheme (formerly the Rebuilding Ireland Home Loan).

The HDAP confirms a five-year social housing target of 1,717 homes for the period 2022-2026, with delivery expected through a combination of local authority delivery and Approved Housing Body (AHB) delivery. The Plan notes the Government expectation at the time that delivery would broadly be split at c. 60% local authority / c. 40% AHB, while emphasizing that the local authority retains responsibility for delivery. The HDAP also provides an affordable housing target of 226 homes over the Plan period.

A key emphasis of the HDAP is matching delivery to need, noting that social housing demand in the county is heavily weighted toward smaller units, with approximately 48% 1-bed and 28% 2-bed need. The Plan also reinforces the importance of universal design and meeting specialist needs, including provision for older persons, people with disabilities and other priority groups as part of main stream delivery planning.



The HDAP identifies several delivery risks and constraints that could affect output, including the availability, cost and activation of land, capacity to scale delivery across delivery partners, construction cost inflation and supply chain challenges, and infrastructure constraints, particularly wastewater capacity alongside the staffing and operational resources required to support a growing housing stock.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. A. Harney, seconded by Cllr. M. Lee and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-13 – NORTHEAST GALWAY ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION CLG

Pg 65-69

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission requests that the area of the proposed Clonberne wind farm and other areas in North and East Galway are changed from 'open to consideration' to 'not normally permissible' in the Local Authority Renewable Energy Strategy with respect to wind energy development. The submission also believes that the region in a line from Abbeyknockmoy to Mountbellew to Ballyforan should be designated

by the Local Authority as Vulnerable Landscape given its unique Annex II habitats and environmental characteristics. The submission also seeks that North-East Galway be changed from an area of low sensitivity to an area of high vulnerability. The submission seeks to amend Appendix 4, to update the Landscape Character Assessment to a characterisation more appropriate for such a sensitive wetland area of high biodiversity value and for the insertion and mention of Turloughs in the Landscape Character Units, 5b Castlegar Basin, 5c Springfield Basin and 5e Northern River Clare Basin as per page 20 of Appendix 4.

The submission goes on to give an extensive listing of International, national, and local legal acts and policy documents relevant to the above area.

International

In this section the submission outlines the Nature Restoration Law 2024 and the subsequent legal requirements on member states. It goes on to demonstrate how various decisions reached by the EU are designed to protect the environment, with a focus on the precautionary principle. Outlined is the aim for a high level of protection and promotion of the prevention principle. Finally, this section outlines the primary objectives of the Habitats directive, Ireland's compulsion to comply, and a number of CJEU rulings which have found that Ireland has failed to meet some of its obligations.

National

The submission goes on to name a number of relevant acts and policies for conservation of nature and how they relate to the above.

Local

In this section the ecological sensitivity as outlined in the SEA Environmental Report for the Development Plan 2022 – 2028 are noted for Peatlands, Fens, Turloughs, and Cutover Bogs.

Turloughs

The submission outlines the essence of Turloughs, their relation to karst landscapes, and how they work hydrologically. Emphasis is placed on the unique nature of Turloughs in Ireland and their designation as a priority habitat under the EU Habitat Directive and their current conservation status as unfavourable. This section goes on to note the importance of the wider hydrological network supplying the Turloughs and issues around drainage. The following paragraphs reiterate the uniqueness of Turloughs in Ireland. The following paragraphs outline the conservation status of the Whooper Swans, and evidence of their high numbers around the Turloughs, and how the Turloughs are ecologically important to the life cycle of the Whooper Swans. The submission notes that particular features of wind turbines could be problematic, taking into account the dangers which they may represent for birds.

A specific request is asked of the Local Authority to assess the number of Whooper Swans nesting in the North-East Galway area.

This section goes to note the National Landscape Strategy and its core objective of protection and management of the landscape. It outlines how Inland Wetlands have declined between 2000 and 2018, and the obligations of the Council to protect the landscape.

Bogs

This section of the submission relates to Boglands, again listing a host of EU Directives, legal cases, and policies which place legal protections on several types of bog land (Active Raised, Degraded Raised, Blanket, Transition Mires, and Quaking Bogs). Specific notice is given to Ireland's breach of Article 6(1) due to failure of conservation of a large number of bog sites.

Implications for Renewable Energy Developments

The submission argues that bogland is not a suitable place for wind turbine developments, as the presence of these Annex I bog habitats in an area, whether they are officially designated as SACs or not, presents a fundamental conflict with the purpose of a large-scale industrial development. Their argument is that the previously outlined legal framework exists to prevent the potential environmental damage that such a project would cause. The submission lists the following potential negative impacts:

- Carbon release from peat disturbance,
- Hydrological damage from construction,
- Wind Farm Wake effect the potential for localised drying,
- Habitat and Biodiversity loss.

