

Monthly Meeting (Draft County Development Plan 2021-2027)

Reconvened – Thursday 01 October 2020 at 6pm

Minutes of the Adjourned Council Meeting of Louth County Council held in St. Gerard's Hall, Dundalk on Thursday 01st October 2020 at 6pm

In Attendance: -

Executive: J Martin (CE), F Pentony (DOS), P Donnelly (DOS), Alan Sherry (Meetings Administrator)

Councillors: M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, K Meenan, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully, A Watters, M Yore (18)

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C. Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty (11)

Forward Planning Staff: Joanna Kelly - Senior Planner, Turlough King - Senior Executive Planner, Gerard Brennan – Executive Planner, Ciara Doran, Assistant Planner, Clare O'Hagan, Senior Staff Officer

Minute No. 154/20

Consideration of the Louth County Development Plan:

1. Motion No. 28 (continuation from 30.09.20) – Cllr. K Meenan

Proposed amendment

Cllr. K Meenan – proposed insertion of text in to Section 3.14

The Senior Planner provided a revised wording with regard to Section 3.14 to reflect national policy guidance.

The limited use of vehicular cul-de-sacs may be considered in residential developments where there is a particular concern regarding through traffic or challenges in creating an inclusive, safe, and secure living environment. This will only be considered where their use would not dominate such layouts. On larger and/or irregular blocks short cul-de-sacs may also be used for midblock penetration to serve a small number of dwellings and to enable more compact/ efficient forms of development.

Cllr. K Meenan indicated that he was happy to accept the amended wording

Proposed by: Cllr. K Meenan Seconded by Cllr. M Yore

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, K Meenan, D Minogue, E Tully, A Watters, M Yore– **Total 15**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, A McKeivitt, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, L Reilly, T Sharkey, J Sheridan, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 14**

The amendment was passed.

2. Motions No. 29, No. 30, No. 63 and No. 64 (the proposed additional text/wording is in blue) Cllr A Watters and Cllr. H Conlon

Proposed amendment

No. 29 Cllr A Watters – re: to provide additional clarity with regard to replacement dwellings – Insertion of text in to Section 3.19 ‘Whilst there is a general presumption in favour of retaining and refurbishing existing dwellings, particularly traditional vernacular dwellings that are part of the traditional housing stock and important features in the rural landscape; there will be instances where the replacement of existing dwellings may be acceptable.

Permission for the replacement of a vernacular dwelling will only be considered where it is demonstrated the subject vernacular dwelling is not reasonably capable of being made structurally sound or otherwise improved.’

Additional Policy Objective: To ensure the design, scale, and layout of any replacement dwelling does not have a visual impact significantly greater than the dwelling to be replaced.

To require applications for replacement dwellings to comply with the standards and criteria set out in section 13.12.11 of Chapter 13 Development Management Guidelines ‘Replacement Dwellings’.

Additional text Chapter 13 Section 13.12.11 ‘Consideration will be given to the replacement of existing habitable dwellings where the dwelling to be replaced is not considered to be a vernacular building or does not make an important contribution to local heritage. In cases where a dwelling has recently been destroyed by a fire consideration will be given for a replacement dwelling.

The following criteria shall be considered as part of the assessment of any application for a replacement dwelling:

- The original structure was last used as a dwelling and that its roof, internal and external walls are generally intact.
- In the assessment of whether a house which it is proposed to replace is habitable or not, the
- Planning Authority will rely on the definition of a “habitable house” as defined in section 2 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- The new dwelling shall not have a visual impact significantly greater than the dwelling to be replaced.
- The new dwelling shall be located within the curtilage of the dwelling to be replaced and shall generally be located on the footprint of the dwelling to be replaced unless it can be demonstrated that an alternative position would provide visual, environmental, public health, or traffic safety benefits.
- Where an existing access to a dwelling to be replaced does not meet current road safety standards consideration shall be given to improving the design of the access in the interests of road safety. See section 13.23.12 for further details.
- All necessary services shall be capable of being provided without creating significant adverse impact on the local landscape or environment

