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| **COMHAIRLE CONTAE ÃTHA CLIATH THEASSOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL**Minutes of South Dublin County Council Development Plan Meeting held on 5th February 2016.
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| **Councillors** |  | **Councillors** |
|  Bonner, B. Casserly, V. Coules, N. |  | Lahart, J.Lavelle, W.Leech, B. |
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|  Ferron, B. |  | O’Brien, D. |
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 **OFFICIALS PRESENT** Chief Executive D. McLoughlin Directors/Head of Functions E. Taaffe Senior Planners B. Keaney Heritage Officer R. Dwyer Senior Executive Officer L. Leonard Senior Executive Planner A.Hyland Administrative Officer B. Martin Executive Planners J.Phelan, N. Conlon Senior Executive Technician P. Larkin Assistant Planners A. Fahey, B. Coyne, E. Burke Senior Staff Officer E. Colgan Assistant Staff Officer S. Beatty Clerical Officer E. De Courcy  |  |  |
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The Mayor, Councillor S. Holland, presided.Apologies were received from Councillors A.M. Dermody, G Kenny and D. O’Donovan.The following Motions Nos. 19, 24, (26, 27, & 144), 59 – 65 and 72 were deferred from the South Dublin County Council Development Plan meeting on 4th February 2016**DPM19/0216 Item ID:47838**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty That the lands (about 1.6 hectares or 3.95 acres at [Cornerpark, Newcastle](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=2dd1dbc6-607f-4a72-bfae-a59300c85548)),  shown  hatched on the attached map which is signed anddated, shall be zoned with objective F "To preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities"  with  specific local  objective  to provide for a play-space.**REPORT:**A similar request in relation into the subject lands was made under a submission (Ref. 0357) on the Draft Development Plan and it was recommended under the Chief Executive Report on the Draft Plan Public Consultation (December 2015) should not be amended. Motion Item 48736, which seeks to zone lands surrounding the subject site as RES-N, also refers.A comprehensive Local Area Plan (LAP) for Newcastle was adopted in December 2012 and ensures that the existing zoned lands in Newcastle are developed in a co-ordinated manner that links the provision of social and physical infrastructure, services and facilities including parks and open spaces to housing. The LAP sets out a hierarchy of parks and open spaces within designated neighbourhoods under a Green Infrastructure Strategy; this includes a village park of approx. 6 hectares. The LAP Phasing Strategy prescribes the quantum of open spaces that is required under a series of phases that is linked to housing numbers. The subject lands are located outside of the LAP boundary and would not, therefore, be subject to the phasing strategy or other detailed standards set out in the LAP. This zoning of the subject lands would undermine the development of lands within the LAP boundary and the realisation of the various strategies that have been incorporated into the LAP, including those that seek the provision of parks and opens spaces.It is also noted that the subject lands are subject to proposed zoning objective RU, under which Open Space use is permitted in principle.RecommendationIt is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPDATED REPORT (05/02/2016):**The information communicated by the Elected Members at the meeting on February 4th is noted.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert SLO under C Policy 12 (Open Space) of Draft Plan:“To support and facilitate the provision of Parks and Open Spaces with children’s play areas in accordance with the Newcastle Local Area Plan (2012) or any superseding plan.”[M19 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50853)[M19 - Newcastle LAP Layout](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50942)[M19 - Newcastle LAP Open Space Strategy](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50941)Following contributions from Councillors F. Timmons, B. Bonner, T. Gilligan, E. O’Broin, the Chief Executive Mr. Danny McLoughlin responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the original Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 1(ONE)****AGAINST: 10(TEN)****ABSTAIN: 16(SIXTEEN)**The Motion **FELL.** **DPM24/0216 Item ID:48004**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.On Map 9 to rezone .3Ha from RU ro RES-N  on Kiltipper Road - Submission no 0111 dealt with on Page 366 of Chief Executives Report as the current zoning does not reflect the use nor the potential use - Map supplied with Submission 0111**REPORT:**It is considered that the zoning of the subject site could prejudice the development of the RES-N zoned lands in Killinarden – Kiltipper in terms of access arrangements, permeability and the use of existing constructed roads in accordance with that initially envisaged under the Killinardin – Kiltipper Action Area Plan**.**The subject site has already been developed with a residential dwelling and the RU zoning of the site under the Draft Plan will still allow for the subject dwelling to be extended/refurbished or replaced (in necessary) in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.Furthermore, the zoning of the subject lands would be surplus to the housing needs of the County during the lifetime of the Draft Plan and beyond are also not appropriate to intensive housing development by reason of their location at the edge of the Rural Metropolitan Area of the County.In the context of the location of the site in an elevated position at the edge of the rural metropolitan consolidation area; its development status; the surplus requirement for additional residential zoned lands and potential access and road layout implications for other zoned lands, it is considered that the proposed zoning would neither be appropriate or necessary.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPDATED REPORT (05/02/2016):**The information communicated by the Elected Members at the meeting on February 4th is noted.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M24 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51006)Following contributions from Councillors R. McMahon, D. Richardson, C. King, C. O’Connor, J. Lahart, M. Murphy, P. Donovan, B. Leech, L. Dunne, N. Coules, D. Looney, Mr. E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the original Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 24(TWENTY FOUR)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 3(THREE)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED.**Councillor P. Foley absented himself from the Chamber for Motions 26, 27 & 144.**DPM26/0216 Item ID:47989**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor W. Lavelle.**Motion: L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P.Gogarty**“That the lands at [Coolamber](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=c192a97e-d7f2-41a7-aa74-a594011d1939), Lucan, Co Dublin, off the Newcastle Road be rezoned OS”, given that they are adjacent to existing OS lands across the road at Finnstown and any amenities provided off the road would be accessible.[NB attempted to attach map here but there is no simple way of attaching from your own computer through CMAS]Coolamber Map**REPORT:**The subject lands, which were zoned for residential development under the 1998 County Development Plan, are located within an established residential area and have a long established zoning history. The lands have also been subject to a planning permission for residential development in the past therefore further establishing the precedent for residential development.It is a requirement under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) for the County Development Plan, including its Core Strategy, to be consistent with the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2010-2022 and to ensure that sufficient and suitable lands are zoned to meet the population and housing requirements for the County. The Core Strategy contained in the Draft Plan identifies a growth in population of over 26,300 people and a need for over 32,000 dwellings during the lifetime of the County Development Plan. It is a requirement to ensure that enough lands are zoned for such need and in appropriate places.The subject lands are designated within the Metropolitan Consolidation Town of Lucan in an area where population and housing growth should be directed particularly the context of their location close to the Dublin – Kildare rail line. The Settlement Strategy contained within the Regional Planning Guidelines (RPGs) identifies Metropolitan Consolidation Towns as settlements that will continue to support such key public transport corridors and will be important locations for services, retail and economic activity. This is reflected by the Draft County Development Plan.The subject lands are ideally positioned to help meet the population and housing needs of the County and prevent a sprawl of development beyond the boundaries of the identified settlements and into rural and high amenity areas of the County that are not served by public transport. The use of these lands purely for open space purposes would represent an inefficient use of zoned lands located close to a high capacity public transport corridor particularly in the context of their long established zoning history and planning history. This is also particularly the case in the context that there is sufficient open space provision in the area of the subject lands.The removal of the proposed RES-N zoning objective from the lands would also reduce the Draft Plan’s Housing Land Capacity particularly for the Metropolitan Consolidation Town of Lucan and would be at variance with the Core Strategy and the Regional Planning Guidelines.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M26 - Flood Mapping](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50964)[M26 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50707)It was **AGREED** to take Motion 26 in conjunction with Motions 27 & 144. **DPM27/0216 Item ID:48028**Proposed by Councillor L. O'Toole**Motion: L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P.Gogarty**That the lands at Coolamber, Lucan, Co Dublin, off the Newcastle Road be rezoned OS”, given that they are adjacent to existing OS lands across the road at Finnstown and any amenities provided off the road would be accessible.**REPORT:**The subject lands, which were zoned for residential development under the 1998 County Development Plan, are located within an established residential area and have a long established zoning history. The lands have also been subject to a planning permission for residential development in the past therefore further establishing the precedent for residential development.It is a requirement under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) for the County Development Plan, including its Core Strategy, to be consistent with the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2010-2022 and to ensure that sufficient and suitable lands are zoned to meet the population and housing requirements for the County. The Core Strategy contained in the Draft Plan identifies a growth in population of over 26,300 people and a need for over 32,000 dwellings during the lifetime of the County Development Plan. It is a requirement to ensure that enough lands are zoned for such need and in appropriate places.The subject lands are designated within the Metropolitan Consolidation Town of Lucan in an area where population and housing growth should be directed particularly the context of their location close to the Dublin – Kildare rail line. The Settlement Strategy contained within the Regional Planning Guidelines (RPGs) identifies Metropolitan Consolidation Towns as settlements that will continue to support such key public transport corridors and will be important locations for services, retail and economic activity. This is reflected by the Draft County Development Plan.The subject lands are ideally positioned to help meet the population and housing needs of the County and prevent a sprawl of development beyond the boundaries of the identified settlements and into rural and high amenity areas of the County that are not served by public transport. The use of these lands purely for open space purposes would represent an inefficient use of zoned lands located close to a high capacity public transport corridor particularly in the context of their long established zoning history and planning history. This is also particularly the case in the context that there is sufficient open space provision in the area of the subject lands.The removal of the proposed RES-N zoning objective from the lands would also reduce the Draft Plan’s Housing Land Capacity particularly for the Metropolitan Consolidation Town of Lucan and would be at variance with the Core Strategy and the Regional Planning Guidelines.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M27 - Flood Mapping](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50965)[M27 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50704)It was **AGREED** to take Motion 27 in conjunction with Motion 26 & 144. **DPM144/0216 Item ID:47866**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.**Coolamber site, Lucan**That a Specific Local Objective to be included, applying to the Coolamber site at Lock Road, Lucan as follows: *"Notwithstanding any other policies or objectives outlined in this Plan, it shall be an requirement to firstly maintain a complete, unbroken boundary comprising railings along the eastern boundary of the site adjoining Finnsview; and secondly to provide for permeability with the Finnstown neighbourhood centre to the north of the site."**Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**An Application to for the demolition of the gate lodge, construction of 74 no. residential units and all associated site works on a 2.47 hectare site on the Lock Road, also known as the Coolamaber site, was received by Council on 6 February 2015.  A request for Additional Information was issued on 4 June 2015.  Following the Applicants response, a Split Decision to Grant/Refuse the proposed development was issued.  The decision was appealed to An Bord Pleanala (APB) on 28 July 2015, and on 4 January 2016 a decision to refuse the development was issued by the Board.   A draft Tree Preservation Order was also made on the 25 April 2015 in response to the passing of an emergency motion at the Lucan Area Committee meeting. The Request for Additional Information raised a number of concerns in relation to the proposed layout of the development, quality of open space, lack of linkages to adjoining areas and the removal for a number of trees to the north-east of the site.  In response to these concerns, the Applicant amended the layout of so that the main area of open space was located to the north-east of the site.  This enabled the proposed area of open space to be consolidated with an area of open space to the east within the adjacent residential estate.   A link between the two areas of open space was requested in order to expand the areas open space network.  This would enable both existing and future residents direct access to a larger quantum of open space.   The link would also reduce walking distances for residents of Finnsview, Finnsgreen and Finnscourt  to bus services along the Newcastle Road, and when combined with another proposed link, to Finnstown neighbourhood centre.   This draft Tree Preservation Order however meant that a lager proportion of the site could no longer be developed.  As a result the proposed link to Finnsview was omitted. Concerns regarding the proposed link between Finnsview and the proposed development were raised in a number of Appeals/Observations to ABP.  In response to these concerns the Inspectors report states: *‘With regard to the urban design guidelines set out in the development plan, and with particular regard to DMURs, I would therefore consider that it is vital that any development of the appeal site be fully ‘permeable’ with regard to pedestrian and cycling movement in order to allow safe movements, especially for children walking and cycling. For this reason, I would fully concur with the general objective of the planning authority to ensure that open space within the site connect fully and seamlessly with adjoining areas of open space and the adjoining neighbourhood shopping area, and that where possible all walls and barriers next to cul-de-sacs and existing open spaces be removed. I would consider this to be not just a matter of general amenity, but essential to reduce the risk to children created by the location of the main road and the poor location of crossings and entries to the local neighbourhood centre and local estates and links to schools and public transport nodes’*The Reason and Considerations given by the Board in regards to its decision to refuse the proposed development also make reference to ‘the lack of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists’.The proposed SLO would directly contradict the approach taken by Planning Authority in relation to the development of the site and the assessment of the ABP Inspector and the decision of the Board.  The SLO would also directly contradict a number of Policy Objectives within the Draft Plan, namely: TM3 Objective 1:*'To create a comprehensive and legible County-wide network of cycling and walking routes that link communities to key destinations, amenities and leisure activates'* TM3 Objective 2:*'To ensure that connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists is maximised in new communities and improved within existing areas in order to maximise access to local shops, schools, public transport services and other amenities, while seeking to minimise opportunities for anti-social behaviour and respecting the wishes of local communities'*For these reasons the proposed SLO cannot be supported. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M144 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50829)Following a contribution from Councillor P. Gogarty, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded. Councillor P. Gogarty proposed amended wording as follows:*Specific Local Objective**To maintain a RES zoning objective for the site identified at Coolamber and, in considering the specific local needs of the area, to provide for the following:**- A maximum residential density of 40 units per hectare;**- To maintain a complete unbroken boundary comprising railings or other permanent structure along the perimeter of the site with the exception of an entrance off the Newcastle Road and pedestrian and cyclist permeability with the Finnstown Neighbourhood Centre to the north of the site;**the above notwithstanding any other related policies or objectives outlined in this Plan.*A show of hands vote on the proposed amendment to the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 21(TWENTY ONE)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 3(THREE)**The Motions **AS AMENDED** were **CARRIED****DPM59/0216 Item ID:47899**It was proposed by Councillor E. Ó Broin and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.It shall be an objective of the plan to provide adequate sites for the development of post primary schoolsl in the City West area to meet the needs of the growing population in that communityCllrs Eoin Ó Broin & Cllr Jonathan Graham**REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.It was Agreed to take Motion Nos. 59 – 65 together**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M59 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50914)[M59 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50724)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM60/0216 Item ID:47902**It was proposed by Councillor P. Foley and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.I have been contacted by several residents of Citywest who are looking for "zoning for multiple secondary schools" in the Citywest area, as part of the Development Plan 2016 - 2022. What are the Manager's thoughts on it?**REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M60 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50913)[M60 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50794)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM61/0216 Item ID:47951**It was proposed by Councillor J. Lahart and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That the Development Plan 2016-2022 reflects the need for additional post-primary schools serving the Citywest / Saggart area - to ensure that children attending the existing vibrant local schools have local post-primary school options availabel to them**REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M61 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50912)[M61 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50793)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM62/0216 Item ID:47971**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.To provide for a suitable location for a Post Primary School in the General Citywest area to cater for the increasing young population in the 4 National Schools in the area.**REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M62 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50911)[M62 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50770)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM63/0216 Item ID:48007**It was proposed by Councillor D. Richardson and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That this council provide land space for secondary schools for the Citywest Saggart area in the draft development plan for 2016 to 2022currently there are four thriving nationals schools in the area.all schools are fully subscribed with no current secondary schools in the area.children attending the schools should not have to travel outside the area   **REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M63 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50910)[M63 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50749)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM64/0216 Item ID:48053**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**CityWest Second-Level Schools**To identify and reserve appropriately-sized site(s) on lands in the CityWest area for the provision of multiple Second-Level Schools for Citywest, in conjunction with the Department of Education & Skills.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Brophy, Casserly, Dermody, Donovan, Egan, Higgins***REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M64 - Fortunestown LAP](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50909)[M64 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50733)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED****DPM65/0216 Item ID:48090**It was proposed by Councillor K. Mahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.Motion For Development Plan"Based on the available housing capacity in the city West Saggart area, and the likelyhood of significant population growth in the area, the Development Plan identifies the potential need for a second Post Primary School in the area. With co- locastion becoming an increasingly common aspect of Education the plan notes the co -location of a VEC School and an Educate Together school in the area and the likely need for both to develop secondary schools either through co-location or independently"Anti-Auisterity Alliance**REPORT:**As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services. South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012 under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools, and to support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with requirements for additional schools accommodation identified through same. It is noted that the list of schools detailed in Section 3.14.0 of the Draft Plan was provided by the Department of Education and Skills, arising from their latest projections on the need for school places and provision of new schools in the County. The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022.In addition, it is noted that the Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. Council staff spoke to some 538 people at public information sessions and 90 submissions were received. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and identifies 5 school sites (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools), a Garda Station, a Library and the required community floorspace. These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.As noted under Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022, the Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.The Fortunestown Local Area Plan was adopted in May 2012 by South Dublin County Council following an extensive public consultation programme. The Local Area Plan relates to an extensive area of lands that are undeveloped and zoned for development in the Citywest and Saggart area (144 hectares – 356 acres). The statutory Local Area Plan incorporates a comprehensive series of strategies and objectives in relation to Accessibility and Movement; Green Infrastructure; Land use; and Built form. These strategies are based around maximising accessibility and use of the Red Luas Line and provides for a range of community infrastructure, including the **identification of 5 school sites** (3 primary schools and 2 secondary schools). These facilities are included as part of the LAP phasing requirements.The intention of this motion is noted, however, and it is recommended that an additional objective be provided under C Policy 9 *Primary & Post-primary Facilities* to support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area in line with the LAP.**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of an additional objective under C Policy 9 to state:To support and facilitate the provision of post-primary schools in the Citywest/Saggart area, in line with the Fortunestown LAP and any subsequent plan for the area.[M65 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50655)The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED** **DPM72/0216 Item ID:48092**It was proposed by Councillor K. Mahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan."That Development Plan 2016-2022 provides for a new objective under Category C -Policy 9 - Primary and Post Primary Facilities, to identify the existence of educational facilities of differing ethos or management and distinguishes between "co-located" and "stand alone" institutions. Such an objective should be a guiding consideration in future area plans and instruct interaction with the Dept of Education and Skills regarding future educational developments in the County"Anti- Austerity Alliance**REPORT:**The Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services, with South Dublin County Council working with the Department under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and reserve sites for new primary and post-primary schools and facilitate the delivery of same in line with the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The management or classification of schools falls outside the remit of the Council and is therefore not a matter for the County Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**UPATED REPORT (05/02/20016)**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.**REPORT:**The information communicated by the Elected Member at the meeting on February 4th 2016 is noted.The Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services, with South Dublin County Council working with the Department under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and reserve sites for new primary and post-primary schools and facilitate the delivery of same in line with the Department’s Schools Building Programme.The management or classification of schools falls outside the remit of the Council and is therefore not a matter for the County Development Plan; however, the intention of this motion is noted. It is therefore recommended that additional text be inserted in Section 3.11.0 of the Draft Plan to include reference to school facilities serving the cultural and religious needs of the County, and support for the co-location of schools or ‘stand alone’ institutions where appropriate**Recommendation:**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with the following amendment, comprising insertion of text into Section 3.11.0 Educational Facilities to state:3.11.0 Educational FacilitiesEducational facilities have an important role to play in developing sustainable and balanced communities in the County. The Department of Education and Skills is responsible for the delivery of educational facilities and services.South Dublin County Council has worked with the Department of Education and Skills since 2012, under a nationally agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), to proactively identify and acquire sites for new primary and post-primary schools and support the Department’s Schools Building Programme. The Department of Education and Skills will continue to work closely with South Dublin County Council under the Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the identification and acquisition of school sites.The Department of Education and Skills will commence a new phase of school building during the period 2016-2022. The Department has identified a need for additional post primary schools in South Dublin County up to 2026. Schools in Lucan (Kishoge Community College), Tallaght (Kingswood) and Rathcoole (Holy Family Community School) are under construction or at design stage. Demand for further provision is also identified in the Lucan; Saggart/Citywest; Newcastle/Rathcoole; Knocklyon/Firhouse/Ballycullen areas. The Department identifies a possible requirement for further provision in the Lucan and Dublin 24 areas particularly, although other areas may also require some level of additional provision.With regard to primary school requirements, the Department of Education and Skills reviews demographic data on an ongoing basis, with any requirements for additional accommodation at primary level up to 2026 in the Development Plan area, either via new schools or expansion of existing schools, identified through that process. It is likely that additional provision will be required at primary level within the Development Plan area, over the lifetime of this Plan.The Provision of Schools and the Planning System, a Code of Practice for Planning Authorities, published jointly by the Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government, sets out the best practice approach to facilitate the timely and cost effective roll out of school facilities.**South Dublin County Council will continue to support and facilitate the provision of primary and post primary school facilities to serve all cultural and religious needs of the County, and support the co-location of schools or ‘stand alone’ institutions where appropriate.**[bold text refers to additional text as per Motion 72]The Chief Executive’s updated recommendation was **AGREED** **DPM110/0216 Item ID:47903**In the absence of Councillor M. Devine the following Motion **FELL**:"That this council establish a “task force” that will actively survey areas that are proliferated with signage that detracts from the local area and may well be illegal. To follow up with a report/ headed item that will be included at each council meeting"*Co-sponsored by Cllr J Graham***REPORT:**The Chief Executive acknowledges the content of the motion and advises that the Draft Plan has extensive references to signage and the quality of the public realm in the Draft Plan:UC1 Objective 5: To promote and facilitate environmental and public realm improvements in existing town, village, district and local centres to address environmental quality, urban design, safety, identity and image.TM3 Objective 4: To prioritise the upgrade of footpaths, lighting & public realm maintenance and supporting signage on public roads/paths where a demonstrated need exists for busy routes used by runners & walkers.HCL 4 Objective 4: To reduce and prevent visual and urban clutter within Architectural Conservation Areas including, where appropriate, traffic management structures, utility structures and all signage.11.2.8 SIGNAGE – ADVERTISING, CORPORATE AND PUBLIC INFORMATIONSignage relates to all signs erected on the exterior of buildings, within windows, as stand alone structures or attached to public utilities. Signage has the potential to give rise to visual clutter and to alter the character of an area and as such will be carefully assessed. Development proposals that include signage should take account of the following:* In general, signs on a building should only advertise goods or services that are associated with the premises and no more than 2 advertising signs should be erected on any elevation.
* Signs should generally be limited to the ground floor of a building unless located directly over the entrance to a major commercial or retail building.
* Signs should be simple in design and integrate with the architectural language of the building and not obscure any architectural features.
* Signs should be proportionate to the scale of the building to which they are attached and sensitive to the surrounding environment.
* Signs attached to Protected Structures and in Architectural Conservation Areas should be in keeping with the character of the building and adhere to best practice conservation principles (see Section 11.5.3 Architectural Conservation Areas).
* Any sign or associated structure should not create an obstruction to pedestrian or cyclist movement or create a traffic hazard. Careful consideration should be given to the materials used in the construction of a sign and the methods used to light it.
* All signage within the traditional historical villages of the County must be respectful and enhance the historical context of the Architectural environment of these villages.