A request for a rigorous and detailed environmental assessment for development on peatlands is requested. Overall, the submission believes the policy of placing renewable energy projects on peatlands because they are seen as "unproductive" land is misguided. Their preservation and restoration should be prioritized and that there can be no reasonable scientific doubt as to the lack of adverse effects on the integrity of these priority habitats if windfarm developments are allowed to go ahead.

High Concentration of Protected Sites

A number of maps are included to support this submission, indicating the high concentration of protected sites.

Impacts on Birds

The submission notes the amount of Special Protection Areas in the area and the inhabitant birds, such as Golden Plover, and the potential of wind turbine impacts on such birds.

Risks to Hydrology and Peatlands

The risk to the local hydrology and peatlands is reiterated in this section of the submission.

Other Environmental Risks

Other risks are noted such as carbon release, habitat fragmentation, and geological vulnerability.

Conclusions

Ultimately the submission considers that that the area of North-East Galway and South Roscommon meets the criteria under Article 15c (ii), and thus allowing

renewable energy projects in this area would seriously compromise the ecological characteristics of the turloughs, bogs and karst landscape. The submission notes that CJEU has recognized that Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive has a wide spatial scope, which is not limited to the actual geographical area of the plan or location of the project concerned, and based on the above evidence it is believed by North East Galway Environmental Protection that Northeast Galway and South Roscommon require strict protection for areas of very high biodiversity and climate value. References and maps are included in the submission.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted.

However, the various topics in question in this observation do not form part of the proposed draft variation to the County Development Plan. The Renewable Area Strategy and the Landscape Character Assessment does not form part of this draft variation. This draft variation is limited to only consider observations which directly relate to the review and update of the existing Housing Strategy and Housing Need and Demand Assessment of the Galway County Development Plan with associated updates to the County Development Plan, the proposed updates to existing Policy Objectives and narrative in the County Development Plan which will place a renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands in the County, and the Rectification of Land use Zoning Map for Oranmore.

Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report. As such, this request falls outside the scope of the current variation process and cannot be considered at this time. As stated within the Variation notice, it should be noted that submissions can only be considered if they relate to an element of the proposed variation and any submission that does not relate to the proposed variation will not be considered.

The request for a Whooping Bird survey is noted, however this would not be within the scope of this variation. The appropriate statutory environmental assessments were carried out during the preparation of the 2022-2028 Galway County Council Development Plan process, likewise the appropriate statutory environmental assessments are being carried out as part of this variation process. Any further statutory plan making process or statutory plan review process would include similar appropriate environmental assessments. The LARES and LCA will be reviewed as part of the Galway County Development Plan review, which at this stage is expected to commence in June.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. A. Harney, seconded by Cllr. T. Welby and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-15 – MKO ON BEHALF OF THE O'DONNACHA FAMILY

Pg 69

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Settlement Capacity Audit and Area Based Transport Assessment

This submission relates to lands at Briarhill (R1b and R2a) and seeks clarification on the status of the lands in the context of the SCA and the forthcoming Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA). Submission notes that site R1b are considered Tier 1 in terms of infrastructure capacity. Submission considers that a planning application on lands R1b would be welcomed by the Planning Authority. Clarity is requested on the potential of a planning application on lands R1b in the context of the ABTA. Submission also queries phasing at Briarhill under policy objective BUFP 11 Phasing of the Development. Submission suggests that the SCA indicates that R1b are sufficiently serviced by existing infrastructure and a planning application for these lands would be timely, despite the continued absence of the ABTA.

Residential Zoned Land Tax

Submission notes that lands R1b have been included on the RZLT map. Clarity is sought on the inclusion of these lands for RZLT in the context of the ABTA. It is further stated that if development of the lands is premature in the absence of the ABTA, the lands should not be included on the RZLT map.

Submission requests an update on the ABTA.

Clarity is sought around the effects of Objectives GCMA 24 and BUFP 11 and how they interact with the Settlement Capacity Audit, and the resultant effect on these land holdings.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. The SCA indicates that infrastructure is present for the referenced sites at Briarhill. However, an ABTA must be carried out to facilitate the sustainable development of these lands in a coherent manner. While the RZLT falls outside the scope of Variation 1. It appears that lands R1b would meet all of the criteria for inclusion on the RZLT map.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-18 – MKO ON BEHALF OF JAMES COSTELLO

Pg 70

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

Settlement Capacity Audit and Area Based Transport Assessment

This submission relates to lands at Briarhill (R1a and R2a). Submission notes that lands R1b are considered Tier 1 in terms of infrastructure capacity.