No. 30 Cllr. H Conlon – re: to provide additional clarity for vernacular building proposals

Insertion of additional text in to Section 3.18 - ‘Traditional vernacular dwellings make an important contribution to the character of the rural landscape in the County. The Council will encourage the preservation of vernacular dwellings through careful restoration and adaptation over their demolition and replacement. The Council will also encourage the restoration or adaptation of vernacular buildings such as former schoolhouses, churches, and traditional farm outbuildings. Section 13.12.11 provides further information on the design criteria for the restoration of vernacular dwellings and buildings.

Insertion of additional Policy Objective in to Section 3.18 - To encourage the sensitive

refurbishment of existing vernacular dwellings and buildings and to generally resist the demolition and replacement of these buildings in order to protect the traditional building and housing stock and preserve the built heritage in the rural parts of the County. To require applications for replacement dwellings to comply with the standards and criteria set out in section 13.**.** of Chapter 13 Development Management Guidelines 'Refurbishment of existing vernacular dwellings and buildings'.

Insertion of additional text in to section 3.12.11 - The following criteria shall be considered as part of the assessment of any application to refurbish or extend a vernacular dwelling or building:

- The structural integrity of the building.
- A building Survey/Engineer's Report from
- A suitably qualified professional shall be included with any application confirming
- That all external structural walls and internal walls are substantially intact and the building is capable of being renovated/refurbished without demolition.

No. 63 Cllr. H Conlon – re: to include additional wording in Section 9.8 'such as thatch' and 'including thatched cottages'

No. 64 Cllr H. Conlon re: insertion of additional wording in Section 9.9 Historic Building Stock 'thatched cottages', BHC36 – replacement of word 'town' with 'urban' and TOU 27 – insertion of wording 'including thatched cottages'

Cllr. A Watters queried the timeline between the existing Plan leading in to the new Plan with regard to outline permission and if full planning permission would be based on the old or new Plan. The Senior Planner advised that local needs would have been established on the outline permission sought and that the permission consequent with regard to site specifics would be based on the new Plan, with the process taking a total of 5 years between outline and consequent permissions. It was also outlined that the new Plan wouldn't be adopted until August of 2021 with a subsequent 6 weeks to take effect, allowing for a substantial lead in period.

Proposed by Cllr. A Watters **Seconded by:** Cllr T. Cunningham

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, K Meenan, D Minogue, J Sheridan, E Tully, A Watters, M Yore– **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, A McKevitt, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, L Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 13**

The amendment was passed.

3. Motions No. 31 – Cllr A Watters

Proposed amendment

Cllr A Watters – proposal to amend the boundary at Lordship

The Senior Planner advised that in relation to L5's that is was an overall number allocated to the settlements and that the council would need to be satisfied that the proposal, when looked at in an holistic manner would met the requirements of the L5's and the Rural Housing Policy.

The CE advised that Lordship was not serviced i.e. no sewage scheme in place

Motion withdrawn

4. Motions No. 32 – Cllr E Tully

Proposed amendment

Cllr E Tully – re: identification of additional lands for residential development in Baltray
--

Cllr Tully outlined the rationale for the proposal to allow for a second entry point in to the village. The Senior Planner advised of an extant permission currently being developed out with a through route that would run up to the location of the existing road laneway and the justification for the proposed additional zoning wouldn't be warranted as through connection was possible and not contingent on zoning lands for provision of a road. She also indicated that the road up to the red line boundary was a public road.

The CE advised that she was opposed to any settlement boundary being extended, as zoning was oversubscribed as it was.

Cllr Tully advised that building needed to be provided on higher rather than lower ground as they were subject to flooding.

The Senior Planner advised that she was satisfied that adequate lands were zoned in Baltray with the extant permission and that a population increase may not be commensurate with existing population levels and that is was unjustified to zone additional lands to create a through road.