The issue of illegal signage in areas is a planning enforcement issue. In this regard, it is noted that Part VIII of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) sets out the legislative requirements for enforcement. The issue of enforcement is not addressed in Part II of the Act, which relates to the making of a County Development Plan. The establishment of a 'task force' would require the allocation of staff resources and is not a matter for the Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted. **Transport & Mobility****DPM111/0216 Item ID:47840**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.That a objective to build a sustainable Cycle Lane to run the length of Watery Lane (inside Riversdale) - the entry and exit points would be Orchard Road at the Camac River be inserted into the Development plan**REPORT:**Table 6.4 – Six Year Cycle Plan of the Draft Plan includes the Camac Greenway/7C.  This proposed route links Corkagh Park to Grand Canal via Clondalkin.  The route through Clondalkin is shown on Map 13 of the Book of Maps, and is reflective of that shown within the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan (2013) produced by the NTA.  The proposed route from Clondalkin Town Centre closely follows the Camac River (starting at Orchard Road) to the north of the Áras Chrónáin Irish Cultural Centre and adjacent to Watery Lane. It should be noted that all cycle routes illustrated within the Draft Plan (and Cycle Network Plan) are indicative only.  The final route will be the subject to route section, detailed design and public consultation. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M111 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50635)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM112/0216 Item ID:47868**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Greenways**To amend Maps 1 & 2 and Table 6.4 to add a further Minor Greenway from the Griffeen Valley Greenway to S05 (Fonthill Road) via the embankment between Moy Glas & Castle Riada; Glenvale; Foxborough and Balgaddy.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**The proposed route is the subject of Part 8 permission from 2012.  The permission, which was subject to a number of amendments, was submitted to the National Transport Authority (NTA) for funding.  The NTA declined funding for the amended proposal stating it was no longer in compliance with their Project Management Guidelines.  This was due to the removal of a number of proposed links to adjoining estates which would reduce accessibility and activity along the main link.   The Esker link also forms part of the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network, namely secondary route 8C.link, which provides a strategic link between Primary Route 7A (Adamstown to City Centre).  It is also noted that Esker route between Griffeen Road and the Outer Ring Road runs parallel to the preferred route of the Lucan Luas (see also Item 47878).  In this context the design of the route may be revisited as part of a wider package of transport-related measures.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted[M112 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50823)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM113/0216 Item ID:47869**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Greenways**To amend Maps 1 & 2 and Table 6.4 to add a further Minor Greenway from Willsbrook Road, through Willsbrook Park, along Esker Lane and Lucan Road as far as the schools in the Chapel Hill/Lucan Village area – with a view to providing safe, dedicated walking and cycling routes to promote sustainable transport to schools.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**The proposed route has been identified in the preparation of the Lucan Area Access Study to provide access between Lucan Educate Together National School and Coláiste Phádraig CBS School. The route will also form part of the broader Lucan Area network, linking to Griffeen Valley Greenway.   **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M113 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50990)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM114/0216 Item ID:47885**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Western Dublin Orbital Route**In Table 6.6, to amend the last sentence under ‘Western Dublin Orbital Route (north)’ to now read: *“The primary objective of South Dublin County Council in this regard shall be to protect the scenic Liffey Valley parklands and amenities at Lucan Demesne and St Catherine’s Park, and to examine all possible engineering options for a future route so as to minimise the impact on the environment, landscape and amenities.”**Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**Table 6.6 – Medium to long Term Road Objectives describes the function of the Western Orbital Route as:*'Major regional link between the N7 to N4. Any further connections, and a possible alternative route to the west of Leixlip and/or Celbridge, will be determined in consultation with Kildare and Fingal County Councils, the National Roads Authority and the National Transport Authority. The primary objective of South Dublin County Council in this regard shall be to protect the scenic Liffey Valley parklands and amenities at Lucan Demesne and St Catherine’s by restricting any road bridge at this location while giving consideration to the possibility of a tunnel'*  The wording was agreed at the Development Plan meeting in June 2015 (Motion Nos. 243, 254 and 255).The proposed wording is reflective of the range of alternatives that will need to be considered as part of an environmental appraisal (such as an Environmental Impact Statement). **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted[M114 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50608)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM115/0216 Item ID:47956**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor P. Donovan. With reference to Chapter 6, specifically 6.2.0, that the need for future public transport links between Hazelhatch and Saggart, and Newcastle and Rathcoole, be included in the Development Plan. Co Sponsor: Cllr. William Lavelle**REPORT:**TM Policy 2 Public Transport includes an Action stating that the Council will:*‘Investigate a future public rail transport corridor between Saggart and Hazelhatch, linking the greater Tallaght area to the west via Saggart/Citywest, Greenogue/Baldonnell & Newcastle, facilitating future sustainable development’*It is noted in the Report on Draft Plan Public Consolation that the National Transport Authority (NTA) has expressed concerns in relation to the inclusion of the above Action.  The NTA acknowledged that whilst it is in the remit for Council to pursue any objectives as it deems appropriate *‘the feasibility and desirability of a new heavy rail line between Tallaght and Saggart is not clear and is not being considered by the Authority’*.Concerns in relation to the proposed rail link have also been detailed at previous Development Plan meeting in June 2015 due to low population densities along the route.  Concerns were also raised that the identification of a rail link may result in pressure to zone land for development in an area that has not been identified for growth within the Core Strategy.  However by removing the word *‘rail’* from the Action, a range of proposals could be explored that be more in keeping with local needs and the Development Plan Core Strategy.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment to section 6.20 Public Transport Action as follows:Investigate a future public transport corridor between Saggart and Hazelhatch, linking the greater Tallaght area to the west via Saggart/Citywest, Greenogue/Baldonnell & Newcastle, facilitating future sustainable development.[M115 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50989)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM116/0216 Item ID:47964**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.With reference to Chapter 6 that the text describing the three National Roads be amended to differentiate between national primary (N7 and N4) and national secondary roads (N81)Co Sponsor: William Lavelle & Paula Donovan**REPORT:**This is a minor change to the Plan. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adoptedThe Motion was **AGREED****DPM117/0216 Item ID:48068**It was proposed by Councillor J. Lahart and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That the Development Plan 2016-2022 reflects the need to plan for local and regional Park and Ride Facilities in the County – particularly to facilitate local commuters within driving distance but not walking distance of local bus services**REPORT:**One of the Action listed under TM Policy 2  - Public Transport states: *'Facilitate the provision of Park and Ride facilities in appropriate locations at transport nodes and along strategic transport corridors (see also Section 6.2.1 - Park and Ride Facilities)'*Section 6.2.1, namely Table 6.3 – ‘Park and ride locations within the county’ nominates the appropriate locations for such facilities based on access to road network and public transport services (existing and planned). **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.The Motion was **AGREED****DPM118/0216 Item ID:48088**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor V. Casserly.Co Sponsored with Cllr Paula DonovanRef: Chapter 6 Transport & Mobility - Map 9That the manager considers an alternative route to the proposed NTA Greater Dublin Cycle Network Plan is indicated on Map 9 with reference to the following specific locations1. Through the Estate of Ellensborough from the entrance gate to the Crescent and onto the Drive2. 74 Templeroan Avenue 3. Sally Park to Firhouse Road**REPORT:**All Cycle routes illustrated within the Draft Plan (and Cycle Network Plan) are indicative only.  The final route will be the subject to route section, detailed design and public consultation.   See also Item 47896 with regard to Sally Park.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted[M118 - Location Map - Ellensborough](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50992)[M118 - Location Map - Sally Park](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50673)[M118 - Location Map - Templeroan](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50680)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM119/0216 Item ID:48097**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan,.Chapter 6 Transport & Mobility Ref: Map 9to improve permeability around Knocklyon, that the Manager would consider supporting a study to evaluate a pedestrian footbridge over the M50 linking Woodstown Village estate side to the other side of the M50 so that children can travel safely to school and families can walk/cycle to amenities around Knocklyon SC and avoid the dangerous junctions of M50 off ramps and on ramps at Junction 13**REPORT:**The Report on Draft Plan Public Consultation recommended against the insertion an objective into the Plan for a new bridge linking Woodstown on the basis that the need for such a links had not been identified in any the recently completed strategic planning documents (such as the Greater Dublin Area Strategic Cycle Network).  The viability of a link (and any alternatives) could be investigated further in connection with preparation of Local Permeability Improvements (as per Section 6.3.2 of the Draft Plan). **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M119 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50671)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM120/0216 Item ID:47970**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.With reference to Chapter 11, objective 11.2.8, that the regulation of the provision of digital signage be amended to include ‘major roads’ as per the guidelines used in many other countries.Co Sponsored: Cllr. William Lavelle**REPORT:**It is recommended in the Draft Plan Consultation Report (December 2015) that Section 11.2.8 of the Draft County Development Plan be amended to include additional standards for Digital and Electronic Signage and that such signage should be limited to town centres and/or large retail precincts and that these be subject to certain standards that ensure that make a positive contribution to the public domain and do not constitute a traffic hazard.It is agreed that, because of their multi-media and interactive qualities, digital signs (such as LCD, LED, plasma or other electronic display area), have the potential to consolidate information and contribute to the vibrancy of the public domain. Restrictions are, however, required in relation to such signs to ensure they do not create disturbance (noise and light projection) or unwanted distraction (road safety).The Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government Circular letter PL 2/2016 date 22 January 2016 provides further clarity in relation to signage that is exempt from requiring planning permission and this includes electronic display signage for primarily construction site or event related notices and traffic management/traffic sign arrangements.It is recommended that the subject motion be amended to seek provision under Section 11.2.8 of the Draft Plan for Digital and Electronic Signage along major roads but only in circumstances where such signage relates to traffic management and safety only.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment to Section 11.2.8 as follows:"The provision for Digital and Electronic Signage along major roads shall only be permitted in circumstances where such signage relates to traffic management and safety only.”The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM121/0216 Item ID:47870**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan**Ash Park estate, Lucan**To amend Map No. 1 to remove the marked stretch of cycle route through and along the eastern boundary of Ash Park estate from Griffeen Valley Park to the Griffeen Way/Road roundabout.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:****It should be noted that all Cycle routes illustrated within the Draft Plan (and Cycle Network Plan) are indicative only.  The final route will be the subject to route section, detailed design and public consultation.**Table 6.4 – Six Year Cycle Plan of the Draft Plan includes Route 7A, a Primary Route from Lucan to Palmerstown via Liffey Valley (linking to Dublin City Centre).  The route as shown in the Book of Maps is reflective of that shown within the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan (2013). The route crosses Griffeen Valley Park linking Haydens Lane to Griffeen Way.  Part of the route follows a series of interconnected green spaces between the Griffeen Glen, Elm and Ash Park Estates. To remove a single section of the route would leave Route 7A incomplete. An alternative route has been identified via the preparation of the Lucan Area Access Study along a liner park (and existing pathway system) between Griffeen Glen Park and Elm View.  This route could be continued to Griffeen Road, then turning north to relink with the route along Griffeen Way. Recommendation­It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:*To amend Map No. 1 to reroute the marked stretch of cycle route through and along the eastern boundary of Ash Park Estate along the area of open space between Griffeen Glen Park and Elm View to Griffen Road, then turning north to relink with the route along Griffeen Way.*[M121 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50820)Following contributions from Councillors W. Lavelle, D. O’Brien and G. O’Connell, Mr. E. Taaffe, Director of Land Use, Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the original Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 21 (TWENTY ONE)****AGAINST: 2 (TWO)****ABSTAIN: 4 (FOUR)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM122/0216 Item ID:47876**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor G.O’Connell**Mount Bellew Way, Lucan**To amend objective TM7 SLO 1 to increase the requirement for visitor parking spaces from 10 to 20 and to delete the word ‘residential’.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly* **REPORT:**TM7 SLO 1 states:*‘Provide for a minimum of 10 visitor parking spaces, along with a turning point, on any primary access roadway off Mount Bellew Way provided for future residential development in these zoned lands, so as to facilitate better management of drop-offs and pick-ups at the neighbouring Lucan Educate Together NS’.*The SLO was agreed by the Council in response to Motions Nos. 87 and 88 at the June 2015 Development Plan meeting.The land to the south of Mount Bellew way is proposed to be zoned RES – To protect and/or improve residential amenity.  This would enable a variety of other uses, subject to planning permission.  Taking this into account, omitting the term ‘residential’ is appropriate. The number of spaces needed to cater for visitor and provide a drop off/pick up zone for the school is unknown at this time. The appropriate quantum of parking will be dependent on the type/intensity of development that takes place on the lands to the south of Mount Bellew Way and the safe management of vehicle movements/traffic flows around the school**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That TM7 SLO 1 be amended to state:*‘Provide for a visitor parking spaces, along with a turning point, on any primary access roadway off Mount Bellew Way so as to provide for the future development of these zoned lands and to facilitate the better management of drop-offs and pick-ups at the neighbouring Lucan Educate Together NS’*[M122 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50993)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM123/0216 Item ID:47878**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.**Luas to Lucan**In light of the commitment of the National Transport Authority to “reassessing all of the potential route options” for the planned Luas to Lucan, the draft plan should be amended:* - To include a new objective under TM2: *“To fully support and facilitate the delivery of the Luas to Lucan, along the most direct and efficient route, subject to a future reassessment of all of the potential route options.”*
* - To amend the third ‘Action’ under ‘TRANSPORT AND MOBILITY (TM) Policy 2 Public Transport’ (page 101) to read: *“Maintain a reservation along the Emerging Preferred Route for the Metro-West (linking Tallaght, Clondalkin, Liffey Valley, Blanchardstown, Ballymun, Dublin Airport and Swords) and to seek to maintain a reservation for a route for the Lucan Luas following a future reassessment of all of the potential route options.”*
* - To add a note to the marked Emerging Preferred Route on Maps 1 & 2 stating *“Previous Emerging Preferred Route. Future reassessment of all of the potential route options to be undertaken”.*