Submission then states that a planning application on lands R1a would be welcomed by the Planning Authority. Clarity is requested on the potential of a planning application on the lands R1a in the context of the ABTA. It is further stated that the UFP for Briarhill indicates that development in the area will be phased in alignment

with the provision of infrastructure and connectivity and sets it in the context of the publication of the ABTA as per GCMA 24 and GCMA 11. Submission considers that the SCA would indicate that R1a are sufficiently serviced by existing infrastructure and that a planning application for these lands would be timely, despite the ABTA absence.

Residential Zoned Land Tax

R1a submission notes that these lands have been included in the RZLT map. Clarity is sought on the inclusion of these lands in the context of the ABTA. It is submitted that if development of the lands is premature in the absence of the ABTA, the lands should not be included on the RZLT map.

In summary, an ABTA update is requested. It is stated that lands R1b are appropriately serviced based on the SCA. Clarity is sought on how the SCA relates to policy objectives GCMA 24 and BUFP 1.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. The SCA indicates that infrastructure is present for the referenced sites at Briarhill. However, an ABTA must be carried out to facilitate the sustainable development of these lands in a coherent manner. While the RZLT falls outside the scope of Variation No.1. It appears that lands R1a would meet all of the criteria for inclusion on the RZLT map.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. J. McClearn and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-22 – GALWAY AIRPORT AVIATION BUSINESS CENTRE ACTION GROUP

Pg 71

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The following is a summary of the submission from the Galway Airport Aviation Business Centre Action Group submitted under the Proposed Variation No. 1 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.

This submission advocates for the retention of the runway at the Galway Airport site for aviation purposes. The group argues that the airport is a vital piece of strategic infrastructure that should be reopened as an aviation business centre rather than a commercial public transport hub. The primary goal is to enhance Galway's economic resilience, competitiveness, and connectivity to support high-value industries like medical devices, ICT, and advanced manufacturing.

The Key Points of the submission are as follows:

Strategic Aviation Asset: The group maintains that the existing runway is a strategic asset that, if lost, can never be recovered. The action group feel the runway should be safeguarded to provide direct air access for private and business travel.

Economic Competitiveness: Retaining the airport is seen as essential for keeping existing major employers in Galway and attracting new foreign direct investment (FDI), as proximity to an airport is a critical factor for multinational firms.

Business Efficiency: A local airport would convert "all-day travel burdens" into half-day or same-day journeys, significantly improving productivity for "executives, clients and engineers" who currently rely on road access to distant airports.

Future Innovation: The submission highlights emerging opportunities in the aviation ecosystem, such as drone-enabled logistics, unmanned aerial systems, and future electric aircraft to service offshore windfarms.

Policy Alignment: Reopening the airport is stated to align with national goals for balanced regional development and the expansion of the Atlantic Economic Corridor.

Strong Public Support: The group notes significant public interest, citing an online petition to "Reopen Carnmore Airport" that has gathered over 2,110 signatures without formal promotion.

Strategic over Financial Value: The conclusion emphasises that the case for the airport is "fundamentally strategic rather than purely financial," aimed at ensuring Galway remains a national and international centre for high-value employment.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. The Action Group should refer to Chapter 5 Economic, Enterprise and Retail Development which includes a Vision Document for the Former Galway Airport site. The contents of this submission fall outside the scope of Variation No.1.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. J. McClearn, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-31 – DAVID MULCAHY PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD ON BEHALF OF OAKWAY HOMES

Pg 72

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission welcomes the Variation's proposal to facilitate development on Residential Phase 2 lands. It seeks to amend Variation wording in Volume No.2 to align better with the text in Volume 1 regarding lands zoned Residential Phase 2.

The submission relates to two land holdings referred to as (Site 1 west and Site 2 east) in Bearna both primarily zoned Residential Phase 2 save for a portion of the site to the east which also has an Existing Residential zoning. The submission sets out the context, description and current zoning of the sites (the submission appears

to interchange references Site 1 west and Site 2 east). The submission further outlines some of the text included in the Proposed Variation and includes the SCA table for Bearna.