Following further discussion with regard to the de-zoning of lands the CE advised that the remaining lands zoned new residential would have to be de-zoned to cover the area being re-zoned.

The motion was withdrawn

5. Motions No. 33 - Cllr P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr P McGeough – To include a provision in the Plan for Senior Citizens to return and build in their native area as follows: “That senior citizens who in the past moved into settlements to raise their family be allowed to return and build in their native area be it rural or otherwise, this may involve downsizing. The rational for returning home is that their siblings or their children who live in the area can provide care”

Cllr McGeough outlined the reasoning for his proposal.

The Senior Planner advised that she would be opposed to the proposal based on the Rural Housing Policy etc. as it further diluted the current policies in the Plan and questioned as to how it would comply with national policy and also as to the definition of senior citizens. She also advised that general ties to family would be in the settlement in which they were currently residing and that ties to the rural area would be distant. It was also outlined that current policies provided support for housing adaptations etc.

Following further discussion from the floor, the CE advised that a number of surveys of older people had been undertaken which highlighted that they wished to remain in their own area and in some cases downsize to a 1-2 bed house in an urban settlement.

Proposed by: Cllr P McGeough

Seconded by: Cllr. A Watters

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, H Conlon, T Cunningham, P McGeough, K Meenan, D Minogue, A Watters, M Yore– **Total 7**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, E Coffey, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, A McKevitt, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully, M Yore - **Total 11**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was defeated.

6. Motion No. 34 - Cllr A McKevitt

Proposed amendment

Cllr A McKevitt – proposal re: Backland Development (Chapter 13, Section 13.12.6), proposal re: Ribbon Development and proposal re: addition to Table 3.4 to provide for native residents with exceptional health related issues.

Backland Development: [Backland Development will only be considered in Rural Policy Zones 1 and 2 where the applicant's site has been owned by the family for at least 15 years and the landholding is at least 1.5hectares. Only one dwelling will be permitted per landowner. Any backland development should be accompanied by a deed of right of way to the proposed dwelling and must not have a negative impact on traffic safety.](#)

The Senior Planner advised that the proposal in relation to backland Development was contrary to national policy and that submissions would be expected if it was put forward for the Draft Plan. The Senior Planner also clarified as to the text provided in relation to backland development in the pre-draft plan.

Proposed by: Cllr A McKevitt

Seconded by: Cllr S Kelly

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, C Keelan, S Kelly P McGeough, A McKevitt K Meenan, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully A Watters, M Yore– **Total 15**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, M Doyle, F MacRaghnaill, - **Total 3**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was carried.

Motion No. 34 - Ribbon Development - Cllr. McKevitt

Proposed amendment

Cllr. McKevitt advised the proposal put forward was to provide for people who had no other land available.
--

The CE advised that motion put forward could not be used for DM and sought to clarify the proposal i.e. build anywhere. The Senior Planner advised that the wording used in the Plan had been adopted from national guidelines. The existing plan provided for 4 along 300m, with this plan allowing for 5 along 250m, as per national guidelines, giving a degree of flexibility.

Cllr. E Coffey suggested that a definition of Ribbon Development be provided for in the Plan.

The Senior Planner advised that section 13.12.5 refers to ribbon development. It was also advised that the amount of rural housing in the countryside and the pattern of development would need to be looked at and reiterated that provision made in the plan was in line with national guidelines.

Following some further discussion Cllr. McKevitt withdrew the proposal.

Motion No. 34 – Cllr. McKevitt

Proposed amendment

Cllr. McKevitt – proposal for additional text be added to Table 3.4 to provide for native residents with exceptional health related issues to build in Rural Policy Zone 1 if they own family land there.

The Senior Planner highlighted concern with regard the wording provided and indicated that a native resident was defined in the plan and that an amendment already put through dealt with the issue. Also that Zone 1 contains AONB and any policy should be to protect these areas.

Following some further discussion from the floor the Senior Planner advised that the policy, as already amended was being watered down impacting on rural housing need, landscape etc.