*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly, Higgins***REPORT:**TM Policy 2 contains a number of Policy Objectives that seek to expand and improve public transport services within the County, namely: TM2 Objective 1:*'To secure the implementation of major public transport projects as identified within the relevant public transport strategies and plans for the Greater Dublin Area'*TM2 Objective 2:*'To establish future public transport routes that will support the County’s medium to long term development, in particular orbital routes'*Reference to specific projects are detailed in the Actions listed under this Policy, including:*‘Maintain a reservation along the Emerging Preferred Routes, as identified by the Railway Procurement Agency, for the Lucan Luas (linking Lucan, Liffey Valley and the City Centre) and the Metro-West (linking Tallaght, Clondalkin, Liffey Valley, Blanchardstown, Ballymun, Dublin Airport and Swords) for the future provision of high frequency public transport services’*In October 2015 the National Transport Authority published the Draft Transport Strategy 2016-2035 for the Greater Dublin Area.  The ‘Lucan Luas’ has been retained in the Draft Development Plan.  It should be noted however that the Metrowest has not been retained, and in its place a high frequency orbital bus route has been proposed between Tallaght and Blanchardstown.The route shown in the Draft Transport Strategy reflects that shown on the Development Plan Maps as the Emerging Preferred Route for the Lucan Luas.  The Metrowest route has also be retained to facilitate orbital bus services.  Each route may however be the subject of a further route selection process.The Actions of TM Policy 2, which reference specific routes, can be amended to reflect recent circumstances and take note of future route options with the aim of establishing a direct and efficient route. Recommendation­It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That the Actions of TM Policy 2 that reference the Lucan Luas and Metro-West be amended (as two separate Actions) as follows:*‘To support the delivery of the Luas to Lucan (linking Lucan, Liffey Valley and the City Centre).  To facilitate this service the reservation along the Emerging Preferred Route for the Lucan Luas, as identified by the Railway Procurement Agency will be maintained, subject to a future reassessment of all of the potential route options to ensure the most direct and efficient route is taken'.*And*'To support the delivery of the Core Orbital Bus Network with a high frequency service between linking Tallaght, Clondalkin, Liffey Valley and Blanchardstown.  To facilitate this service the reservation along the Emerging Preferred Route alignment of former Metro-West subject to a future reassessment of all of the potential route options to ensure the most direct and efficient route is taken'.*And To add a note to the marked Emerging Preferred Route on Maps 1 & 2 stating *‘Route may be subject to reassessment’.* [M123 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50995)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM124/0216 Item ID:47896**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.To remove the cycle lane proposal through Monalea Wood and Sally Park and redirect it down the Firhouse Road to the Ballycullen Road junction and up the Ballycullen Road.**REPORT:****All Cycle routes illustrated within the Draft Plan (and Cycle Network Plan) are indicative only.  The route was finalised under a Part 8 permission in 2012.  The route varies from that shown on the Draft Plan Maps and and connects Firhouse Road via Monalea Wood and Monalea Park (via public road and upgrade of existing pathway system) only.  The route no longer is proposed via Sally Park.  The Development Plan Maps can be amended to reflect the route permitted under Part 8.**Table 6.4 – Six Year Cycle Plan of the Draft Plan includes the Primary Route S05 linking Tallaght to Ballyboden via Old Bawn, Dodder Valley Park, Firhouse and Knocklyon (linking to Dun Laoghaire).  The route is shown on Map 37 of the Book of Maps, and is reflective of that shown within the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan (2013) produced by the National Transport Authority.  The proposed route from Firhouse Road to Ballycullen Road is shown via Sally Park, Monalea Wood and Monalea Park. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:To remove the cycle lane proposal through Sally Park and redirect it along the route of the approved Part 8 for the Tallaght to Ballyboden Cycle Route.[M124 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50723)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM125/0216 Item ID:47932**In the absence of Councillor M. Devine the following Motion **FELL:****Co-sponsored by Cllr Graham**'It shall be an objective of this council to ensure, with regard to future planning matters, that all public transport stops are disable proofed'. **REPORT:**The design of public transport infrastructure is generally the remit of service providers.  Where new public transport stops are proposed, Council is consulted as part of the planning process.  Council has also worked with the National Transport Authority to refit bus stops so that they cater for the needs of the visually and physically impaired via the provision of accessible kerbs (i.e. higher kerbs) and tactile paving.  These actions can be reflected as an Action under TM Policy 3 – Public Transport.  **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendmentThat the following Action be added to TM Policy 3 – Public Transport.  *To work with public transport service providers to ensure that all railway stations and bus stops are designed to be universally accessible.***DPM126/0216 Item ID:48134**In the absence of Councillor M. Devine the following Motion **FELL:**"That this council survey all public transport stops (Luas and Bus) and provide a list of those suitable for providing Disabled Parking Bays- disability proofing public amenities"*Co-sponsored by Cllr J Graham***REPORT:**Universal access to public transport infrastructure is addressed in relation to Item 47932.  **DPM127/0216 Item ID:47962**It was proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor P. Donovan.With reference to Chapter 6, That TM6 Objective 1 be amended to include a direct reference to the prioritisation of safety at rural junctions.Co Sponsor: Cllr. Paula Donovan**REPORT:**This issue has been addressed at previous Development Plan meetings in February 2015 and June 2015.  As a result of previous motions the following objective was added to the draft Development Plan as TM6 Objective 4: *‘To prioritise safety at rural junctions’*It should be noted that TM6 Objective 1 refers to the application of speed limits within the County. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That TM6 Objective 4 be retained as a direct reference to the prioritisation of safety at rural junctions.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM128/0216 Item ID:47976**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**That, notwithstanding the comments of the DEC&LG Ref 0183, The NRA and TII, the objective as set out in Table 6.5 Six Year Plan and Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Plan to provide a segregated junction at Kennelsfort/R148 shall remain part of the 2016 – 2022 Development Plan and is noted It is also noted that concerns have been raised that the proposed upgrade would not be in accordance with established policy. Section 5.8.3 - Principles of Road Development of the Draft Transport Stagey for the Greater Dublin Region states that: ‘That there will be no significant increase in road capacity for private vehicles on radial roads inside the M50 motorway’. This is not the purpose of the proposed segregated junction; safety for pedestrians and cyclists, reduction of air and noise pollution, the integrity of the community as well as the free movement of Buses, Public Transport and Commercial Vehicles are the real issues.It is accepted that this has been a long standing approach from the NTA, as further noted in Section 3.2.6 of the Road Network Draft Transport Strategy: ‘Since the mid-1990s, transport policy in the GDA has been directed towards reducing the growth in car travel and increasing the use of public transport, cycling and walking. The Section 5.8.2 Regional and Local Roads of the Draft Transport Strategy states: ‘Address localised traffic delay locations, including on radial routes inside the M50 C-Ring, in cases where the primary reason for intervention is to address safety or public transport issues at such locations’It is accepted that the provision of a segregated junction, or flyover, at this location is a substantial financial commitment. A project of this scale could not be funded by SDCC alone and the support of the NTA would also be crucial should funding from a national agency be sought. As such a strong case for such funding must be made early in the lifetime of the 2016-2022 CDP, supported by a feasibility study and strong cost/benefit analysis that shows a substantial improvement in the level of service afforded to sustainable users, whilst not increasing the capacity of the street network for private cars.**REPORT:**The provision of a segregated or grade separated junctions at Kennelsfort Road and the R148 has been addressed in reports to council at Development Plan meetings in February 2015 and June 2015.  The following item was agreed by Council and added to Table 6.5 - Six Year Road Programme:*‘grade separated junction to enhance the efficiency of the junction, particularly for buses on the N4/Lucan Road QBC and ensure safe crossing facilities are provided for all users’*Concerns have been raised by the NTA in regard to the proposed junction stating that it may that the proposed upgrade would not be in accordance with established policy.  Section 5.8.3 - Principles of Road Development of the Draft Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Region states that: ‘*That there will be no significant increase in road capacity for private vehicles on radial roads inside the M50 motorway’*This has been a long standing approach from the NTA, as further noted in Section of the 3.2.6 Road Network of the Draft Transport Strategy:*‘Since the mid-1990s, transport policy in the GDA has been directed towards reducing the growth in car travel and increasing the use of public transport, cycling and walking.  Complementing this approach has been a policy of not increasing road capacity for private cars on radial roads inside the M50. The basis for these policies is recognition that it is unrealistic and unsustainable to accommodate growth in travel demand across the region through car based movement’*It is noted however that the R148 has been declassified (ie the former N4).  It is also noted that Section 5.8.2 Regional and Local Roads of the Draft Transport Strategy states: *‘Address localised traffic delay locations, including on radial routes inside the M50 C-Ring, in cases where the primary reason for intervention is to address safety or public transport issues at such locations’*Taking the above into account, a case may be made that demonstrates a substantial improvement in the level of service afforded to sustainable users, whilst not increasing the capacity of the street network for private cars.  However the provision of a segregated junction, or flyover, at this location would be a substantial financial commitment that is beyond the scope of current funding. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion be adopted subject to the reference to a ‘grade separated junction’ is omitted from Table 6.5.[M128 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50760)Following contributions from Councillors G. O’Connell and P. Gogarty, Mr. E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 22(TWENTY TWO)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 1(ONE)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM129/0216 Item ID:47990**Proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**In Table 6.5 Six Year Road Programme retain grade separated junction objective at "Kennelsfort Road and the R148", "Upgrade of existing junction" and "Provision of grade separated junction to enhance the efficiency of the junction, particularly for buses on the N4/Lucan Road QBC and ensure safe crossing facilities are provided for all users."**REPORT:**The proposed junction upgrade at Kennelsfort Rd/R148 is addressed in relation to Item 47976.   M129 - Location MapCouncillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion**DPM130/0216 Item ID:48014**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor V. Casserly.**Cycle routes to schools**To add a new objective under TM3: *“To provide that planning permissions granted for the development of schools facilities should include a requirement for the provision of cycle paths from the school to join the nearest cycle network, where feasible.”**Co-sponsored by Cllr. Brophy, Casserly, Dermody, Donovan, Egan, Higgins***REPORT:**In general, where schools exist and/or are proposed (including major expansions), the provision of new cycle facilities is prioritised for funding under the Sustainable Travel Measures Grants programme.  This can be stipulated as a requirement on any permission.  However this should only relate to new schools, or where major expansion are prosed in relation to existing school. **Recommendation­**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:To add a new objective under TM3: To provide that planning permissions granted for the development of all new schools or for existing schools where 25% or greater expansion in classrooms is proposed, should include a requirement for the provision of cycle paths from the school to join the nearest cycle network, where feasible.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM131/0216 Item ID:47965**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.With reference to Chapter 6, specifically 6.3.0, that the Council adopts the recommendation that the Draft County Development Plan be amended to cross-reference (TM) Policy 3 Walking and Cycling with (HCL)Co Sponsored by William Lavelle and Paula Donovan**REPORT:**This motion is more relevant to Transport and Mobility Policy 3 Objective 1 (cycling and walking routes) and should be amended to relate to said objective and to make reference to the policies and objectives contained in Chapter 9 particularly those that relate to Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:To amend Transport and Mobility Policy 3 Objective 1 as follows -To create a comprehensive and legible County-wide network of cycling and walking routes that link communities to key destinations, amenities and leisure activities *with reference to the policies and objectives contained in Chapter 9 (Heritage, Conservation and Landscape) particularly those that relate to Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes*. (Amendment in *italics*)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM132/0216 Item ID:48037**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.On page 104  Include additional Objectives:1 Promote, provide and encourage the development of cycling and walking routes suitable for people of different generations and levels of fitness, to facilitate health and wellbeing by providing quality green space. Support awareness campaigns promoting the health benefits of walking and cycling.2  Support, develop, protect, maintain, enhance and promote the development of regional and local network of trails in conjunction with the Irish Trails Strategy and the Walks Scheme in conjunction with the National Waymarked Ways Committee and other national programmes, designate and protect from inappropriate development walking routes and local waymarked Ways in partnership and local  tourism interests, adjoining local councils and the DoTT because of their  recreational and tourism potential.3  Facilitate and promote the construction of cycleways and integrate these cycleways with the DTO cycling policy for the GDA (September 2006) as may be amended4  Promote, facilitate, safeguard and encourage the development and expansion ofsafe cycling facilities and cycle routes (including adjoining counties). Support the continued development of cycle routes by identifying routes and by laying particular emphasis on those that link existing cycle routes and tourist destinations. Support and implement FI’s Strategy for the Development of Irish Cycle Tourism and liaise with the Sports Council, the NTA and other bodies in the development of cycling touring routes particularly in tourist areas and areas of high amenity, implement the relevant policies of the DoTT’s NCPF (2009) and the National cycleway Network scoping Study (2010) so that there is an integrated and coherent network. Support the development of the National Cycle Network and enhance and maintain these routes with better sign posting, lighting and road surfaces, including signing/lining and the use of coloured surfaces, separation from vehicular traffic, the provision of cycling maps and the promotion of looped routes.5  Support the implementation of the DTO Cycle Policy.6  Support the continuing development of the Dodder Greenway (Grand Canal to Bohernabreena) as part of the National East Coast Trail Cycle Route which will be progressed by in conjunction with South Dublin Council and in co-operation with other agencies, including the NTA.7 Support, promote and actively encourage the development of greenways and walking and cycling routes( including  long distance routes) in conjunction with the Irish Sports Council, IW, FI, NTA  and other stakeholders to provide linkages withtrails,particularly those with a historical association, inadjoining counties in partnership with their councils, the state, private and voluntary sectors. 8  Support, improve and expand and upgrade Slí na Sláinte routes in consultation with community groups, local/regional tourism interestsand the DoTT and the HSE.A Table should be included*.* 9 Walking and Cycling will be promoted and encouraged by maintaining and enhancing existing facilities securing the development of a network of safe cycle routes and footpaths on existing roads, proposed roads and on new road improvement schemes and on routes reserved exclusively for pedestrians and cyclistsand linear parks.Provide, improve and extend the network of cycle lanes and pedestrian routes on existing roads, on all new regional, local distributor and local collector roads and on roads being up-graded, to create a safer, more convenient, pleasant and more user-friendly environment. Road safety will be improved by lowerspeed limits and priority over motorized transport. Ensure that the needs of walkers and cyclists are given full consideration in proposals to upgrade public roads. Provide/ extend lighting on footpaths on the outskirts of towns and villages (including, where appropriate, off-road routes and along public rights of way) in accordance with the best international standards with special consideration being given to anticipated volumes and by continually upgrading the condition of existing footpaths in all areas and provide controlled and uncontrolled crossings, where warranted, at all major crossings.  Advise other road users on the need for safe behaviour near pedestrians and cyclists.10Signpost and waymark Walking and Cycle Routes with appropriately designed quality signage so as to facilitate visitors.11  Protect,promoteand facilitate the development ofexisting historic and other themed trails(including pilgrim paths andSli Mor), suitable walking routes, cycle tracks and bridle pathsand protect them from inappropriate development. Explore the feasibility of developing themas long distance walking routes in co-operation with the Irish Sports Council, FI and other local councils. Routes should be sign posted.12 For the benefit of local people and visitors, support and encouragecycling and walking groupsto work in co-operation with local community groups Regional Tourism Authority and adjoining councils in the development, expansion, maintenance and enhancement of routes(including long distance walkingand cycle tourist routes, Sli na Slainte and heritage trails) to provide a network of walking routes and rural footpaths and improved access for mountaineering and hill walking.13  Develop an overall Walking and Cycling Policy/Strategy within two years of the adoption of the Plan, in line with the emerging Government Strategy,  working in partnership with state, private and voluntary sector, walking clubs and community groups. The Strategy should list National Trails Network, Sli na Slainte, Pilgrim Paths and other defined walking trails and walking routes, disused roads, canals, river banks, and undertake to carry out a feasibility study to investigate the recreational use of these routes and the potential of establishing walking and cycling routes, maps showing walking and cycling routes.14Provide car parking  and/or lay-by for cyclists, hillwalkers and mountain climbers at (from your local knowledge name important locations) and other appropriate points to access amenities and scenic areas from 9am until dark*.*15  Establish new Walkways and cycle routes on a legal and permanent basis.16Preserve, support and protect existing or potential walking routes(including local walks, long-distance walks and waymarked Ways) and cycleways byprohibiting the intrusionof development along these routes particularly those in scenic and high amenity areas  and along inland waterways. Take into account the impact of proposed development when considering applications for permission for developments in their vicinity in order to protect the integrity of these important recreational and tourism resources*.***REPORT:**The proposed amendments incorporates a number of subject matters that are addressed via the Policy Objectives and Actions linked to to TM Policy 3 Walking and Cycling, and various other sections of the Draft Plan.  Issues relating to cycle networks, greenways, rural areas and local permeability are addressed in relation to Item 48036.  Other issues related to transport and mobility are addressed below.  Issues related to tourism, green infrastructure, landscape and public rights of way are addressed in relation to the relevant chapters of the Draft Plan.   Design of Facilities TM3 Objective 3 states:*‘To ensure that all streets and street networks are designed to prioritise the movement of pedestrians and cyclists within a safe and comfortable environment for a wide range of ages, abilities and journey types’*TM3 Objective 4 states:*‘To prioritise the upgrade of footpaths, lighting & public realm maintenance and supporting signage on public roads/paths where a demonstrated need exists for busy routes used by runners & walkers’*Several listed Actions of (TM) Policy 3 seek to ensure these objectives are achieved via the following: * *‘Provide additional directional signs for major destinations, civic amenities and tourist attractions on major pedestrian and cycle routes, including references to distances, estimated times and/or number of steps to be taken’*
* *‘Ensure facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are designed in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets and the National Cycle Manual’*
* *‘Further develop a footpath repair and assessment system where members of the public can report maintenance issues and instigate repairs, and implement a public lighting renewal, improvement and maintenance strategy’*