The submission suggests changes to remove perceived restrictions associated with Residential Phase 2 lands. Changes are suggested to Volume 2, S 1.10 to ensure consistency with text in volume 1. The submission requests the amendment of Policy Objective GCMA 1 Residential Development as follows:

a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements, and consider planning application for residential development on appropriate ~~reserve the~~ lands designated as Residential (Phase 2) ~~for the longer term growth needs of the area. Residential (Phase 2) lands are generally not developable within the lifetime of this Plan, with the exception of the following developments, which may be considered by the Planning Authority within the lifetime of this County Development Plan subject to a suitable case being made for the proposal:~~

~~1. Single house developments for family members on family owned lands.~~

~~2. Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area.~~

~~3. Where it is apparent that Residential (Phase 1) lands cannot or will not be developed within the plan period, residential development may be considered in a phased manner on some Residential (Phase 2) lands. The above exceptions will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in this Metropolitan Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted where a substantiated case has been made to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority and the development will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer term growth needs of this metropolitan area.~~

b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted.

In relation to the changes proposed to Policy Objective GCMA 1 Residential Development in the submission, it is considered that the proposed amendments to policy objective GCMA 1 as part of the Proposed Variation are in accordance with the goals and aspirations of the Section 28 Guidelines. It is considered that the updated relevant Policy Objectives throughout the CDP will allow the appropriate release of Residential Phase 2 lands. This will provide more flexibility and potentially more lands for housing delivery across the County. The Variation as set out will support the provision of housing on zoned land where appropriate and in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development. It is considered that the relevant Policy Objectives and supporting narrative have been amended appropriately and

sufficiently with a view to supporting the provision of housing on zoned land across the County. Again, this offers flexibility and releases lands for housing development in accordance with the Section 28 Guidelines.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

In relation to the next 3 submissions – GLW C200 33; GLW C200 34 & GLW C200 35, Ms. Loughnane noted that they were the same submissions but related to different areas. She further advised that all three submissions had been discussed in detail during the Workshop held on 06/02/2026.

Cllr. P. Feeney noted the issue of sequential growth and stated that R1 lands took precedence over R2 for development. He then enquired whether development of R2 lands would therefore be non-sequential, and thus whether An Coimisiún Pleanála would use this as an argument to prevent development. He stated that it would be unacceptable to have this line of argument used by frequent submitters to delay or prevent developments or used as the basis of a Judicial Review to do same.

Ms. Loughnane advised that one of the affected applicants attended the In-Person consultation event held in December 2025. She noted that these lands would have gone through SEA process in CDP already and OPR had seen, and were aware of the lands, and so this should give prospective developments a degree of assurance should an application be made. She advised that Galway County Council would make a supporting submission to ACP where appropriate. She advised that for such a submission, it would need to clearly enshrine the intentions of the Elected Members. She then added that specific policy objectives in the CDP have been amended for the five Local Area Plans, and that these plans were set to be subsumed into the next County Development Plan.

GLW C200-33 – ENVIROPLAN CONSULTING LTD ON BEHALF OF LIMEHILL ESKER CLAREGALWAY LTD

Pg 74-77

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission relates to Residential Phase 2 lands in Tuam and Ballinasloe and welcomes the renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands. However, the submission raises concerns that certain provisions remaining in the County Plan and the Proposed Variation could frustrate planning applications on residential phase 2 lands if not changed. The submissions raise concern with the use of the word sequential and notes that it can be assumed that lands zoned residential phase 2 lands are locationally acceptable. The submission requests that the term 'sequential growth' be omitted from the Proposed Variation.

Submission also requests that the wording of the proposed Variation should be amended so that the term 'sequential' is replaced with 'consolidated'. It is requested that this change is carried out in:

- Section 2.4.4 entitled "Future Settlement Growth", change "sequential growth" to "consolidated growth",

- Section 2.4.5 entitled "MASP", change "sequential manner" to "consolidated manner".

The submission raises concern that policy objectives that restrict Residential Phase 2 lands will remain as part of the proposed variation. Submission advises that if it is the intention of the Planning Authority to treat Residential Phase 2 lands as Residential Phase 1 then Policy Objectives such as GCMA 1, BUFP 21, GUPP 1, SGT1 and SGV 1 would need to be revised. Submission provides suggested text changes.