Cllr. M Doyle expressed an issue with the wording used, in that it was very subjective.

The Senior Planner outlined that if someone already resides in Z1 that there is provision to allow for houses to be adapted to their needs. Further the amendment to the pre-draft plan in respect of housing policies in Zone 1 as passed by the Members provided further scope for rural housing in this Zone and the need for this specific policy was unjustified.

Motion withdrawn.

7. Motions No. 35, No. 36 and No. 42 - Cllr M Hall

Proposed amendment

Cllr M Hall proposals:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motion No 35 – insertion of additional text in to Section 4.7.2 ‘Play facilities for |
|---|

children'

The Council recognises the need to maximise opportunities for play facilities for children. 'Ready, Steady, Play! A National Play Policy' seeks to raise awareness of the importance of play and contribute to the expansion of play facilities. This National Play Policy is about creating better play opportunities for children. The Council will support the provision of playgrounds in a variety of land use zoning categories where appropriate.

Insert an additional policy objective: To maximise the range of public play opportunities available to all children

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

Proposed by: Cllr. Joanna Byrne **Seconded by:** Cllr. M Yore

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M. Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKeivitt K Meenan, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully A Watters, M Yore– **Total 18**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was carried.

- **Motion No. 36 – Cllr M Hall**

Proposed amendment

Insertion of text in to Section 4.8 'a permanent studio space is required for artists in Drogheda.

The CE queried the purpose of the statement with regard to Motion No. 36 and was of the opinion that it shouldn't be included in the Plan.

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

Proposed by: Cllr. F MacRaghnaill **Seconded by:** Cllr. Joanna Byrne

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, T Cunningham, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough K Meenan, A Watters – **Total 6**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, E Coffey, H Conlon, M. Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly , J Sheridan, E Tully, M. Yore **Total 12**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was defeated.

• **Motion No. 42 – Cllr M Hall**

Proposed amendment

Insertion of additional text in Section 5.7.1 –

Cross Border Investment “Louth County Council will continue to collaborate with East Border Region Ltd, a Local Authority led cross border network, to protect and improve the prosperity of residents in the border counties and continue to work alongside the members from Monaghan and Meath County Councils and Armagh City, Banbridge and Craigavon Borough Council, Ards and North Down Borough Council and Newry Mourne and Down District Council.

EU Structural Funds such as INTERREG VA and going forward, PEACE PLUS, a new EU cross-border programme, provides funds that will contribute to a more prosperous and stable society in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland. It is managed by SEUPB and implemented by East Border Region Ltd. The programme will achieve this by funding activities that promote peace and reconciliation and contribute to the cross-border economic and territorial development of the region.’

The CE advised that in relation to Motion No. 42, that Louth is already part of the East Border Region didn't feel the need to elaborate any further.

Following discussion from the floor Motion No. 42 was withdrawn

8. Motion No. 37 - Cllr M Hall

Proposed amendment

Cllr M Hall – proposal to insert additional text in to Policy Objective SC24 ‘especially post-primary in Northern Environs’

Cllr S Kelly advised of the similarity between the proposed motion and Motion No. 36 i.e. identification of particular locations.

The CE advised of an MOU at national level between LCC and Dept. of Education for provision of schools and the LCC would always work with the Department in providing/acquiring a suitable site.

Proposal withdrawn

9. Motions No. 38 and Motion No. 62 - Cllr Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr Keelan advised that he was withdrawing his proposal in relation to SC13 (Motion 38) and proposed a further amended wording to NGB46 (Motion 62) to be inserted in to Section 2.15 ‘to recognise a strategic piece of infrastructure at the former Dundalk Landfill Site be developed for playing pitches and for recreation purposes during the lifetime of the Plan.’

The CE advised against the use of the wording ‘during the lifetime of the plan’, based on advice given by Engineering staff, that the site was not ready to be developed on. Following further discussion from the floor Cllr. Keelan accepted the proposal to remove the wording ‘during the lifetime of the Plan’.