(TM) Policy 6 Road and Street Design also states that:*‘It is the policy of Council to ensure that streets and roads within the County are designed to balance the needs of place and movement, to provide a safe traffic-calmed street environment, particularly in sensitive areas and where vulnerable users are present’*This is further detailed within the Objectives listed under this Policy, namely:‘TM6 Objective 1:*To appropriately apply speed limits taking into account the characteristics of the surrounding area, the design of the street environment and the presence of vulnerable users’*‘TM6 Objective 2: *To ensure that all streets and street networks are designed to passively calm traffic through the creation of a self-regulating street environment’*And the following Actions* ‘*New roads and streets within urban areas shall be designed in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the DMURS’*
* *‘That the design of street networks in new residential estates shall facilitate the implementation of Special Speed Limits, including the lowest speed limits applicable under current legislation’*
* *‘Speed limits in urban areas will be set in accordance with the Guidelines for Setting and Managing Speed Limits in Ireland, DTTAS (2015) and the Road Traffic Act 2004 (as amended), including the provision of Special Speed Limits (i.e. 30 km/h and 40 km/h zones) within town and village centres, residential areas and around schools’*

These Actions are further detailed in Section 6.4.3(I) – Design of Streets and Roads in Urban Areas and Section 6.4.3(II) – Special Speed Limits.  The application of these National Guidelines within the County will ensure that streets are designed to place an emphasis on slow modes of transport, provide for reduced traffic speeds and create a safer environment for vulnerable users.The Polices, Policy Objectives and Actions provide a robust framework for the development of a safe network of pedestrian and cycle facilities. The NTA has also requested that reference be made to the National Cycle Manual (NCM) under (TM) Policy 6 Road and Street Design.  The NCM will be of relevance where cycle facilities exist or are proposed. **Car Parking**Section 11.4.2 - Car Parking Standard outlines the parking requirement for associated land uses.  There is no specific requirement for parking at access points to walking trails, nor is there any know national standards to guide such measures.  Such issues would be looked at on a case by case (if required).  Any proposed facilities would also be subject to an environmental appraisal, particularly in sensitive areas.  The requirement for such facilities can be noted within Section 11.4.2 of the Plan.It is acknowledged that the proposed amendment is meritorious, however as demonstrated above, the proposed amendment would result in a significant degree of duplication within the Development Plan.   The proposed wording contained in the subject motion is also protracted and difficult to decipher and as such is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly. This may lead to difficulties and confusion in the application of the Plan and therefore the proposed wording cannot be supported.**Recommendation­**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That Section 11.4.2 note that Council will also seek to provide car parking and/or lay-by for cyclists, hillwalkers and mountain climbers at access points to walking/cycling trails in scenic areas.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM133/0216 Item ID:48061**It was proposed by Councillor J. Lahart and seconded by Councillor D. Looney.That the Development Plan 2016-2022 reflects the need to address additional traffic congestion in the Ballycullen area leading to major national road routes such as the M50**REPORT:**Recent major upgrades in the Ballycullen area leading to the M50 include the upgrade of the junction of Ballycullen Road and Killininny Road from a roundabout to a signalised junction and the duplication of the M50 flyover at Junction 12.  Table 6.6 also included proposal for two bridges from Firhouse Road to the N81 and from Bohernabreena Road to Kiltipper Road which will also serve to address traffic congestion in the Firhouse and Ballycullen area (see Items 48061 and 47895) The scope for further improvements is limited, however additional street reserve is available to enable the widening of Killininny Road.  Any such proposal will however need to be approached with caution as creating more road space to cater for traffic is likely to attract more cars to the network.  Any proposed widening will also need to be consistent with TM1 Objective 3 which states:*'To focus on improvements to the local road and street network that better utilise existing road space and encourage a transition toward more sustainable modes of transport, while ensuring sufficient road capacity exists for the residual proportion of the trips which will continue to be taken by private vehicle'*Any proposed road widening will also need to be considered in the context of the Draft Transport Stagey 2016-2030 for the Greater Dublin Area and the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan (2013), i.e. requirements for bus and cycle lanes, and national policy documents which seek to promote a shift from private cars to more sustainable modes of transportation. An Objective can be added to Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Road Objectives to reflect these requirements. **Recommendation­**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That the following proposal to widen Killininny Road be added to Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Road Objectives.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal | Description | Function |
| Killininny Road | Widening of the existing carriageway between Oldbawn and the M50 | To reduce delays to the M50 and create additional road space for the provision of dedicated bus and cycle lanes.    |

[M133 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50996)Following contributions from Councillor J. Lahart and P. Donovan, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded. The Motion was amended as follows:In the table to be added to Table 6.6 Medium to long term road objectives the middle box under Description to read:-“Minor widening of the existing carriageway within the curtilage of the existing road” The **AMENDED** Motion was **AGREED****DPM134/0216 Item ID:48067**It was proposed by Councillor J. Lahart and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That the Development Plan 2016-20122 addresses the need for the residential nature of much of the CityWest Campus development to be reflected in safe ways for pedestrians, cyclists and children and not exclusively for business access vehicular traffic - that the Development Plan reflects the heavy residential character of this part of the County**REPORT:**TM3 Objective 3 states:*‘To ensure that all streets and street networks are designed to prioritise the movement of pedestrians and cyclists within a safe and comfortable environment for a wide range of ages, abilities and journey types’*The Actions of (TM) Policy 3 seek to ensure these objectives are achieved via the following: *‘Ensure facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are designed in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets and the National Cycle Manual’*(TM) Policy 6 Road and Street Design also states that:*‘It is the policy of Council to ensure that streets and roads within the County are designed to balance the needs of place and movement, to provide a safe traffic-calmed street environment, particularly in sensitive areas and where vulnerable users are present’*This is further detailed within the Objectives listed under this Policy, namely:TM6 Objective 1:*‘To appropriately apply speed limits taking into account the characteristics of the surrounding area, the design of the street environment and the presence of vulnerable users’*TM6 Objective 2: *‘To ensure that all streets and street networks are designed to passively calm traffic through the creation of a self-regulating street environment’*And the following Actions* ‘New roads and streets within urban areas shall be designed in accordance with the principles, approaches and standards contained within the DMURS’
* ‘That the design of street networks in new residential estates shall facilitate the implementation of Special Speed Limits, including the lowest speed limits applicable under current legislation’
* ‘Speed limits in urban areas will be set in accordance with the Guidelines for Setting and Managing Speed Limits in Ireland, DTTAS (2015) and the Road Traffic Act 2004 (as amended), including the provision of Special Speed Limits (i.e. 30 km/h and 40 km/h zones) within town and village centres, residential areas and around schools’

These Actions are further detailed in Section 6.4.3(I) – Design of Streets and Roads in Urban Areas and Section 6.4.3(II) – Special Speed Limits.  The application of these National Guidelines within the County will ensure that all streets are designed to place an emphasis on slow modes of transport, provide for reduced traffic speeds and create a safer environment for vulnerable users.  Specific references to individual locations are not necessary. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:That the Development Plan 2016-20122 addresses the need for the residential nature of much of the  County to be reflected in safe ways for pedestrians, cyclists and children and not exclusively for business access vehicular traffic.[M134 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50997)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM135/0216 Item ID:47960**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.With reference to Chapter 11, specifically 11.4.6, that school travel plans being provided for new schools and major extensions include a plan for pedestrians and identify potential pedestrian safety issues and mitigation measures such as the installation of zebra crossings or school warden services.Co Sponsored: Cllrs William Lavelle and Paula Donovan**REPORT:**Section 11.4.3 – Travel Plans of the Draft Plan makes reference to Workplace Travel Plan or Mobility Management Plans.  These are required for all larger sized developments as defined in Table 11.25 of the Draft Plan.Section 6.3.3 -  Green Schools of the Draft Plan also notes that: ***‘****The Planning Authority will continue to implement pedestrian and cycling improvements with the Assistance of the NTA through the Green Schools and the STMGs programmes. The Planning Authority will also ensure that road safety and traffic management systems outside existing and planned schools are to the highest standard across the County’*The requirement for a Travel Plans can be formalised under Table 11.25 of the Plan.  Requirements for zebra crossings or school wardens will be addressed in any such plan as part of a package of measures to encourage sustainable travel modes. **Recommendation­**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Add a requirement to Section 11.4.6 that Mobility Management Plans be submitted for all new schools or for existing schools where 25% or greater expansion in classrooms is proposed.  The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED**It was agreed to take Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 together:**DPM136/0216 Item ID:47841**Proposed by Councillor F. WarfieldThat this council not pursue the draft development plan proposal linking a bridge between Firhouse and Old Bawn across Dodder Valley Park.Cllr. Brendan FerronCllr. Fintan Warfield**REPORT:**Table 6.6 – Medium to Long Tern Road Objectives includes a proposal for the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road and the N81 (Glenview Roundabout).  The primary purpose of this bridge is:*‘To relieve traffic congestion around the Oldcourt Local Centre/Bridge and facilitate the possible routing of the Tallaght Swiftway (Bus Rapid Transport)’*The proposed bridge will also assist in the mitigation of additional pressures placed on the existing Oldbawn Bridge by the development of the lands to the south within the Ballycullen-Oldcourt Local Area Plan.The existing Oldbawn Bridge experiences significant congestion at the AM and PM peaks.  This is a particular concern in relation to delays for bus services.  The Draft Transport Strategy 2016-2035 for the Greater Dublin Area proposes to introduce a number of new/improved bus services in the Firhouse/Oldbawn area, including:   * Tallaght - Clongriffin Bus Rapid Transport.
* Tallaght - Rathfarnham – Terenure Core Radial Bus Route
* Tallaght - UCD/Dundrum Core Orbital Bus Corridor

The provision of these services will be the subject of a route selection process.  This will include the option of utilising the existing Oldbawn Bridge.  This area is however is subject to a number of constraints including: * Limited road space: At present there is no available road space to enable the provision of segregated bus lanes. The creation of the additional space will require the widening/duplication of the existing bridge and the compulsory purchase of sites.
* Delays at multiple junctions:  There are three signalised junctions within 200m of the Oldbawn Bridge.  It is also likely that the junction of the R113 and Killininny Road will need to be upgraded in future, resulting in four signalised junctions within 400m.
* Built heritage:  The Oldbawn Bridge is a listed on Record of Monuments and Places (Schedule 1).  The weir immediately adjacent to the bridge is listed on the Record of Protected Structures (schedule 2).  This presents a major constraint to the widening and/or duplication of the bridge.
* Additional pressures: As noted above, congestion in this area is likely to increase with the development of lands associated with the Ballycullen-Oldcourt LAP.