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
GCMA 1 Residential Development GCMA = Galway City Metropolitan Area	"(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands: 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in this Metropolitan Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development."
BUFP 1 Residential Development BUFP = Bnairhill Urban Framework Plan	"(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands: 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Briarhill Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development."
GUPP 1 Residential Development GUPP = Garraun Urban Framework Plan	"(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands: 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area

Minutes of Special Council Meeting held on 16th February 2026

		<p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.</p>
SGT 1 Residential Development	Residential Development	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Towns where appropriate.</p>
SGT = Small Growth Town		
SGV 1 Residential Development	Residential Development	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Village where appropriate.</p>
SGV = Small Growth Village		

The submission also states that the Variation does not offer guidance for Residential Phase 2 lands in the settlements of Tuam, Ballinasloe, Athenry, Loughrea and Gort and calls for specific policy objectives for Residential Phase 2 lands in these settlements.

The submission suggests a number of Policy Objectives which are outlined in the table below.

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
KT 1 Residential Development KT = Key Towns i.e. Tuam and Ballinasloe	<p>(e) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands. 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area. <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.*</p>
SP 1 Residential Development SP = Strategic Potential i.e. Athlery	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands. 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area. <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Athlery Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Bnathill Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.*</p>
SST 1 Residential Development SST = Self Sustaining Towns i.e. Loughrea & Gort	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands. 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area. <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.*</p>

Chief Executive Response

The contents of this submission are noted. It is also noted that the submission relates to lands in Tuam and Ballinasloe. Policy Objective SS2 Key Towns has been edited as part of Variation 1 with the sole purpose of considering Residential Phase 2 lands for development.

In addition, policy objectives SS3 Strategic Potential; SS4 Self Sustaining Towns are also included in the Proposed Variation where it is sought to support the provision of housing on zoned land where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

The proposed wording of the selected policy objectives and narrative are considered sufficient and appropriate to satisfy the overall purpose of Variation No.1.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. A. Harney, seconded by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-34 – ENVIROPLAN CONSULTING LTD ON BEHALF OF LEADLANE (ATHENRY) LTD

Pg 77-81

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission made by Enviroplan on behalf of Leadlane (Athenry) Ltd with Residential Phase 2 lands in Athenry.

Welcomes the renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands. However, the submission raises concerns that certain provisions remaining in the County Plan and the Proposed Variation could frustrate planning applications on Residential Phase 2 lands if not changed. The submission raises concern with the use of the word sequential and notes that it can be assumed that lands zoned Residential Phase 2 lands are locationally acceptable. The submission requests that the term 'sequential growth' be omitted from the Proposed Variation.

Submission also requests that the wording of the proposed Variation should be amended so that the term 'sequential' is replaced with 'consolidated'. It is requested that this change is carried out in:

- Section 2.4.4 entitled "Future Settlement Growth", change "sequential growth" to "consolidated growth",

- Section 2.4.5 entitled "MASP", change "sequential manner" to "consolidated manner".

The submission raises concern that policy objectives that restrict Residential Phase 2 lands will remain as part of the Proposed Variation. Submission advises that if it is the intention of the Planning Authority to treat Residential Phase 2 lands as Residential Phase 1 then Policy Objectives such as GCMA 1, BUFP 1, GUFP 1, SGT1 and SGV 1 would need to be revised. Submission provides suggested text changes.

Minutes of Special Council Meeting held on 16th February 2026

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
<p>GCMA 1 Residential Development</p> <p>GCMA = Galway City Metropolitan Area</p>	<p><i>“(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands</i> <i>2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area</i> <p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in this Metropolitan Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.”</i></p>
<p>BUFP 1 Residential Development</p> <p>BUFP = Bnarrhll Urban Framework Plan</p>	<p><i>“(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands</i> <i>2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area</i> <p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Briarrhll Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.”</i></p>
<p>GUFP 1 Residential Development</p> <p>GUFP = Garraun Urban Framework Plan</p>	<p><i>“(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands</i> <i>2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area</i> <p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.”</i></p>
	<p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.”</i></p>
<p>SGT 1 Residential Development</p> <p>SGT = Small Growth Town</p>	<p><i>“(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause</i> <i>2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area</i> <p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Towns where appropriate.”</i></p>
<p>SGV 1 Residential Development</p> <p>SGV = Small Growth Village</p>	<p><i>“(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause.</i> <i>2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area</i> <p><i>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</i></p> <p><i>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Village where appropriate.”</i></p>

The submission also states that the Variation does not offer guidance for Residential Phase 2 lands in the settlements of Tuam, Ballinasloe, Athenry, Loughrea and Gort and calls for specific policy objectives for Residential Phase 2 lands in these settlements.

The submission suggests a number of Policy Objectives which are outlined in the table below.