Proposed by: Cllr. C Keelan

Seconded by: Cllr. M Doyle

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly P McGeough, A McKeivitt K Meenan, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully, A Watters, M Yore– **Total 17**

Against: Cllr. F MacRaghnaill, - **Total 1**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was carried.

10. Motions No. 39 - Cllr H Conlon and Cllr C Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr H Conlon and Cllr C Keelan amalgamated two proposals in relation to graveyards and proposed to insert the additional text in blue into policy objective SC 44:

To protect and maintain historic graveyards within the County **and to give specific recognition to the historic potential associated of some namely: Old Castletown Cemetery, Old Faughart Graveyard, Kane Graveyard and to promote awareness accordingly through the Tourism Section and to support local communities in their endeavours with the upkeep and maintenance.**

Cllr. H Conlon proposed to amend policy objective SC 44 to include for the addition of Salterstown Graveyard.

The Senior Planner suggested an amendment to omit the specific graveyards and to keep the text

‘to support local communities in their endeavours with the upkeep and maintenance.’

F Pentony advised that the Council weren’t in a position to provide support but that the Council would continue to assist in terms of grants.

Following further discussion the CE advised that the Council would not be taking on legal responsibility for any additional graveyards or giving financial commitment by way of the Development Plan for communities.

Proposed by: Cllr H Conlon

Seconded by: Cllr C Keelan

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, H Conlon, C Keelan, P McGeough, K Meenan - **Total 5**

Against: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, T Cunningham, M Doyle, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully, A Watters - **Total 12**

Abstained: Cllr M Yore - **Total 1**

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was defeated.

11. Motion No. 40 - Cllr E Coffey

Proposed amendment

Cllr E Coffey – proposal for the inclusion of a policy objective ‘EE 46’ in relation to the location of whiskey maturation facilities ‘To support the provision of whiskey maturation facilities within the open countryside where the scale of such development is appropriate to the location and surrounding area which is located in reasonable proximity to appropriate levels of infrastructure and road access.’

Cllr Coffey provided further specifics with regard to the proposal

Proposed by: Cllr E Coffey

Seconded by: Cllr. S Kelly

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, C Keelan, S Kelly, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, K Meenan, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, E Tully, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 14**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, M Doyle - **Total 2**

Abstained: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, F MacRaghnaill - **Total 2**

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was carried.

12. Motion No. 41 - Cllr E Coffey

Proposed amendment

Cllr E Coffey – proposal for the insertion of additional text in to section 5.7.1 – Cross Border Investment

Proposal withdrawn

13. Motions No. 42, No. 43 and No. 44

Already dealt with/withdrawn.

14. Motion No. 45 - Cllr E Coffey

Proposed amendment

Cllr M Hall – proposal to omit the wording ‘Tattoo Parlours’ from the list of lower order retailing Section 5.24.1

In the absence of Cllr Hall, the Senior Planner advised that the reasoning for the proposal to remove the wording is because Cllr. Hall felt that it was of a discriminatory nature.

Proposed by: Cllr. F MacRaghnaill

Seconded by: Cllr. M Doyle

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, T Cunningham, M Doyle, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, K Meenan, D Minogue, E Tully, A Watters– **Total 9**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, E Coffey, H Conlon, C Keelan, S Kelly, A McKeivitt, L Reilly, J Sheridan, M Yore - **Total 9**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty - **Total 11**

The motion was carried, following a casting vote by the Chair, Cllr. D Minogue.

15. Motion No. 46 - Cllr P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr P McGeough – proposal to insert additional text ‘Ardee **MUST** be prioritised by Louth County Council in conjunction with statutory agencies as a location for FDI opportunities’

The CE advised that FDI was a matter for the IDA and that the council could not influence them in prioritisation of areas within the county.

The Senior Planner made reference to Policy EE 5 which covers Louth. Cllr McGeough accepted the wording but felt that it needed to be specific to the Ardee area.