In recognition of these constraints, Section 4.2.5 of the Draft Transport Strategy refers to *‘a public transport bridge over the Dodder to the east of Tallaght from Firhouse Road to the N81’.* Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed bridge is the subject of significant local opposition (and environmental constraints) it is difficult to see how the levels of service required for BRT and the Core Bus Network could be achieved via the Old Bawn Bridge.  Should the proposed Firhouse-N81 be omitted from the Draft Plan, it is likely that high frequency services will routed elsewhere such as via Spawell Roundabout and N81. From a suitable transport perspective this would be undesirable, as large sections of this route are sparsely populated.   It should be noted that the proposed location of the bridge is indicative only, and would need to be finalised following a more detailed appraisal and design process. This would include environmental and transport/traffic appraisals (such as an Environmental Impact Statement), which will require a range of alternatives to be considered and would address detailed concerns regarding the impacts of any proposal.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M136 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50630)It was agreed to take Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 together.Following contributions from Councillor J. Lahart, D. Looney, P. Foley, R. McMahon, K. Mahon, F. Warfield and B. Ferron, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised. A show of hands vote on the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 28(TWENTY EIGHT)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 1(ONE)**The Motions **AS PUT** were **CARRIED****DPM137/0216 Item ID:47894**Proposed by Councillor R. McMahonTo remove the objective from the plan under Table 6.6 Medium to Long term Objectives the reference to a new bridge from Firhouse to N81 due to its' unsuitability for many reasons at this location**REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road to and N81 (Glenview Roundabout) are addressed under Item 47841. [M137 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50721)Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 taken together.**DPM138/0216 Item ID:48057**Proposed by Councillor J. LahartThat the proposal in the draft development plan to construct a new route across the Dodder, through the Dodder Valley (in the vicinity of the Carmellite Convent, Firhouse Road) - be deleted from the County Development Plan 2016-2022**REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road to and N81 (Glenview Roundabout) are addressed under Item 47841. [M138 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50731)Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 taken together.**DPM139/0216 Item ID:48066**Proposed by Councillor C. BrophyCo sponsored with Cllr Paula DonovanChapter 6 Transport & MobilityThat the Manager would remove from the development plan the current Long term road/bridge objective linking the Firhouse Road to the Tallaght By Pass (N81) at Glenview**REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road to and N81 (Glenview Roundabout) are addressed under Item 47841 (M136).  [M139 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50726)Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 taken together.**DPM140/0216 Item ID:48083**Proposed by Councillor D. LooneyTo remove the Firhouse-N81 Bridge from the Medium-Long Term Road Objectives (Table 6.6).*Co-Sponsored by Cllr F N Duffy***REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road to and N81 (Glenview Roundabout) are addressed under Item 47841.  [M140 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50643)Motions 136, 137,138, 139 and 140 taken together.**DPM141/0216 Item ID:48112**In the absence of Councillor P. Kearns the following Motion **FELL:**To remove the proposal for the Firhouse N81 bridge from the Development Plan**REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Firhouse-N81 Bridge between Firhouse Road to and N81 (Glenview Roundabout) are addressed under Item 47841.  [M141 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50710) **DPM142/0216 Item ID:47895**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. GilliganTo remove the objective from the plan under Table 6.6 Medium to Long term Objectives the reference to a new bridge from Bohernabreena Road to Kiltipper Road due to its' unsuitability for many reasons at this location**REPORT:**Table 6.6 – Medium to Long Tern Road Objectives includes a proposal for a Oldcourt-Oldbawn Bridge between Bohernabreena and Killtipper Road.  The primary purpose of this bridge is: *‘to provide access to Ballycullen-Oldcourt LAP lands’.*Should the proposed bridge not be provided, the only direct means of access between the Ballycullen-Oldcourt and Tallaght will be via the existing Oldbawn bridge, which as detailed in relation to Item 47841, experiences significant pressure.In recognition of the need to free up capacity at the existing Oldbwn bridge, the proposed bridge between Oldcourt-Oldbawn has been included in the Draft Transport Strategy 2016-2035 for the Greater Dublin Area. Section 4.2.5 refers to a *‘link road from Oldcourt Road to Kiltipper Road’*. The Draft Transport Strategy recognises that by providing direct access to the Ballycullen-Oldcourt LAP lands, pressure will be reduced on the existing Oldbawn Bridge. As noted above in relation to the Firhouse-N81 bridge (47841) creating additional capacity in the Firhouse-Oldbawn area is critical for the delivery of quality public transport services in the area.It should also be noted that the proposed locations of the bridges are indicative only and would be finalised only following a detailed appraisal and design process. This would include environmental and transport/traffic appraisals (such as an Environmental Impact Assessment). This will also require a range of alternatives to be considered and would address detailed concerns regarding the impacts of any proposal.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted[M142 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50722)It was agreed to take Motion 142 in conjunction with Motion 143.Following contributions from Councillors J. Lahart, C. King, R. McMahon, M. Murphy, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 30(THIRTY)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0(ZERO)**The Motions **AS PUT** were **CARRIED****DPM143/0216 Item ID:48077**It was proposed by Councillor J. Lahart and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That the proposal in the County Development Plan to construct an additional bridge across the Dodder connecting Bohernabreena and Kiltipper be removed from the Plan **REPORT:**Items in relation to the proposed Medium to Long Term Road Objectives the Oldcourt-Oldbawn Bridge between Bohernabreena and Kiltipper Road are addressed under Item 47895**.** [M143 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50696)Motion 143 taken in conjunction with Motion 142.**DPM145/0216 Item ID:47884**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded Councillor E. Higgins.**New Griffeen link road**To amend Table 6.5 (Six Year Road Programme) such that the description of ‘Clonburris/Kishogue Street Network’ includes the following addition: *“including a new road link from the Griffeen Avenue/Griffeen Road junction southwards to the Adamstown Link Road*”; with Maps No. 1/2 to be amended to include this road alignment.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**The lands to the south of the Griffeen Avenue/Griffeen Road junction are proposed to zoned SDZ (replacing the current A1 zoning) to facilitate the development of the Clonburris Strategic Development Zone.  A major application (SD09A/0149) for mixed development on these lands was granted An Bord Pleanala and does not expire until February 2018. The street network permitted under SD09A/0149 provided for vehicular access between the junction of Griffeen Avenue/Griffeen Road and the Adamstown Link Road.  However the street layout was designed for local access only.  Movement through the residential neighbourhood (which also includes the existing Lucan East Educate Together school) is discouraged as the route is indirect and the individual streets are designed to be self-regulating with design speeds of 10-30 km/h.  Such a route would not need to be identified within Table 6.5 as it would not form part of a strategic road network. The provision of direct link that forms part of the strategic road network (i.e. as an alternate route to the Outer Ring Road) is not supported as the road would;* result in potential conflicts with national policy documents (ie DMURS) and TM 6 Policy and its related Policy Objectives and Actions relating to the design of streets in urban areas. relating to road safety;
* conflict with the existing permission;
* be premature with regard to the new Clonburris SDZ Planning Scheme; and
* would serve to attract traffic in the form of a ‘rat run’ through the Kishoge Cross neighbourhood, raising safety and amenity concerns for future residents.

For these reasons the proposed amendment cannot be supported. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted [M145 - Kishoge Cross Neighbourhood Plan SD09A/0149](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51005)[M145 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50998)Following contributions from Councillors W. Lavelle, P. Gogarty, G. O’Connell, Ed. O’Brien, and E. Ó’Broin. Mr E. Taaffe, Director of Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.Councillor W. Lavelle **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion**DPM146/0216 Item ID:47886**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell**Retention of N4/N7/M50 junction objectives**To decline to accept the Chief Executive’s recommendation to amend Table 6.5 Six Year Road Programme and Table 6.6: Medium to Long Term Road Objectives to remove the proposals for the following junctions:* - Fonthill Road/N4;
* - Esker Lane/N4;
* - Tandy’s Lane/N4;
* - Tay Lane/N7 Junction;
* - Junction 8 (M50).

*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly, Egan, Higgins***REPORT:**Table 6.6 – Medium to Long Term Road Proposals includes a number of proposals to reopen and/or reinstate junctions along national routes  that have been closed or omitted by the Transport Infrastructure Ireland  (formerly the National Roads Authority).   Concerns have been raised at previous Development Plan meetings in February 2015 and June 2015 regarding the inclusion of these proposals due to: * A lack of support from the relevant national agencies.
* The safety impacts of locating of additional junctions along a high speed heavily trafficked routes.
* The impacts on traffic congestions and carrying capacity along national routes.
* Conflicts with National and European polices/guidelines.

As these junction proposals are located along national routes any proposals will require the consent of TII to be carried out.  The support of the National Transport Authority (NTA), Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport (DTTS) and/or Department of Environment, Community and Local Government (DECLG) would also be crucial, particularly if funding from a national agency is sought. As detailed in the report on the Draft Plan Public Consultation, objections to these proposals were received from all four national agencies during the draft Plan consultation. The reasons for objection included:  * Their potential to generate traffic and impacting adversely on the operation and carrying capacity of the National Road Network which is already under immense pressure.
* Conflicts with the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines, which only allow access onto the motorway/national road nextwork in *‘exceptional circumstances’.*
* Conflicts with the requirements of Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T) which require the upgrade of the N7 to motorway or ‘express road’ standards between the M50 and Naas by 2030. The N4 is also considered part of the TEN-T comprehensive network.

Taking into account the objections of national agencies, the inclusion of the junctions proposals will conflict with number of Actions directly linked to Polices and Policy Objectives within the Plan, notably:      TM Policy 4 Strategic Road and Street Network: *‘Work in conjunction with transport agencies, including the DTTAS, NTA, and National Roads Authority (NRA) to deliver improvements to and extensions of the Strategic Road Network’* TM Policy 5 Traffic and Transport Management: *‘Maintain and protect the safety, capacity and efficiency of National roads and associated junctions in accordance with the Spatial Planning and National Roads: Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DECLG (2012)’*The concerns of DECLG, as detailed in their submission on the Draft Plan, are also shared in relation to sending conflicting signals. The implementation of these proposals is improbable and their inclusion will serve to unduly raise community exceptions and reduce the credibility of the Plan.  It should also be noted that the closure of these junctions occurred following an extensive public consultation process (including the appropriate environmental appraisal).  As such the inclusion of these proposal is seeking to circumvent due process. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M146 - Junction 8 (M50)](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50780)[M146 - Location Map Esker Lane/N4](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50775)[M146 - Location Map Fonthill Road/N4](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50765)[M146 - Location Map Tandy's Lane](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50786)[M146 - Location Map Tay Lane/N7](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50769)It was agreed to take Motions 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151 & 152 together.Following contributions from Councillors W. Lavelle, G. O’Connell, E. Higgins, P. Gogarty, Ed O’Brien, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 22(TWENTY TWO)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 8(EIGHT)**The Motions **AS PUT** were **CARRIED****DPM147/0216 Item ID:47972**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and Councillor P. Gogarty**Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**That, notwithstanding the comments of the DEC&LG Ref 0183, The NRA and TII, and in recognition of the new status of the Liffey Valley Centre as a Regional Retail Shopping Centre the objective as set out in Table 6.5 Six Year Plan and Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Plan to upgrade the Fonthill/N4 Junction shall remain part of the 2016 – 2022 Development Plan, thus removing from local communities motorised traffic that is regional and/or national.**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction and the policy position of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted[M147 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50768)**DPM148/0216 Item ID:47973**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and Councillor P. Gogarty **Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**That, notwithstanding the comments of the DEC&LG Ref 0183, The NRA and TII, and given the need to divert traffic, that is destined for the National Route eventually, away from pedestrians and cyclists, the objective as set out in Table 6.5 Six Year Plan and Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Plan to provide an exit from Tandy’s Lane onto the N4 shall remain part of the 2016 – 2022 Development Plan.**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction proposals under the remit of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886.With regard to safety, it is unclear how the reopening of Tandy’s Lane would benefit cyclists and pedestrians.  Tandy’s Lane is a narrow street with narrow footways and no cycle facilities.  At present the street provides access from the R835 to a number of small residential estates (Ardeen and Ardeevin).  Reopening this junction will attracted a significant number of additional trips into this residential area and will have a negative impact on the safety and amenities of the residents of Tandy’s Lane and adjoining estates.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M148 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50766)**DPM149/0216 Item ID:47975**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and Councillor P. Gogarty **Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**That, notwithstanding the comments of the DEC&LG Ref 0183, The NRA and TII, and given that traffic wishing to get to and from the N4 from Esker Communities should be facilitated to do so in the safest manner possible, the objective as set out in Table 6.5 Six Year Plan and Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Plan to open up a “left-in, left-out” from the N4 at Esker Lane shall remain part of the 2016 – 2022 Development Plan.**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction proposals under the remit of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M149 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50761)**DPM150/0216 Item ID:47977**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and Councillor P. Gogarty **Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**That, notwithstanding the comments of the DEC&LG Ref 0183, The NRA and TII, the objective as set out in Table 6.5 Six Year Plan and Table 6.6 Medium to Long Term Plan to provide Junction 8 on the M50 at Cloverhill shall remain part of the 2016 – 2022 Development Plan. While it is noted that the management of the M50 is the remit of TII its location, operation and service profoundly impact on SDCC local communities. The Draft Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035 notes that ‘traffic levels on the M50 have continued to grow, even during the economic downturn, and delays on this corridor are now a common feature, despite a near-doubling of its capacity in recent years’. The Transport Strategy also states that ‘other than on the southern section of the route, further capacity enhancements to the M50 are neither physically possible nor environmentally desirable’. This reality is readily accepted. However, the restoration of J8 will not increase traffic on the M50 but rather provide a more readily accessible route for (especially Commercial Traffic for) Clondalkin (including Clonburris when developed), Park West/Cherry Orchard (proposed as a new Town by DCC) and the Liffey Valley Major Retail Centre as well as for the Cloverhill and Wheatfield Prisons and Courthouses. If anything, it will release other pressure points and will certainly help move local communities closer to desirable EU norms in terms of health and safety.**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction proposals under the remit of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886.[M150 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50759)**DPM151/0216 Item ID:47991**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**That the following proposals for the following junctions be retained Table 6.5 Six Year Road Programme and Table 6.6: Medium to Long Term Road Objectives:- Fonthill Road/N4- Esker Lane/N4- Tandy’s Lane/N4"**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction proposals under the remit of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886. (M 146)[M151 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50999)**DPM152/0216 Item ID:48084**It was proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor W. Lavelle.To decline to accept the Chief Executive’s recommendation to amend Table 6.5 Six Year Road Programme and Table 6.6: Medium to Long Term Road Objectives to remove the proposals for the following junctions:·         Fonthill Road/N4;·         Esker Lane/N4;·         Tandy’s Lane/N4;·         Tay Lane/N7 Junction;·         Junction 8 (M50) ,**REPORT:**Concerns in relation to the inclusion of this junction proposals under the remit of national agencies are detailed in response to Item 47886.(M 146)**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M152 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51000)Motions 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151 & 152 taken together.**DPM153/0216 Item ID:47901**It was proposed by Councillor B. Ferron and seconded by Councillor S. Holland. **Co-sponsored by Cllr B Ferron:*** "That the council commit to the renovation of the bridge at Bolbrook"
* "That this council ensure a “lollipop lady” is in situ to allow safe passage for school children at Bothar Katherine Tynan and Cookstown intersection"
* "That the original stone wall be reinstated at Greenhills Rd/Tymonville Estate"
* "That  3 Ton vehicular signs be erected at appropriate sections within the Kilnamanagh ring road to prevent risks to residents".
* "That the council assess and report on solutions to ease traffic tailbacks on the Mayberry Rd, Kilnamanagh"
* "That the public realm along Bothar Katherine Tynan Rd- from Parkhill, Belgard Rd to Kingswood Luas stop to M50 interchange- be  upgraded".
* "That the Maplewood bungalows facing directly onto the N81 be provided with noise protection barriers".

**REPORT:**Requests for minor works and localised traffic management are non-strategic issues and are, therefore, not a matter for the County Development Plan.  Such issues can be perused via the Area Committee process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted[M153 - Location Map Bolbrook](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50609)[M153 - Location Map Bothar Katherine Tynan](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50610)[M153 - Location Map Greenhills Rd/Tymonville Estate](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50611)[M153 - Location Map Kilnamanagh ring road](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50613)[M153 - Location Map Maplewood](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50616)[M153 - Location Map Mayberry Road](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50614)[M153 - Location Map Parkhill](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50615)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM154/0216 Item ID:48036**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor S. Holland.On page 104  Policy 3  Replace Objective 1 with: Create, provide, promote, improve, develop, sustain, support, enhance, encourage and facilitate walking, rambling and cycling as appropriate recreational and tourism activities by identifying more dedicated walking and cycling routes to enable the creation of a high quality dedicated comprehensive network of safe cycling/walking routes and tourist trails(including looped walks, local walks, community walks and medium/long distance walks)and the public/rural footpath network, in rural areas (including suitable linear lands along  established rights of way, strategic green corridors and other off-road routes) linking communities to key destinations, amenities and leisure activities and exploiting  their vast recreational and tourist potential(including international tourists). Map suitable recreational routes and promote and facilitate the development of such routes having cognisance of national policy. Enhance and extend existing routes, byutilising links from residential areas through parks and open spaces to link with existing waymarked trails and facilitate a green infrastructure network and linking with Sli na Slainte and existing or new public rights of way and the Green Infrastructure network to provide access to scenic, mountain, lakeshore and river features and views of special interest, particularly where these have a historical association. The development of various cycling/walking routes have helped to open up diverse landscapes and promote tourism. Off-road walkways can be established by informal, formal agreements with landowners or by acquisition. Support proposals that improve pedestrian routes and that improve and develop walking and cycle networks. **REPORT:**TM3 Objective 1 states:*‘To create a comprehensive and legible County-wide network of cycling and walking routes that link communities to key destinations, amenities and leisure activates’*The proposed amendment to TM3 Objective 1 incorporates a number of subject matters that are addressed throughout Draft Plan.  These issues are responded to individually below in relation to transport and mobility Issues related to tourism, green infrastructure, landscape and public rights of way are addressed in relation to the relevant chapters of the Draft Plan.   Cycle Network(TM) Policy 3 Walking and Cycling of the Draft Plan also contains a number of objectives that seek to improve cyclist mobility across the County. A number of Actions listed under this policy also refer to the implementation of additional cycle links, namely to *‘work with the NTA to assist and secure funding for the ongoing implementation of the County Strategic Cycle Network’.*Table 6.4 - Six Year Cycle Network Programme nominates Council’s priorities for the implementation of the Strategic Cycling Network.  This will provide for new links along a variety of roads and streets (including the upgrade of existing links which are assessed to be inadequate), including Green Routes which generally pass through interlinked areas parklands that form part of the County’s open space networkGreenways and Rural AreasSection 6.3.0 is predominantly concerned with walking and cycling in urban areas, as this is where, by far, the greatest levels of pedestrian and cyclist activity within the County take place (at present and into the future).  Notwithstanding this, the development of a number of Greenways will directly benefit rural/urban fringe urban communities, in particular the Liffey Valley (Strawberry Beds area), Dodder (Bohernabreena area) and Grand Canal Greenways (Hazelhatch area).  One of the actions listed under (TM) Policy 3 Walking and Cycling states that Council will:*‘Adopt a County-wide signage scheme for motorists, in accordance with the Traffic Signs Manual, warning of the presence of pedestrians and cyclists along rural roads’*The development of a number of Greenways will also directly benefit rural/urban fringe urban communities, in particular the Liffey Valley (Strawberry Beds area), Dodder (Bohernabreena area) and Grand Canal Greenways (Hazelhatch area).MappingThe level of information illustrated on the Draft Plan 2016-2022 Maps (and within the Draft Plan more generally) is comprehensive.  A balance needs to be found in regard to the illustration of detailed Ordinance Survey information and strategic direction to ensure that the maps are legible.  Furthermore detailed maps regarding walking and cycling routes (and other information) are already available from multiple sources, such as the Ordinance Survey Discovery Series.  Detailed maps of the existing and proposed cycle lanes though metropolitan and rural Dublin (and adjoining counties) are contained within the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan.Local Permeability(TM) Policy 3 Walking and Cycling of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 includes a number of objectives that seek to increase pedestrian and cyclist accessibility to key services and locations.  One of the listed Actions of this policy is to:  *‘Reduce walking and cycling distances to areas of employment, community services, schools, shops, public transport and other community facilities through the delivery of Local Permeability Improvements within existing communities’*This Action is further detailed Section 6.3.2 Local Permeability Improvements which make reference to work undertaken in conjunction with the NTA. This included the preparation of the Appraisal and Prioritisation of Proposed Permeability Projects Study, which examines levels of connectivity within communities and identifies potential walking and cycling links within communities throughout the County. (TM) Policy 3 Walking and Cycling of the Draft Plan also contains a number of objectives that seek to improve cyclist mobility across the County. A number of Actions listed under this policy also refer to the implementation of additional cycle links, namely to ‘work with the NTA to assist and secure funding for the ongoing implementation of the County Strategic Cycle Network’.Table 6.4 - Six Year Cycle Network Programme nominates Council’s priorities for the implementation of the Strategic Cycling Network.  This will provide for new links along a variety of roads and streets (including the upgrade of existing links which are assessed to be inadequate), including Green Routes which generally pass through interlinked areas parklands that form part of the County’s open space network. Local communities have been engaged via various consultation processes during the preparation of all cycle network and permeability projects carried out to date in the County. This process included consultation undertaken at an early stage to allow findings to be considered prior to detailed designs being proposed.With regard to future studies, SDCC would welcome the review and expansion of the Initial Appraisal Document via a ‘whole of catchment’ multi-agency approach that closely links all major public transport services to permeability projects such as those funded through the Green School/ Sustainable Transport Measures Grants (STMG) procesMinor WorksRequests for new/improved footpaths, crossings and other localised pedestrian facilities, referenced in submissions received, are a non-strategic issue and are, therefore, not a matter for the County Development Plan.It is acknowledged that the proposed amendment is meritorious, however as demonstrated above, the proposed amendment would result in a significant degree of duplication within the Development Plan.   The proposed wording contained in the subject motion is also protracted and difficult to decipher and as such is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly. This may lead to difficulties and confusion in the application of the Plan and therefore the proposed wording cannot be supported.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adoptedThe Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****Infrastructure & Environmental Quality****DPM155/0216 Item ID:47967**It was proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.With reference to Chapter 7, specifically 7.8.0, that the text be amended to include ‘an aviation museum’ as a potential ancillary use of Casement Aerodrome.Co Sponsored: William Lavelle**REPORT:**The content of the motion is noted and accepted. The Draft Plan includes for an objective in the Economic and Tourism chapter that states:ET8 Objective 2: To support tourism projects that seek to showcase and promote the County’s cultural heritage including arts, music, aviation history, Irish Language customs and ways of life including the development of museums, cultural centres and interpretative centres at appropriate locations.It is considered that the reference to an aviation museum in Section 7.8 in relation to Casement Aerodrome complements the objective in Chapter 4.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M155 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51001)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM156/0216 Item ID:48076**In the absence of Councillor D. O'Donovan the following Motion **FELL:**That the Chief Executive undertakes to facilitate the expansion of broadband to the Bohernabreena/Glenasmole area.  **REPORT:**The Chief Executive notes and accepts the general content of the motion to facilitate the expansion of broadband in the County. The content is included in the Draft Plan under IE4 Objective 1 as follows:IE4 Objective 1: To promote and facilitate the provision of appropriate telecommunications infrastructure, including broadband connectivity and other innovative and advancing technologies within the County.It is not considered necessary to specifically name the Bohernabreena/ Glenasmole area as the Development Plan is a County wide document and the provision of broadband relates to the entire County.**Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion be adopted. No amendment to the Draft Plan required.**DPM157/0216 Item ID:47839**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.that the distance of recycle bottle banks is changed in order to facilitate extra recycling bottle banks in key location in SDCC**REPORT:**The Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion to provide a flexible policy to facilitate extra recycling bottle banks in the County. It is considered that the Draft Plan provides for this as follows:1. The Draft Plan contains the following objective in relation to bring infrastructure:

E5 Objective 5: To provide for and maintain the network of bring infrastructure (e.g. civic amenity facilities, bring banks) in the County to facilitate the recycling and recovery of hazardous and non-hazardous municipal wastes.2. Section 11.6.5 outlinesBring Banks & Recycling Facilities Bring bank facilities will generally be required at appropriate locations in the following developments:* In conjunction with significant new commercial developments, or extensions to same. A minor offset in car parking requirements may be considered where public recycling bring facilities are provided.
* In conjunction with new waste infrastructure facilities, proposal should include bring facilities for the acceptance of non-hazardous and hazardous wastes from members of the public and small businesses.
* In conjunction with large scale residential and mixed use developments, proposals should provide recycling facilities to serve residents and in some appropriate locations, the wider community.

Additionally, Section 11.6.5 outlines that the design and siting of the Refuse Storage & Recycling Facilities in Developments should ensure that ‘the location and design of any refuse storage or recycling facility should ensure that it is easily accessible both for residents and/or public and for bin collection, be insect and vermin proofed, will not present an odour problem, and will not significantly detract from the residential amenities of adjacent property or future occupants. **Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion is adopted as the principle of the motion is already contained in the Draft Plan. No changes to Draft Plan required.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM158/0216 Item ID:47873**Proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle**Weston Airport**To decline to accept the Chief Executive’s recommendation to amend the text of IE9 Objective 6.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**There are a two motions in relation to the text of IE9 Objective 6 (Weston Aerodrome) and the Chief Executive recommended an amendment to the Objective in the Chief Executive Report. The following is a summary of the 3 wording options to inform the decision making:

|  |
| --- |
| **Text in Draft Plan:** IE9 Objective 6: To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.Councillor Lavelle motion (Item 47873 - co-sponsored by Cllr Casserly) provides for keeping this wording   |
| Text Proposed in Chief Executive's Report on Public Consultation: Amend IE9 Objective 6 to readTo facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate the aviation operations given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.   |
| Proposed by Councillor Gogarty (Item 48001 - M159)(co – sponsors Cllr O’Toole & O’Connell)To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, while facilitating small-scale ancillary uses, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.   |

The submissions received during the public consultation in relation to Weston included that part of the future vision for the aerodrome is to reinforce the position of the aerodrome as an aviation training facility. The Chief Executive considers that ancillary on the ground uses are acceptable and that the text in the Draft Plan restricts ‘growth’ in general. It is considered that the intention of the objective is to restrict the expansion /operation of the aviation uses at Weston.In this context, it is considered that the wording of IE9 Objective 6 in the Draft Plan should be amended to facilitate such ancillary on the ground uses.As such, the Chief Executive considers that the amendment proposed in the CE report provides a balance of flexibility in terms of ancillary uses and consolidating the aviation operations.**Recommendation**It is recommended to amend the motion to adopt the following wording:Amend IE9 Objective 6 to read:To facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate the aviation operations given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.[M158 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50669)Councillor W. Lavelle **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion.**DPM159/0216 Item ID:48001**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**Amend IE9 Objective 6 to read"To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, while facilitating small-scale ancillary uses, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.**REPORT:**There are a two motions in relation to the text of IE9 Objective 6 (Weston Aerodrome) and the Chief Executive recommended an amendment to the Objective in the Chief Executive Report. The following is a summary of the 3 wording options to inform the decision making:

|  |
| --- |
| **Text in Draft Plan:** IE9 Objective 6: To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.Councillor Lavelle Motion (Item 47873/ Motion 158 - co-sponsored by Cllr Casserly) provides for keeping this wording   |
| **Text Proposed in Chief Executive Report on Public Consultation:** Amend IE9 Objective 6 to readTo facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate the aviation operations given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.   |
| **Proposed by Councillor Gogarty (Item 48001 - motion 159)**(co – sponsors Cllr O’Toole & O’Connell)To consolidate the development of the aerodrome within its existing setting, while facilitating small-scale ancillary uses, but to restrict further growth given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.   |

The submissions received during the public consultation in relation to Weston included that part of the future vision for the aerodrome is to reinforce the position of the aerodrome as an aviation training facility. The Chief Executive considers that ancillary on the ground uses are acceptable and that the text in the Draft Plan restricts ‘growth’ in general. It is considered that the intention of the objective is to restrict the expansion /operation of the aviation uses at Weston.In this context, it is considered that the wording of IE9 Objective 6 in the Draft Plan should be amended to facilitate such ancillary on the ground uses.As such, the Chief Executive considers that the amendment proposed in the CE report provides a balance of flexibility in terms of ancillary uses and consolidating the aviation operations.**Recommendation**It is recommended to amend the motion to adopt the following wording:Amend IE9 Objective 6 to read:To facilitate the development of ancillary uses at the aerodrome within its existing setting and consolidate the aviation operations given its proximity to Casement Aerodrome, Dublin Airport and neighbouring suburban residential areas.[M159 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50816)Following a contribution from Councillor P. Gogarty, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raisedA show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 18(EIGHTEEN)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 8(EIGHT)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM160/0216 Item ID:47874**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Weston Airport**To support submission DRAFTDEVPLAN0237 to reinstate Objective EE42 of the existing Development Plan in the new plan i.e. that it is the policy of the Planning Authority to seek to revert the runway classification from Code 2B to Code 1A.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**The coding of the runway at Weston Aerodrome is a matter for the Irish Aviation Authority. The aerodrome as a whole is currently licensed by the IAA as Code 2B and it is not within the remit of the Planning Authority to change the code of the runway. The coding of the runway is linked to the length and width of the runway.In this context, it is considered that the content of IE9 Objective 5 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 is relevant and adequate.  IE9 Objective 5 - ‘To restrict any further effective lengthening of the operational runway or over-run areas’ **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M160 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50813)Following contributions from Councillor W. Lavelle and P. Gogarty, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 16(SIXTEEN)****AGAINST: 1(ONE)****ABSTAIN: 9(NINE)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED** **DPM161/0216 Item ID:48008**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded Councillor S. Holland.Page 119 – Replace IE1 Objective 9 with the following text – (voted for by the councillors)IE1 Objective 9: Liaise with the relevant stakeholders, to ensure the implementation of BS8515-2009 rain & grey water harvesting, subject to class of use (SI 600 2001) and the economic viability for the end user.**REPORT:**The content of the motion is noted.The CE considers that the Draft Plan contains the relevant information as follows:**IE1 Objective 10:** To promote water conservation and best practice water conservation practices in all developments, including rain water harvesting, grey water recycling and supporting the implementation of BS8515: 2009 Rainwater harvesting systems – Code of practice.**E4 Objective 1:** To ensure that medium to large scale residential and commercial developments are designed to take account of the impacts of climate change, including the installation of rain water harvesting systems and that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures are incorporated in accordance with national building regulations, policy and guidelines.Furthermore, the Implementation Chapter of the Plan states in **Section 11.6.1:**(v) Rain Water HarvestingDevelopment proposal including rain water harvesting should liaise with the relevant stakeholders, to ensure the implementation of BS8515-2009 (Rain & grey water harvesting), subject to class of use (SI 600 2001) and the economic viability for the end user**Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion is not adopted as the principle of the motion is already contained in the Draft Plan.Following contributions from Councillors F.N. Duffy, G. O’Connell, P. Gogarty, D. Looney, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 25(TWENTY FIVE)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 1(ONE)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM162/0216 Item ID:48118**In the absence of Councillor A-M. Dermody the following Motion **FELL:** CHAPTER 7 ENVIRONMENTAL / ZONING PROPOSALI have read the Manager's comments in relation to the lands in Killinarden Park.  These lands are subject to flooding and note of this needs to be made on the current Development Plan.**REPORT:**The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) carried out for the Development Plan is attached as part of the Chief Executive amendments. The SFRA maps the flood risk areas in the entire County and is an accompanying document to the Development Plan. As such, all known flood risk areas are mapped as part of the Development Plan process.The attached map shows the flood risk for the subject area at Killinarden as per the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) prepared in conjunction with the Development Plan process. It is noteworthy that the lands are subject to a Part 8 application (SD158/0010) and the Part 8 was approved at the December Council Meeting.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted as the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) maps the known flood risk areas in the County.[M162 - Flood Risk Mapping](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50638)[M162 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50840)**DPM163/0216 Item ID:47849**It was proposed by Councillor M. Murphy and Councillor B. Leech.**Flood risk at Baldonnell.**That all lands at Baldonnell that are subject to a flood risk as per the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment carried out by RPS in 2015 for the SDCC Development Plan be zoned for agricultural use and cannot be considered for any other zoning until the flood risk is fully mitigated. This approach would be consistent with the OPWs Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009.Having a plan from a developer to mitigate the risk local to the site is not sufficient as it is almost certain that the works to fully mitigate such a risk would need to be carried out over a much longer section upstream along the Camac river and could only be done by the local authority.Co-signed by Cllr. B. Leech and Cllr. K. Mahon**REPORT:**The Chief Executive acknowledges the motions received and the submissions from prescribed bodies and the public in relation to the ‘EE’ zoning of lands at Baldonnell. The Chief Executive agrees with the submissions from the prescribed bodies and motion to reconsider the zoning of these lands and recommends a Rural (RU) zoning for the area.Identification of Flood Risk As part of the County Development Plan and SEA process 2016-2022, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to inform the Draft Plan was carried out for the County, with a further specific report on flood risk also carried out subsequently due to the lands located at Moneenalion Commons being identified in the County study as having a potential risk. Additionally, the Eastern CFRAM study mapping identifies the area as having a potential risk. The foregoing studies incorporate the best available data and provide an evidence base on flood risk in the County. **The studies identify a significant portion of the site (see attached map showing the subject area and the flood risk mapping) in question as being in Flood Risk Zone A, with ‘a high probability of flooding’**.Flood Risk Guidelines **The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’**.These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test to be met ‘on a solid evidence basis’. It is considered that on the basis of the information currently available to the Planning Authority, this cannot be met in respect of the subject lands i.e. this is because the Planning Authority is not satisfied that ‘it can be demonstrated on a solid evidence base that the zoning or designation for development will satisfy the Justification Test.’Section 4 of the Flood Risk Guidelines relates specifically to "existing, undeveloped, zoned areas at risk of flooding" and Sections 4.26 & 4.27 state that “future flood risk assessments required to support the development plan process may highlight existing, undeveloped areas which, on their own merits, were zoned for development in previous development plans but which new information indicates may now, or in the future, be at risk of flooding”. The Flood Risk Guidelines advise that in the these cases “planning authorities should reconsider the zoning objective” and following this reconsideration, “may decide to:* Remove the existing zoning for all types of development;
* Reduce the zoned area and change or add zoning categories to reflect flood risk;
* Replace the existing zoning with a zoning or specific objective for less vulnerable uses;
* Prepare a local area plan informed by a detailed flood risk assessment to address zoning and development issues in more detail; and/or
* Specify, in exceptional circumstances and where the criteria of the Justification Test have been met, design of structural or non-structural flood risk management measures as prerequisites to development in specific areas, ensuring that flood hazard and risk to other locations will not be increased or, if practicable, will be reduced.