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
KT 1 Residential Development	(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to
KT = Key Towns i.e Tuam and Ballinasloe	<p>normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development."</p>
SP 1 Residential Development SP = Strategic Potential i.e Athenry	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Athenry Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Binnhill Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development."</p>
SST 1 Residential Development SST = Self Sustaining Towns i.e Loughrea & Gort	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate."</p>

Chief Executive Response

The contents of this submission are noted. It is also noted that the submission refers to lands in Athenry. Policy Objective SS3 Strategic Potential has been edited as part of Variation No.1 with the sole purpose of considering Residential Phase 2 lands for development.

In addition, policy objectives SS2 Key Towns and SS4 Self Sustaining Towns are also included in the Proposed Variation where it is sought to support the provision of housing on zoned land where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

The proposed wording of the selected policy objectives and narrative are considered sufficient and appropriate to satisfy the overall purpose of Variation No.1.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. T. Welby, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-35 – ENVIROPLAN CONSULTING LTD ON BEHALF OF PAT MALONE

Pg 81-85

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission made by Enviroplan on behalf of Pat Malone with Residential Phase 2 lands in Gort.

Welcomes the renewed focus on Residential Phase 2 lands. However, the submission raises concerns that certain provisions remaining in the County Plan and the Proposed Variation could frustrate planning applications on Residential Phase 2 lands if not changed. The submission raises concern with the use of the word sequential and notes that it can be assumed that lands zoned Residential Phase 2 lands are locationally acceptable. The submission requests that the term 'sequential growth' be omitted from the proposed variation.

Submission also requests that the wording of the Proposed Variation should be amended so that the term 'sequential' is replaced with 'consolidated'. It is requested that this change is carried out in:

- Section 2.4.4 entitled "Future Settlement Growth", change "sequential growth" to "consolidated growth",

- Section 2.4.5 entitled "MASP", change "sequential manner" to "consolidated manner".

The submission raises concern that policy objectives that restrict Residential Phase 2 lands will remain as part of the Proposed Variation. Submission advises that if it is the intention of the Planning Authority to treat Residential Phase 2 lands as Residential Phase 1 then Policy Objectives such as GCMA 1, BUFP 1, GUF 1, SGT1 and SGV 1 would need to be revised. Submission provides suggested text changes.

Minutes of Special Council Meeting held on 16th February 2026

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
<p>GCMA 1 Residential Development</p> <p>GCMA = Galway City Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in this Metropolitan Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
<p>BUFF 1 Residential Development</p> <p>BUFF = Bunscoil Urban Framework Plan</p>	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Bunscoil Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
<p>GUFF 1 Residential Development</p> <p>GUFF = Garraun Urban Framework Plan</p>	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Garraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.</p>
	<p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Urban Framework Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Garraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.</p>
<p>SGT 1 Residential Development</p> <p>SGT = Small Growth Town</p>	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause. 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Towns where appropriate.</p>
<p>SGV 1 Residential Development</p> <p>SGV = Small Growth Village</p>	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands, subject to a 7 year occupancy clause 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if it will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area.</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Small Growth Village where appropriate.</p>

The submission also states that the Variation does not offer guidance for Residential Phase 2 lands in the settlements of Tuam, Ballinasloe, Athenry, Loughrea and Gort and calls for specific policy objectives for Residential Phase 2 lands in these settlements.

The submission suggests a number of Policy Objectives which are outlined in the table below.

Policy Objective Ref. & Title	Suggested re-wording
KT 1 Residential Development	(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to
KT = Key Towns i.e. Tuam and Ballinasloe	<p>normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Metropolitan area where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
SP 1 Residential Development SP = Strategic Potential i.e. Athenry	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Athenry Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Brathill Urban Framework Plan where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
SST 1 Residential Development SST = Self Sustaining Towns i.e. Loughrea & Gort	<p>(a) Support the development of lands designated as Residential (Phase 1) and Residential (Phase 2) within the lifetime of the County Development Plan, subject to normal planning, access and servicing requirements. The following types of development may also be considered on Residential (Phase 2) lands,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single house developments for family members on family owned lands 2 Non-residential developments that are appropriate to the site context, any existing residential amenity and the existing pattern of development in the area <p>All developments will be subject to compliance with the Core Strategy in the County Development Plan, the Policy Objectives in the Local Area Plan, the principles of proper planning and sustainable development and to meeting normal planning, access and servicing requirements. Developments will only be permitted if will not prejudice the future use of the lands for the longer-term growth needs of this metropolitan area</p> <p>b) Support the provision of housing on zoned land in the Gurraun Urban Framework Plan where appropriate.</p>

Chief Executive Response

The contents of this submission are noted. It is also noted that the submission refers to lands in Gort. Policy Objective SS4 Self Sustaining Towns has been edited as part of Variation No.1 with the sole purpose of considering Residential Phase 2 lands for development.