The CE advised that she could not accept the wording ‘**MUST** be prioritised’ as suggested. Cllr. McGeough requested that the CE to provide alternate wording that would encapsulate the wording provided in 5.13 and EE 44.

Cllr P McGeough advised that he wished to include the text ‘**emphasising FDI**’ into Policy Objective EE 44

Proposed by: Cllr P McGeough

Seconded by: Cllr. D Minogue

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, H Conlon, T Cunningham, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, D Minogue, J Sheridan, A Watters – **Total 8**

Against: Cllrs. M. Butler, E. Coffey, C. Keelan, S. Kelly, A. McKeivitt, L. Reilly, M. Yore - **Total 7**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M. Doyle, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 14**

The motion was carried

16. Motion No. 47 - Cllr C Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr C Keelan – proposal to insert a new Policy Objective in to Chapter 6 Tourism – ‘**To recognise the medieval and industrial heritage of Dundalk and its surrounding district through engagement with Fáilte Ireland and associated agencies.**’

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

17. Motion No. 48

Motion superceded – refer to Motion No. 47 above

18. Motion No. 49 and No. 50

Motions withdrawn

19. Motion No. 51 - Cllr. H Conlon

Proposed amendment

Cllr. H Conlon – proposal to insert a section on the Bord Fáilte Strategy ‘Irish Sea Way’

F Pentony advised that the proposal was only at concept stage with Fáilte Ireland and that it would be premature to put anything in the Plan at this stage.

Motion withdrawn

20. Motion No. 52 - Cllr. P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr. P McGeough – proposal to insert a Policy Objective ‘ To support the provision of camper van facilities at appropriate locations in the County subject to any facilities being acceptable in terms of location, visual impact, and compliance with any environmental assessments required. ’

Proposed by: Cllr P McGeough

Seconded by: Cllr. Joanna Byrne

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKevitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

21. Motion No. 53 - Cllr. C Keelan

Cllr. C Keelan – proposal to insert additional text into Policy Objective MOV 4

Motion withdrawn

22. Motion No. 54 - Cllr. C Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr. C Keelan – proposal to insert additional text into Policy Objective MOV 30
To continue to engage and work closely with the OPW and other stakeholders in the development of the Coastal Greenway from Dundalk to Blackrock, [including the delivery of such infrastructure on both sides of the Castletown River](#), and Baltray to Drogheda to Louth Coastal Defence Projects.

Cllr M Butler sought clarification with regard to checks re: SEA? The Senior Planner advised that all motions made were being fed across to Environmental Consultants to be considered in terms of strategic environmental assessment.

Proposed by: Cllr. C Keelan

Seconded by: Cllr. E Coffey

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 15**

Against: Cllr. M Butler **Total 1**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

23. Motions No. 55, No. 56, No. 57 and No. 58

Cllr. H Conlon queried as to the text proposed in relation to Motion No. 55. The CE advised a general text had been drafted to include for the carrying out of assessments.

Motions withdrawn

24. Motion No. 59 - Cllr. P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr. P McGeough – proposal for provision of a Park and Ride facility

The CE referred to a study undertaken, on foot of which the priority one picked at Dundalk and that TII were looking at it as a pilot, with the possibility of getting further ones later on. The CE also outlined that parking at interchanges was a big problem [nationwide](#), not just in Louth.

The Senior Planner referred the members to MOV18 which deals with provision of park and ride facilities.

Cllr. P McGeough asked if Junction 14 could be specifically mentioned in MOV 18. A number of other suggestions were made by the members i.e. adjacent to motorway interchanges etc. The CE advised that it may not just apply to motorway interchanges and that it may encompass the outskirts of large towns.