**Given the extent and sporadically dispersed location of the flood risk zone A on the lands in question, it is considered that removal of the existing employment zoning as the lands are undeveloped is the most appropriate course of action**, in line with the 'precautionary approach', which requires planning authorities to consider possible future changes in flood risk including the effects of climate change. The intensive development of this area will displace the flood zone and may impact on the residents of existing dwellings downstream.The DECLG Planning Policy Statement 2015, reiterates the Key Principles that should be used as a strategic guide to implementing proper planning and sustainable development of urban and rural areas and state that planning must be plan-led and evidence based. This follows on from the 2010 Planning Act, which requires an evidence based ‘Core Strategy’ as the basis for all County Development Plans.The Chief Executive recommends that the subject lands at Baldonnell be zoned for Rural ‘RU’ in the Chief Executive’s Report. This recommendation is based on evidence and information detailed in specifically commissioned reports prepared by independent consultants for the County Development Plan and the OPW produced Eastern CFRAM.**Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion be adopted[M163 - Flood Mapping](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50827)[M163 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50834)Following contributions from Councillors M. Murphy, E. Higgins, C. King, L. O’Toole, P. Gogarty, G. O’Connell, B. Bonner, P. Kearns, L. Dunne, D. Looney, D. O’Brien, E. Ó’Broin, M. Genockey, K. Mahon, J. Lahart, W. Lavelle, R. McMahon, B. Leech, D. Richardson, R. Nolan. Mr D. McLoughlin, Chief Executive and Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A [Roll Call vote](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=d2441ee3-f4ae-411f-8962-a5c400fd0b7a) on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 18(EIGHTEEN)****AGAINST: 14(FOURTEEN)****ABSTAIN: 2(TWO)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM164/0216 Item ID:48063**It was proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.As per our discussions at the last round of Development Plan debate, that lands at Moneenalion Commons at Baldonnell retain an 'EE' (enterprise) zoning; and that a Specific Local Objective should further be applied to these to require preparation of a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy, prepared by a qualified person(s), to be submitted with any proposal for development on these lands.Map supplied same as at last Development Plan meeting:<http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/Content/Meetings/Documents/45024_Motions_45024a.pdf>Co Sponsored by: Cllr. Kenneth Egan & Cllr. William Lavelle **REPORT:**The Chief Executive acknowledges the motions received and the submissions from prescribed bodies and the public in relation to the ‘EE’ zoning of lands at Baldonnell. The Chief Executive agrees with the submissions from the prescribed bodies and motion to reconsider the zoning of these lands and recommends a Rural (RU) zoning for the area.Identification of Flood Risk As part of the County Development Plan and SEA process 2016-2022, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to inform the Draft Plan was carried out for the County, with a further specific report on flood risk also carried out subsequently due to the lands located at Moneenalion Commons being identified in the County study as having a potential risk. Additionally, the Eastern CFRAM study mapping identifies the area as having a potential risk. The foregoing studies incorporate the best available data and provide an evidence base on flood risk in the County. **The studies identify a significant portion of the site (see attached map showing the subject area and the flood risk mapping) in question as being in Flood Risk Zone A, with ‘a high probability of flooding’**.Flood Risk Guidelines **The Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Flood Risk Management (2009) advises in relation to Flood Zone A that ‘most types of development would be considered inappropriate in this zone’ and that ‘development in this zone should be avoided and/or only considered in exceptional circumstances, such as in city and town centres, or in the case of essential infrastructure that cannot be located elsewhere’**.These 'exceptional circumstances' require all parts of a Development Plan Justification Test to be met ‘on a solid evidence basis’. It is considered that on the basis of the information currently available to the Planning Authority, this cannot be met in respect of the subject lands i.e. this is because the Planning Authority is not satisfied that ‘it can be demonstrated on a solid evidence base that the zoning or designation for development will satisfy the Justification Test.’Section 4 of the Flood Risk Guidelines relates specifically to "existing, undeveloped, zoned areas at risk of flooding" and Sections 4.26 & 4.27 state that “future flood risk assessments required to support the development plan process may highlight existing, undeveloped areas which, on their own merits, were zoned for development in previous development plans but which new information indicates may now, or in the future, be at risk of flooding”. The Flood Risk Guidelines advise that in the these cases “planning authorities should reconsider the zoning objective” and following this reconsideration, “may decide to:* Remove the existing zoning for all types of development;
* Reduce the zoned area and change or add zoning categories to reflect flood risk;
* Replace the existing zoning with a zoning or specific objective for less vulnerable uses;
* Prepare a local area plan informed by a detailed flood risk assessment to address zoning and development issues in more detail; and/or
* Specify, in exceptional circumstances and where the criteria of the Justification Test have been met, design of structural or non-structural flood risk management measures as prerequisites to development in specific areas, ensuring that flood hazard and risk to other locations will not be increased or, if practicable, will be reduced.

**Given the extent and sporadically dispersed location of the flood risk zone A on the lands in question, it is considered that removal of the existing employment zoning as the lands are undeveloped is the most appropriate course of action**, in line with the 'precautionary approach', which requires planning authorities to consider possible future changes in flood risk including the effects of climate change. The intensive development of this area will displace the flood zone and may impact on the residents of existing dwellings downstream.The DECLG Planning Policy Statement 2015, reiterates the Key Principles that should be used as a strategic guide to implementing proper planning and sustainable development of urban and rural areas and state that planning must be plan-led and evidence based. This follows on from the 2010 Planning Act, which requires an evidence based ‘Core Strategy’ as the basis for all County Development Plans.The Chief Executive recommends that the subject lands at Baldonnell be zoned for Rural ‘RU’ in the Chief Executive’s Report. This recommendation is based on evidence and information detailed in specifically commissioned reports prepared by independent consultants for the County Development Plan and the OPW produced Eastern CFRAM.**Recommendation**It is recommended that the motion be adopted[M164 - Flood Mapping](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50797)[M164 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50729)Following the vote on Motion 163, Councillor E. Higgins **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** this Motion.**DPM165/0216 Item ID:48132**In the absence of Councillor M. Devine and Councillor J. Graham the following Motion **FELL:**"That this council engage with the private waste collection companies to progress our suggestion of attaching a simple clip to green bins that will prevent spillage of its contents- significant savings in the councils time and resources are envisaged".*Co-sponsored by Cllr J Graham***REPORT:**The Chief Executive notes the content of the motion. It is considered that the operations of private waste collection companies and innovation in relation to clips to prevent spillage is not an issue for inclusion in the County Development Plan. Recommended that the motion is not adopted as the issue is not relevant to be included in the Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.**DPM166/0216 Item ID:48095**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.That SDCC through ongoing engagement with our neighbouring Local Authorities in Dublin City and Dun Laoghaire Rathdown on the Dodder Greenway Project will drive the establishment of a Single River Authority for the Dodder.**REPORT:****Response:** The Chief Executive notes the content of the motion. The Dodder Greenway is an ongoing project to provide a pedestrian and cycle link from the City Centre to the Mountains. The project is at preliminary design stage and is being prepared in partnership by SDCC, DCC and DLRCOCO. The establishment of a River Authority is not required for the delivery of the Greenway.In terms of flood risk, the Office of Public Works (OPW) is the lead agency for flood risk management in Ireland. There is no legislative status for a River Authority in Ireland and the establishment of same is outside the remit of the County Development Plan. It is not recommended to be included in the Draft Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.Following contributions from Councillors P. Donovan and F.N. Duffy, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****Green Infrastructure****DPM167/0216 Item ID:48020**It was proposed by Councillor L. O'Toole and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.That this council supports Submission number 0011 Page 213 # 6, requesting the setting up of an apiary colony (bee keeping) in Waterstown Park, Palmerstown, through the addition of an SLO with a view to introducing more throughout the country over the life time of this plan. Managed Apiary colonies have huge potential for educational purposes as well as the obvious environmental benefits.**Motion: Cllr L O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty****REPORT:**Policy G1 Objective 2 of the Draft Plan 2016 -2022 seeks ‘To prepare and implement a South Dublin County Green Infrastructure Strategy during the lifetime of this plan that will form the basis for the identification, protection, enhancement and management of the Green Infrastructure Network within the County’. It is considered that the setting up of an apiary colony  within Waterstown Park, Palmerstown will be investigated during the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, which will be prepared during the lifetime of the Draft Plan 2016 – 2022 and also the Biodiversity and Heritage Plans which are currently underway.**Recommendation**No amendment to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022 required.[M167 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50742)Following contributions from Councillors L. O’Toole, G. O’Connell, P. Gogarty, T. Gilligan, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 23(TWENTY THREE)****AGAINST: 1(ONE)****ABSTAIN: 2(TWO)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED****DPM168/0216 Item ID:48039**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 135  Include additional Objective: Retain or improve access.**REPORT:**The issue of access to public open space is addressed under Policy G4 and Objectives G4 1 – 7 of the Draft Development Plan 2016 -2022. It is considered that the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under these Policy / Objectives.**Recommendation**No amendment to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022 required.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM169/0216 Item ID:48040**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 138  Replace Objective 4 with: In respect of both navigable and non-navigable waterways and riparian zones, maintain, preserve, protect from inappropriate development, conserve, safeguard, enhance their amenity and recreation value, restrict the encroachment of development and, where appropriate, restore waterway corridors and riparian zones, including floodplains and valleys of rivers, streams, associated undeveloped riparian strips lakes, canals, springs and other watercourses(including shorelines in immediate adjoining area and skyline development on surrounding hill crests). Keep waterways free from inappropriate development and incompatible use, including clearance and storage of materials taking place within a minimum distance of 10-15m from each bank of any river, stream or watercourse, to ensure that public use is not prejudiced by incompatible use, such as facilities for noise-generating sports and interference with public walking and cycling routes and public rights of way. Protect, maintain and enhance their natural heritage, appearance, quality and landscape character and archaeological heritage and avoid adverse visual impacts so as to maintain their aesthetic,ecological, amenity and tourism and recreational values from the impacts of dispersed and highly visible development. Create and maintain buffer zones and riparian corridors and keep them in an open state and in a natural condition by discouraging culverting or realignment. Prohibit developments which are likely to have significant adverse visual impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on the character of River Valleys and where there is no overriding need for the development to be in that particular location. Ensure that, where an overriding need is demonstrated for a particular development in the River Valleys, careful consideration is given to site selection. The development should be appropriate in scale and be sited, designed and landscaped in a manner which minimises potential adverse impacts on the landscape. Take into account any landscape, nature or archaeological designations. Locate new development in water corridor landscape character areas towards existing structures and mature vegetation. Seek during redevelopment the creation of a riparian buffer strip, where practicable. Promote the natural amenities of rivers for the benefit of recreation and tourism. Development in identified floodplains and riparian corridors must not adversely affect the river’s function as a green infrastructure corridor. Adopt a regional approach in the protection of watercourses by co-operating with neighbouring counties. Seek to limit development in identified floodplains and preserve riparian corridors. Development proposals in river corridors will be considered favourably providing  that they do not involve land filing, diverting, culverting or realignment of river or stream corridors and that  they do not have a negative effect on the distinctive character and appearance of the waterways corridor and the specific characteristic an*d* landscape elements of the specific site and its context.**REPORT:**The Chief Executive Report on Draft Plan Public Consultation (December 2015) notes the content of the submission and is summarised as follows;Requested that Objective G3-4 be reworded to include additional wording and phrases, which would expand on details covered within the Objective and the Green Infrastructure Chapter in general. In particular, requested that development be prohibited alongside watercourses, that the watercourses remain open and gives guidance on how development should be assessed when proposed alongside a watercourse.It is considered that the content of the proposed motion is provided for under the following policies/ objectives in the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022;Policy G3:‘It is the policy of the Council to promote the natural, historical and amenity value of the County’s watercourses; to address the long term management and protection of these corridors and tostrengthen links at a regional level’. Objective under Policy G3 are as follows;G3 Objective 1:To promote the natural, historical and amenity value of the County’s watercourses and address the long term management and protection of these corridors in the South Dublin Green Infrastructure Strategy.G3 Objective 2:To maintain a biodiversity protection zone of not less than 10 metres from the top of the bank of all watercourses in the County, with the full extent of the protection zone to be determined on a case by case basis by the Planning Authority, based on site specific characteristics and sensitivities. Strategic Green Routes and Trails identified in the South Dublin Tourism Strategy, 2015; the Greater Dublin Area Strategic Cycle Network; and other government plans or programmes will be open for consideration within the biodiversity protection zone, subject to appropriate safeguards and assessments, as these routes increase the accessibility of the Green Infrastructure network.G3 Objective 3:To ensure the protection, improvement or restoration of riverine floodplains and to promote strategic measures to accommodate flooding at appropriate locations, to protect ground and surface water quality and build resilience to climate change.G3 Objective 4:To uncover existing culverts and restore the watercourse to acceptable ecological standards and for the passage of fish, where possible.G3 Objective 5:To restrict the encroachment of development on watercourses, and provide for protection measures to watercourses and their banks, including but not limited to: the prevention of pollution of the watercourse, the protection of the river bank from erosion, the retention and/or provision of wildlife corridors and the protection from light spill in sensitive locations, during construction of permitted development.Policy HCL 10 Objective3:‘To ensure that development proposals within the Liffey Valley and Dodder Valley, including local and regional networks of walking and cycling routes, maximise the opportunities for enhancement of existing ecological features and protects and incorporates high value natural heritage features including watercourses, wetlands,grasslands, woodlands, mature trees, hedgerows and ditches, as part of the County’s Green Infrastructure network’.HCL 11 Objective 5:‘To ensure that development along and adjacent to the Grand Canal protects and incorporates high value natural heritage features including watercourses, wetlands, grasslands, woodlands, mature trees, hedgerows and ditches and includes for an appropriate set-back distance or buffer areafrom the pNHA boundary to facilitate protected species, biodiversity, and a fully functioning Green Infrastructure network’.Policy IE2 Objective 9:‘To protect water bodies and watercourses, including rivers, streams, associated undeveloped riparian strips, wetlands and natural floodplains, within the County from inappropriate development. This will include protection buffers in riverine and wetland areas as appropriate (see also Objective GI2 Objective 13 – Biodiversity Protection Zone)’.Infrastructure and Environmental Quality with regard to Water Management and Flood Risk Assessment is provided for under Section 11.6.1 of the Draft Plan (see Section for further details).As the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the policies / objectives referred to above, it is considered that the wording of the proposed motion is not warranted within the Draft Plan. The wording of the proposed motion is not succinct and would result in a significant degree of duplication within the Development Plan. The proposed wording is also protracted and difficult to decipher. This may lead to difficulties and confusion in the application of the Plan and therefore the proposed wording cannot be supported.**Recommendation**No amendment required to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM170/0216 Item ID:48041**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor E. Ó’Broin.That on page 138 Include additional Objectives:1  In partnership with NPWS, local Wildlife Rangers, WI, community groups and other relevant stakeholders, provide, preserve, promote, support, encourage, develop, facilitate, increase and improve public access to and around lakes, rivers, canals and navigational and non-navigational waterway corridors(together with rivers and streams and valleys) to provide amenities and recreational facilities the provision of land-based recreational activities, including walking, cycling, mountain biking, horse riding, wildlife/bird watching and other non-noise generating activities for visitors and locals and focusing on linear features such as canal and river banks and walking paths. Reserve land adjacent to river and canal banks and lakeshores to facilitate these activities.2  Protect, enhance and improve existing public rights of way, where appropriate, and investigate the provision of additional rights of way to inland lakes canal banks and waterways to facilitate the creation or expansion of walking/cycling routes.3 Require that developments along rivers, canals, lakes and other watercourses provide for set aside land for walking/cycling routes and to provide, promote and facilitate the creation of waterside linear parks and an interconnecting network of green open spaces to link with existing fragmented green spaces existing parks and open spaces with towns and other settlements in their vicinity and extend to adjoining counties forming inter-county tourism links, in cooperation with their councils.4  In co-operation with WI, NPWS and community groups, encourage, promote and use the potential of canal towpaths for designated walking and cycle routes, both as recreational and tourism amenities and the promotion of links with any designated walking, cycling routes, existing or proposed.**REPORT:**The Chief Executive Report on Draft Plan Public Consultation (December 2015) notes the content of the submission and is summarised as follows;Requested that additional objectives be added to Section 8.2.0 to include the improvement of public access (public rights of way, where appropriate) to the County's waterbodies and courses; to provide amenities at these locations; to encourage linkages with adjoining counties and the GDA region; to require management plans for particular areas to address compatibility with the GI network (sets out how this compatibility can be met); the consultation with specific stakeholders, including the community; to protect the amenity value of the Grand Canal corridor by managing development along it and that flood protection/alleviation works take place. It is considered that the content of the proposed motion is provided for under the following policies/ objectives in the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022;ET9 Objective 1:To support and facilitate sustainable agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other rural enterprises at suitable locations in the County.ET9 Objective 4:To support sustainable forestry development at suitable locations in the County, subject to the protection of the rural environment, sensitive areas and landscapes.Policy HCL16:It is the policy of the Council to continue to promote and improve access to high amenity, scenic, and recreational lands throughout the County, including places of natural beauty or utility, for the purposes of outdoor recreation, while avoiding environmental damage, landscape damage and impacts to Natura 2000 sites.HCL 16 Objective 1:To promote the preservation of public rights of way that give access to mountain, lakeshore, riverbank or other places of natural beauty or recreational utility such as parklands, geological and geo-morphical features of heritage value and to identify and map such public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.HCL 16 Objective 2:To promote and facilitate the creation of Permissive Access Routes and heritage trails that will provide access to high amenity, scenic and recreational lands including rural areas, forests, woodlands, waterways, upland/mountain areas, the Grand Canal, the Dodder Valley, the Liffey Valley and between historic villages (utilising modern technology), in partnership with adjoining local authorities, private landowners, semi-state and other public bodies such as Coillte and the Forest Service.HCL 16 Objective 3:To promote and facilitate the continued development of the Dublin Mountains Way and the Wicklow Way in association with the Dublin Mountains Partnership, particularly Permissive Access Routes that provide access to regional and local networks of walking, running, hiking and mountain bike trails and other recreational facilities. The routing of new trails and rerouting of existing trails off public roads is encouraged.HCL 16 Objective 4:To promote and improve access, in partnership with the relevant landowners, to all the historic sites in the County and seek to maximise their tourism potential in partnership with the relevant landowners.HCL 16 Objective 5:To bring mountain amenities closer to residential communities by promoting the establishment of a network of formal footpaths, off-road paths and cycleways that facilitate casual walkers and cyclists.Policy G3 Objective 2:‘To maintain a biodiversity protection zone of not less than 10 metres from the top of the bank of all watercourses in the County, with the full extent of the protection zone to be determined on a case by case basis by the Planning Authority, based on site specific characteristics and sensitivities. Strategic Green Routes and Trails identified in the South Dublin Tourism Strategy, 2015; the Greater Dublin Area Strategic Cycle Network; and other government plans or programmes will be open for consideration within the biodiversity protection zone, subject to appropriate safeguards and assessments, as these routes increase the accessibility of the Green Infrastructure network’.Policy ET6'It is the policy of the Council to support and facilitate the development of an integrated network of Greenways and Trails along suitable corridors, including natural linear open spaces such as river banks and canals, with local connections to villages and attractions to take account of the environmental sensitivities along these corridors.ET6 Objective 1:To support and facilitate the development of an integrated network of Greenways and Trails along suitable corridors, including the River Liffey, Dublin Mountains Way, Grand Canal, River Dodder and Slade ValleyAs the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the policies / objectives referred to above, it is considered that the wording of the proposed motion is not warranted within the Draft Development Plan. The wording of the proposed motion is not succinct and would result in a significant degree of duplication within the Development Plan. The proposed wording is also protracted and difficult to decipher. This may lead to difficulties and confusion in the application of the Plan and therefore the proposed wording cannot be supported.**Recommendation**No amendment required to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM171/0216 Item ID:48038**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor E. Ó’Broin.On page 135  Replace Objective 1 with:Design, provide, conserve, enhance, facilitate, manage, protect, improve and promote the establishment of a coherent and evolving Green Infrastructure,including natural heritage, protected areas, landscape and environment in recognition of its economic value and its  importance as a non-renewable resource, toencourage, promote, develop, enhance and facilitate physical activity and improved health and well-being by providing green spaces for walking, cycling and other active recreational activities and by providing attractive and safe routes linking key green space through parks, hedgerows, rivers, streams, woodlands, open spaces and heritage and landscape features, where feasible and appropriate. Protect the green infrastructure network by resisting development that would damage, degrade, fragment, or prejudice it. All planning proposals must provide for the protection of green infrastructure and, where appropriate, for the provision of new green infrastructure.**REPORT:**It is considered that the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the following policies and objectives  in the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022;Policy G1:‘It is the policy of the Council to protect, enhance and further develop a multifunctional Green Infrastructure network by building an interconnected network of parks, open spaces, hedgerows, grasslands, protected areas, and rivers and streams that provide a shared space for amenity and recreation, biodiversity protection, flood management and adaptation to climate change’. Objective under Policy G1 are as follows;Policy G1 Objective:‘The establishment of a coherent and evolving Green Infrastructure network across South Dublin County with parks, open spaces, hedgerows, grasslands, protected areas, and rivers and streams forming the strategic links’.Policy G1 Objective 2:‘To prepare and implement a South Dublin County Green Infrastructure Strategy during the lifetime of this plan that will form the basis for the identification, protection, enhancement and management of the Green Infrastructure Network within the County’.Action under Policy G1:‘South Dublin County Council will develop a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the County in consultation with key stakeholders and the public during the lifetime of the Development Plan. The Green Infrastructure strategy will form the basis for the identification, protection and promotion of Green Infrastructure and provide a structure for the long term management, enhancement and expansion of the Green Infrastructure network across urban and rural areas. The strategy will include a spatial framework on which priorities and actions can be based and a delivery framework’.As the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the policies / objectives above, it is considered that the wording of the proposed motion is not warranted within the Draft Plan. The wording of the proposed motion is not succinct and may lead to difficulties and confusion in the application of the Plan. Therefore the proposed wording cannot be supported.**Recommendation**Amendments to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022 are not necessary and not recommended.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM172/0216 Item ID:48119**In the absence of Councillor A-M. Dermody the following Motion **FELL**CHAPTER 8 GREEN INFRASTRUCTUREThat Kiltipper Park be developed fully within the lifetime of this Development Plan.**REPORT:****As the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the policies / objectives below, it is considered that the wording of the proposed motion is not warranted within the Draft Plan. The Development Plan does not stipulate the development of Capital Investment projects. This is a matter for the relevant Department.**It is considered that the intent of the proposed motion is provided for under the following policies and objectives  in the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022;Policy C12:‘It is the policy of the Council that a hierarchical network of high quality open space is available to those who live, work and visit the County, providing for both passive and active recreation, and that the resource offered by public open spaces, parks and playing fields is maximised through effective management’. Relevant Objectives under this Policy are as follows;C12 Objective 1:To support a hierarchy of open space and recreational facilities based on settlement size and catchment.C12 Objective 2:To maximise the leisure and amenity resource offered by each of the County’s parks through the promotion of Management Plans that provide for the continued improvement of the park setting, biodiversity and recreational facilities.C12 Objective 3:To develop parks and open/green spaces that cater for the diverse needs of the County’s population, in particular different age groups and abilities, through the facilitation of both active and passive recreational activities and universal access.C12 Objective 4:To support and facilitate the development of indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and play spaces in larger parks to cater for all age groups and abilities.Policy G4:‘It is the policy of the Council to provide a hierarchy of high quality and multi-functional public parks and open spaces’. Relevant Objectives provided under this Policy are as follows;G4 Objective 1:To support and facilitate the provision of a network of high quality, well located and multifunctional public parks and open spaces throughout the County and to protect and enhance the environmental capacity and ecological function of these spaces.G4 Objective 2:To connect parks and areas of open space with ecological and recreational corridors to aid the movement of biodiversity and people and to strengthen the overall Green Infrastructure network.**Recommendation**Amendments to the Draft Development Plan 2016 – 2022 are not necessary and not recommended.[M172 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51002)**Heritage, Architectural Conservation & Landscapes****DPM173/0216 Item ID:47987**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.9.1.6 Additional objection inserted to protect. preserve and maintain industrial heritage features including weirs, millraces, and mills along the River Dodder and River Liffey**REPORT:**Noted.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.The Motion was **AGREED****DPM174/0216 Item ID:48000**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.Section 11.5.5 (iii) to revert back to original wording that allows barbed wire fencing for farmers and others fencing their land.**REPORT:**Noted.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.The Motion was **AGREED****DPM175/0216 Item ID:47935**It was proposed by Councillor E. Ó Broin and seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty.To include Mount St Joseph Cemetery, Monastery Heath, Monastery Road in the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) of the County Development Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 47934 | Councillor E. Ó Broin | Development Plan Meeting |   | Motions | 20/01/2016 |
| To include Mount St Jerome Cemetery, Monastery Heath, Monastery Road in the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) of the County Development Plan  |