In addition, policy objectives SS2 Key Towns and SS3 Strategic Potential are also included in the proposed variation where it is sought to support the provision of housing on zoned land where appropriate in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

The proposed wording of the selected policy objectives and narrative are considered sufficient and appropriate to satisfy the overall purpose of Variation No.1.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No Change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. S. Cunniffe and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-44 – EAMONN O HARA

Pg 85-87

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The purpose of the submission is to promote the development of Flowervale for housing delivery. The submission makes reference to the Housing Need and Demand Assessment and Settlement Capacity Audit of Variation No.1. The submission suggests that the SCA is solely focused on Residential Phase 1 and Residential Phase 2 lands and it is further suggested that the sites in the SCA are peripheral, lacking public and active travel connections. The submission again promotes the Flowervale site for housing delivery. It is further stated that the SCA does not focus on active travel and makes reference to the NTA submission in this regard. The submission advises that the Variation does not identify any site capable of delivering housing with support accommodation.

The submission makes the argument that the lands at Flowervale meet all requirements with additional factors making it an attractive location. The submission argues that the Flowervale lands represent the only credible delivery mechanism for objectives identified in the Gort LAP such as:

- Gort River Walk,
- Strategic walking and cycling connectivity to national routes,
- Enhanced pedestrian permeability within the town centre, and
- A future footbridge connection over the Gort River.

The submission makes the following requests:

1. Explicitly include the Flowervale lands within the HNDA and Settlement Capacity Audit as required housing capacity for Gort.
2. Acknowledge that identified Housing-With-Support need cannot be met elsewhere in a compliant location.
3. Recognise Flowervale as uniquely aligned with NTA guidance on multi-modal accessibility and transport-led site selection.
4. Support a minor zoning rationalisation or site-specific objective to enable integrated delivery.

5. Commit to constructive pre-planning engagement to bring forward a compliant scheme.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. The focus of the SCA is on Residential Phase 1 and Phase 2 lands. The Local Transport Plan for Gort focuses on improved active travel measures in the town. See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40 and the SCA.

The purpose of the Proposed Variation No.1 is to align with the requirements of the Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements (July 2025). In essence the Guidelines are seeking Local Authorities to assess the current adopted Development Plans against the requirement to provide the capacity to deliver housing to the extent identified in these Guidelines. These new requirements are in relation to new housing targets for each Local Authority, which may include specialised housing.

The HNDA does not identify specific sites for housing delivery.

Only submissions that relate directly to the proposed draft variation may be taken into account in the preparation of the Chief Executive's Report.

Chief Executive Recommendation

See Chief Executive's Response to GLW-C200-40

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. L. Harney, seconded by Cllr. P. Feeney and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. G. Donoghue queried whether there was an opportunity for her to discuss the HNDA in relation to the two submissions from E. O'Hara. Ms. Loughnane advised that discussion of the HNDA formed only part of today's proceedings. Cllr. G. Donoghue then enquired whether there was an opportunity to give Mr. O'Hara what he wanted in terms of the Flowervale site. Ms. Loughnane advised that it was beyond the scope of this Variation and that the CDP Review process would be the appropriate process for same. Ms. Loughnane clarified that the Section 28 Guidelines requested the bringing forward of additional land for residential development, which in this case was R2 lands. She stated that individual sites were not being analysed for the purpose of giving effect to this guidance. She stated that once the CDP review process was undertaken, with the five LAP's subsumed into it, then there would be adequate scope to access the zonings of individual sites.

GLW C200-45 – EAMONN O HARA

Pg 87

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

This submission is a clarification of submission GLW-C200-44.

The submission wishes to address the obligation on the HNDA to demonstrate how identified housing need can be delivered in practice, in accordance with national policies.

The submission wishes to clarify the following:

The submission claims that the HNDA cannot lawfully identify the need for Housing-With-Support/older persons in Gort without identifying at least one viable delivery location.

Not to show Flowervale as a "preferred site" but to only demonstrate the sites positive qualities.

That the Open Space zoning on the lands has no viable path to implementation.

The issue of the submission is around the identification of need in the HNDA without demonstration of a mechanism to deliver the required development.

The submission directly requests the following:

Justify the HNDA identification of need without identification of sites, and

Confirm if the Flowervale site is an acceptable site to contribute to HNDA-identified need.

Chief Executive Response

The basis in which Local Authorities must conduct a HNDA stems from the National Planning Framework: First Revision.