The Senior Planner cautioned the use of mentioning specific locations

It was agreed to keep current wording as per MOV18

25. Motion No. 60 - Cllr. P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr. P McGeough – proposal to prioritise the Eastern bypass of Ardee

The Senior Planner advised, having liaised with the Infrastructure Section, that the Road in question was not identified in any capital programme works. The CE advised that a decision was made not to undertake any improvements works north of Ashbourne and in the absence of anything happening re: Slane Bypass, it was unlikely of anything being undertaken in Ardee and if put forward would run into difficulty re: funding. The CE also advised that it was needed and was hopeful of something happening in the future.

Cllr. Minogue queried as to whether artic lorries etc. could be stopped from going through Ardee town. Cllr. McGeough asked if a Policy Objective could be included to deal with gridlock in Ardee.

The CE referred to MOV 41 which covered the western end and advised that the proposal could be included, but may be removed following submissions on the Draft Plan. It was agreed that the executive would assist in formulating wording in respect of this proposed amendment.

Proposed by: Cllr. P McGeough

Seconded by: Cllr. D Minogue

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, F MacRaghnaill, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

26. Motion No. 61 – Cllr. H Conlon

Proposed amendment

Cllr. H Conlon – proposal to insert additional text into Policy Objective MOV40

To support the progression of the long term upgrade of the N2; and in particular to protect the selected route of the upgrade road scheme between Ardee and Castleblayney, and prohibit development that could prejudice its future delivery; and to continue to work closely with Transport Infrastructure Ireland, Monaghan County Council, [property owners](#), and [residents affected](#), and other stakeholders in the delivery of this project.

The CE advised that the consultation process as it stood involved property owners and residents and that every part of planning process involves a public consultation element i.e. receipt of submissions etc., but queried as to whether 'work closely' was appropriate with regard to property owners/residents.

Proposed by: Cllr. H Conlon

Seconded by: Cllr. A Watters

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, H Conlon, T Cunningham, C Keelan, P McGeough, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 10**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, E Coffey, M Doyle, S Kelly, L Reilly - **Total 5**

Abstained: Cllr. F MacRaghnaill **Total 1**

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

27. Motions No. 62, No. 63 and No. 64

Motion No. 62 – withdrawn

Motions No. 63 and No. 64 – already dealt with

28. Motion No. 65 - Cllr. J Sheridan

Proposed amendment

Cllr. J Sheridan – proposal for the inclusion of 2 structures on the Record of Protected Structures

1. The Bridge on the Dublin-Belfast railway line over the River Dee at Dromin called “Ardee Br” on the OS Map. The river bridge is a very large viaduct of two or three arches.
2. Just north of “Ardee Br” is a bridge called “Blackmill Br”, it is a railway bridge over a private lane.

The CE queried as to whether the two structures were on an active railway line and advised that it was a separate process when adding structures to the RPS in that owners/occupiers were required to be notified.

The Senior Planner queried the grounds for the protection of the structures, in light of not having a conservation report/technical report to support the proposal.

Cllr. Sheridan asked for the members support to enter into the process to include the structures on the Record of Protected Structures.

Proposed by: Cllr. J Sheridan

Seconded by: Cllr. E Coffey

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, P McGeough, F MacRaghnaill, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

29. Motion No. 66

Already dealt with

30. Motion No. 67 - Cllr. C Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr. C Keelan – proposal for the inclusion of additional text into Policy Objective ENV 31 To encourage forestry and forestry related development, as a means of diversifying from traditional agriculture activity, [with a preference for native species](#).

Proposed by: Cllr. C Keelan

Seconded by: Cllr. M Yore

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, P McGeough, F MacRaghnaill, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

31. Motion No. 68 - Cllr. C Keelan

Proposed amendment

Cllr. C Keelan – proposal for the inclusion of additional text into Policy Objective ENV 58 To encourage proposals that promote sustainable development of water-based sports and marine recreation [in coastal areas and on river systems across the County](#) providing there is no cause of significant adverse impacts on the environment, visual amenity and heritage.