Zoned sites for delivery of residential development have been identified across County Galway.

It is noted that the site at Flowervale is zoned as Existing Residential in the Gort Local Area Plan.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. K. McHugh Farag, seconded by Cllr. T. Welby and agreed by the Members.

GLW C200-46 – EAST GALWAY WINDFARM ACTION ALLIANCE

Pg 88

Ms. Loughnane gave an overview of the issues raised in this submission and read CE Response.

The submission states that the East Galway Windfarm Action Alliance represents 5 No. of communities in East Galway. The submission is specifically related to the cumulative and long-term impacts of large-scale wind energy developments on rural communities. While noting the essential role of renewable energy in national policies, it also seeks that the Development Plan addresses the unintended consequence of wind farm zoning, as in the opinion of the East Galway Windfarm Action Alliance such zonings can have negative impact on one-off rural housing and small-scale cluster developments through for example, sterilisation, setbacks and objections on

planning applications by wind farm operators. The submission seeks a more balanced approach between wind energy development and rural housing. These effects undermine rural settlement patterns, weakens family and community ties, and runs counter to national and local policy objectives aimed at sustaining rural populations and services according to the submission. The submission seeks that the Development Plan addresses these issues to better balance the proper planning and sustainable development of rural areas with specific reference to the balance between renewable energy development and rural living.

Chief Executive Response

The contents of the submission are noted. However, this does not specifically fall within the scope of Variation No.1. The County Development Plan, including Chapter 4 Rural Living and Development and the contents of the Local Authority Renewable Energy Strategy do not seek to prohibit rural housing in County Galway. The planning application statistics for the County would indicate positive delivery of housing across the County in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.

Chief Executive Recommendation

No change.

The CE recommendation was proposed by Cllr. T. Welby, seconded by Cllr. T. Grealish and agreed by the Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised that all submissions received had been dealt with. She advised that AA and SEA Conclusion Statements would now be read into the record.

AA DETERMINATION

Mr. Corcoran brought up SEA and AA Determination on screen and read it into record of Meeting. It was Noted by Members.

Ms. Loughnane advised it was now time for passing of the resolution to adopt the Plan. She advised that the Variation is effective immediately once the resolution was passed by the Members.

RESOLUTION FOR MAKING OF VARIATION 1 TO THE GALWAY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2022 - 2028

Having considered the contents of Variation 1, the Chief Executive's Report on submissions received and the

- The Screening for Strategic Environmental Assessment Report for Proposed Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (Original Report and Updated Report following public display).

- The Screening for Appropriate Assessment (AA) Report for Proposed Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. (Original Report and Updated Report following public display).
- The SEA Screening Determination for the Proposed Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. (Original Determination and Updated Determination following public display).
- The AA Screening Determination for the Proposed Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. (Original Determination and Updated Determination following public display).
- Written submissions relating to SEA, AA and SFRA made during the Variation preparation process.
- Ongoing advice on SEA, AA and SFRA from the Council's agents

In accordance with the provisions of Section 13 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the Elected Members of Galway County Council agree, by resolution, to make Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan, as recommended by the Chief Executive in his report and at the Special Meeting of 16th February 2026 and to proceed in accordance with Section 13 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) to publish notice of the making of Variation 1 of the Galway County Development Plan.

The Resolution for making Variation 1 to the Galway County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 was proposed by Cllr. D. Collins seconded by Cllr. L. Harney and agreed by the Members.

Cllr. D. Geraghty requested that potential amendment of the Habitats Directive and other environmental legislation should be inserted into the agenda for a future meeting.

CE L. Conneally thanked the Members for their work during this process and noted that Galway County Council were now the third Local Authority in the country to have given effect to the Section 28 Guidelines through this Variation. He stated that it sent a very significant signal to Government, to the citizens in Galway and the Construction sector that Galway was open for business. He further stated that Galway County Council had now accommodated in excess of 7,500 additional units with the bringing into parity of R2 lands with R1 lands. He thanked Mr. Hanrahan, Ms. Loughnane, Mr. Corcoran and Forward Planning Team for their work as well as the Councillors for their deliberation during the process.

Ms. Loughnane also thanked her Forward Planning Team for their work during the process and thanked the Members, the Chief Executive and An Cathaoirleach.

An Cathaoirleach D. Collins, on behalf of all the Councillors thanked all the Forward Planning Team for all their hard work on getting Variation completed.

The Meeting ended.

Submitted, Signed and Approved

Cathaoirleach:



Date:

23/3/2026