Proposed by: Cllr. C Keelan

Seconded by: Cllr. E Coffey

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, P McGeough, F MacRaghnaill, A McKeivitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 15**

Against: Cllr. M Butler - **Total 1**

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

32. Motion No. 69 - Cllr. P McGeough

Proposed amendment

Cllr. P McGeough – proposal for the inclusion of Policy Objective for the provision of a Recycling Centre in mid Louth area.
--

The CE advised that no text had been proposed and that including for a Recycling Facility in the Plan didn't make it happen.

Cllr. Keelan proposed for wording 'either Ardee or Dunleer'

The CE advised that there were no plans to have a facility in the mid Louth area, due to the fact that there were already two facilities in the county in both Drogheda and Dundalk, but there was nothing to stop a proposal from a developer etc. being made.

Cllr Butler proposed wording 'to support the development of a Recycling Centre in the mid-Louth area', which would cover either Ardee or Dunleer and to which Cllr McGeough was agreeable.

Proposed by: Cllr. M Butler

Seconded by: Cllr. L Reilly

A roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, E Coffey, H Conlon, T Cunningham, M Doyle, C Keelan, S Kelly, P McGeough, F MacRaghnaill, A McKevitt, D Minogue, L Reilly, J Sheridan, A Watters, M Yore – **Total 16**

Against: Total 0

Abstained: Total 0

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 13**

The motion was carried

The Senior Planner advised that a new section would be required to facilitate the addition of new text as proposed. Cllr. M Butler proposed that it could go under Section 11.1.9, to which the Senior Planner was agreeable.

33. Motions No. 70, No. 71 and No. 72

The Senior Planner advised that Motions No. 70 and 71 had been withdrawn

Motion No. 72 – already dealt with

34. Motions No. 73 - Cllr E Coffey

Proposed amendment

Cllr E Coffey – proposal for lands (2.73Ha) owned by the HSE, beside Louth County Hospital zoned residential to be rezoned as community facilities. I am seeking the lands adjacent to the rear of the estate of Mount Hamilton outlined in red (map attached) and totalling 2.1Ha to be taken out of strategic reserve and re-zoned as new residential. This site is now fully serviced and can be accessed through the estate.
--

Also, that the site on Hoey's Lane outlined (map attached) and measuring 0.160 hectares be re-zoned from open space to new residential, which can be taken from the balance of HSE
--

2.73hectares regarding core strategy figures.

An additional site on the Castletown Road (0.051ha) is located on lands zoned 'Employment Mixed Use' within the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan which it is proposed to re-zone as residential. The site is adjoined by 4 number dwellings to the west that were constructed on lands zoned 'Employment Mixed Use' and the railway line is immediately adjacent to the west. Residential use is not acceptable on lands zoned Employment Mixed Use and if this land is not re-zoned, a material contravention of the Dundalk and Environs Development Plan would be required, and unlikely to proceed for such a small development. Due to the size of the site i.e. 0.051 ha, it is unlikely ever to be considered a viable business, industrial or commercial site. Therefore I am requesting this site be re zoned residential.

Following discussion from the floor, a roll call vote was recorded as follows:

In favour of proposal: Cllrs. E Coffey, C Keelan, S Kelly, A McKeivitt, L Reilly, J Sheridan, M Yore – **Total 7**

Against: Cllrs. M Butler, Joanna Byrne, H Conlon, T Cunningham, P McGeough, F MacRaghnaill, A Watters -**Total 7**

Abstained: Cllr. D Minogue – **Total 1**

Absent: Cllrs. James Byrne, K Callan, E Corrigan, M Doyle, M Hall, C Markey, K Meenan, P McQuillan, D Power, J Reilly, T Sharkey, P Smith, J Tenanty, E Tully - **Total 14**

The motion was carried, following a casting vote by the Chair, Cllr. D Minogue.

Under Section 11(5)(c) of the planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) the members agreed the amendments of the pre-draft Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027 and unanimously agreed it to be the Draft Louth County Development Plan 2021-2027, on 01 October 2020.

Date: _____

Cathaoirleach: _____

Meetings Administrator: _____