**REPORT:**As part of the review of the Draft Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned an independent review of its Record of Protected Structures, with a view to identifying structures that merit addition or deletion. Saint Joseph’s Cemetery was not included in the review given that it had previously been inspected by South Dublin County Council’s Architectural Conservation Officer but was considered to not have sufficient architectural interest to merit inclusion on the RPS. Further to (inter alia) the subject motion, an additional supplementary independent assessment has been commissioned as an addendum to the ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015), which includes Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard. The supplementary assessment of the site was carried out on foot of its local historical interest and by an independent consultant who had the resources to carry out a full historical appraisal.The supplementary assessment advises that Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard is of historic and social significant and should therefore be added to the Record of Protected Structures.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.[M175 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50698)[M175 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50803)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM176/0216 Item ID:47834**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty.That a full and complete assessment of the site known as Mount St. Joseph Cemetery in Clondalkin be facilitated as part of the Development Plan review process"**REPORT:**As part of the review of the Draft Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned an independent review of its Record of Protected Structures, with a view to identifying structures that merit addition or deletion.Saint Joseph’s Cemetery was not included in the review given that it had previously been inspected by South Dublin County Council’s Architectural Conservation Officer but was considered to not have sufficient architectural interest to merit inclusion on the RPS.Further to (inter alia) the subject motion, an additional supplementary independent assessment has been commissioned as an addendum to the ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015), which includes Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard. The supplementary assessment of the site was carried out on foot of its local historical interest and by an independent consultant who had the resources to carry out a full historical appraisal.The supplementary assessment advises that Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard is of historic and social significant and should therefore be added to the Record of Protected Structures.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment.Map and include Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard, Monastery Road, in the County Development Plan’s Record of Protected Structures.[M176 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50693)[M176 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50835)Following a contribution from Councillor F. Timmons, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM177/0216 Item ID:47934**It was proposed by Councillor E. Ó Broin and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.To include Mount St Jerome Cemetery, Monastery Heath, Monastery Road in the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) of the County Development Plan**REPORT:**As part of the review of the Draft Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned an independent review of its Record of Protected Structures, with a view to identifying structures that merit addition or deletion.Saint Joseph’s Cemetery was not included in the review given that it had previously been inspected by South Dublin County Council’s Architectural Conservation Officer but was considered to not have sufficient architectural interest to merit inclusion on the RPS.Further to (inter alia) the subject motion, an additional supplementary independent assessment has been commissioned as an addendum to the ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015), which includes Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard. The supplementary assessment of the site was carried out on foot of its local historical interest and by an independent consultant who had the resources to carry out a full historical appraisal.The supplementary assessment advises that Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard is of historic and social significant and should therefore be added to the Record of Protected Structures.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment.Map and include Mount St. Joseph’s Graveyard, Monastery Road, in the County Development Plan’s Record of Protected Structures.[M177 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50697)[M177 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50806)Councillor E. Ó’Broin **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion **DPM178/0216 Item ID:47837**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.That a full and complete assessment of the site known as RIC Barracks in Clondalkin be facilitated as part of the Development Plan review process.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA motion on the preservation of the former RIC building on Old Nangor Road and inclusion within a ‘heritage plan’ was submitted to the February 2015 Development Plan Council Meeting (Motion 280) and it was agreed to include policies and objectives in the Draft County Development Plan to promote conservation of protected structures and to encourage development that will rehabilitate, renovate and re-use such structures .Protected StructureRiverside (known locally as the former RIC building) on the Old Nangor Road has already been comprehensive assessed by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht and has been added to the National inventory of Architectural Heritage under Reg. No. 11209019. The RIC barracks was given a regional rating under the NIAH and has subsequently been listed as a Protected Structure under the current South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2010 – 2016 and the Draft County Development Pan 2016 – 2022 (Map Ref. Number 136). The site is also located within the boundary of the Recorded Monument of Clondalkin (DU017-041) and the Clondalkin Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).Under a process that is separate from the strategic functions of the Development Plan, an investigation into possible endangerment of Riverside is ongoing. Warning letters were issued by the Council’s Architectural Conservation Officer in May 2015 and August 2015 and a site inspection of the protected structure took place in December 2015, which found that the protected structure remains secure and there are no external visual signs of endangerment.It is noted that the mapping of Riverside is slightly inaccurate and it is recommended that Map 5 be amended accordingly.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Correct exact location of Riverside (Map Ref. Number 136) on Map 5 of the Draft Development Plan.[M178 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50688)[M178 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50716)Following a contribution from Councillor F. Timmons, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded and agreed to prepare a report.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM179/0216 Item ID:47983**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor D. Looney.Section 9.1.0 To extend the ACA in Tallaght Village to include St Marys School House, TJ Burns cottages Balrothery, Goose Park and TJ Burns cottages on the Old Bawn Road.**REPORT:**As part of the review of the County Development Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned the Appraisal of Candidate Architectural Conservation Areas 2015, which was carried out independently by a Conservation Consultant. This included an assessment of candidate Architectural Conservation Areas (ACA) that were considered to exhibit distinct character and qualities based on their built form and layout.A submission seeking the same ACA designation was submitted subsequent to the display of the Draft County Development Plan (Ref 0261). On foot of (inter alia) the submission and other submission relating to built heritage, a brief independent assessment has been commissioned as an addendum to the initial Appraisal of Candidate ACAs and Review of Protected Structures.The supplementary assessment largely includes a review of the suggested extension of the Tallaght ACA. The supplementary assessment, which was carried out by a Conservation Consultant, advises that St. Mary’s School House and Balrothery Cottages are remote and separated from the historic village core of Tallaght and their inclusion within the Tallaght ACA would not be in keeping with sound conservation area designation policy and practice. It is also considered that the housing along the Old Bawn Road is too remote from this historic core of the village.It is considered, however, that there is a case to identify Balrothery Cottages as an Architectural Conservation Area on the basis of their discreet and distinct grouping, which have a high degree of architectural design and detailing. It is therefore recommended that Balrothery Cottages be designated within an ACA.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Designate Balrothery Cottages as an independent ACA and amend Map 9 and Table 9.1 of the Draft County Development Plan accordingly.[M179 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50690)[M179 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51003)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM180/0216 Item ID:47953**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor D. Looney.To support the rebuilding or restoring a working historic mill on the River Dodder, including the restoration of a water course to feed the mill and would envisage that it would be a tourist amenity and educational centre – to include an interpretative centre for the River Dodder valley, a café and ancillary services to support such a venture.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA similar motion was submitted to the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motion 167 – Item 45134) seeking the refurbishment or restoration a working historic mill on the River Dodder for use as a tourist amenity and educational centre – to include an interpretative centre for the River Dodder valley, a café and ancillary services to support such a venture. The motion was adopted with amendment and the following objective was inserted into the Draft Plan:‘HCL 10 Objective 10: To promote and support the development of a tourist amenity and educational/interpretive centre, such as a demonstration mill, within the Dodder Valley.’It is accepted that the above objective was agreed at the June 2015 with the replacement of the word ‘demonstration’ with the word ‘working’ and that the agreed objective should be corrected accordingly.Restorative works have taken place around Firhouse Weir following the preparation of a Conservation Plan. Funding for Conservation works to Firhouse Weir, a Protected Structure, came from the Built Heritage Jobs Leverage Scheme 2014 funded by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.Further restorative works are beyond the strategic land use function of the County Development Plan and cannot be actioned or achieved through the Plan and should therefore be directed to the County Tourism or Heritage Strategy.**Recommendation**Amend HCL 10 Objective 10 to replace the word ‘demonstration’ with the word ‘working’.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM181/0216 Item ID:48093**It was proposed by Councillor D. Looney and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.To insert a new SLO after HCL 19 Objective 1:"To promote the Greenhills Esker as a place of special geological importance within our County."*Co-Sponsored by Cllr F N Duffy***REPORT:**The Greenhills Esker is identified in Table 9.7 and the Development Plan Maps as a County Geological Site along with 5 other geological sites. Further to the December 2015 Chief Executives Report on the Draft Plan consultation, it is recommended that an additional 4 geological sites be identified as County Geological Sites making a total of 10 County Geological Sites.HCL 19 Objective 1 seeks to protect designated Geological Sites from inappropriate development. This is considered to be sufficient to ensure for the protection of the Greenhills Esker and the insertion of a further SLO is unnecessary. Furthermore, the singling out of one of the County Geological Sites could also suggest that other County Geological sites are of lesser interest to the detriment of their geological and heritage value.It is accepted that HCL 19 Objective 1 could be amended to clarify that it relates to the protection of County Geological Sites. It is also recommended that the objective should be amended to promote the importance of such sites through the County’s Heritage Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Amend HCL 19 Objective 1 to clarify that it relates to the protection of County Geological Sites.Amend HCL 19 Objective 1 to promote the importance of such sites through the County’s Heritage Plan.[M181 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50714)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM182/0216 Item ID:47947**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor S. HollandTo include the wording under HCL 9 Objective 7 "....and to encourage the grazing of such areas by local farmers, which would include the provision of cattle grids on the roads leading down from the commonage"**REPORT:**It is accepted that HCL 9 Objective 7 could be augmented to clarify that traditional common grazing grounds should be preserved for use by local farmers. The provision of cattle grids is, however, beyond the strategic land use scope of the County Development Plan and cannot be actioned or achieved through the Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:To amend HCL 9 Objective 7 to clarify that traditional common grazing grounds should be preserved for use by local farmers.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM183/0216 Item ID:47966**It was proposed by Councillor E. Higgins and seconded by Councillor P. Donovan.With reference to Chapter 11, that 11.5.5 be amended to include the protection and preservation of the view of the Brittas Ponds**REPORT:**Section 11.5.5 of the Draft Plan relates to ecological and landscape impact assessment. The proposed motion is more relevant to Section 9.2.1 of the Draft Plan, which includes policy on the preservation of views that are identified for protection and preservation on Development Plan Maps. It is recommended that the motion be amended to designate views for protection and preservation for the entire length of the Brittas Ponds on the eastern side of the Blessington Road/N81 on Development Plan Map No. 11.R**ecommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Designate views for protection and preservation for the entire length of the Brittas Ponds on the eastern side of the Blessington Road/N81 on Development Plan Map No. 11.[M183 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50774)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM184/0216 Item ID:47978**It was proposed by Councillor G. O'Connell and seconded by Councillor P. Gogarty.**Motion: Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty, Cllr L. O’Toole**Given commitment in the CEO’s report to explore the Blue Waterway and the arguments made by the Liffey Valley Park Alliance (0248), P D Adventure Sports (0175) and Canoe Ireland (0176) Table 11.13 Zoning ‘HA-HV’ be amended as follows: 1 Open for consideration (a) Nursing Home (f.g); Sports Club/Facility, un-serviced Campsite (f,g,h); Recreational Facility (f,h). 2 Not Permitted: Boarding Kennels; Traveller Accommodation. And a new clause “in accordance with the Council’s flora, fauna and ecological policies".**REPORT:**Previous Motion – Traveller AccommodationA motion requesting that Traveller Accommodation uses be moved from ‘open for consideration’ to ‘not permitted’ was submitted to the June 2015 Development Pan Meeting under Motion 297 (ID 45109). Following a vote the motion fell.Recreation and Sport/Club UsesHaving regard to the Draft Plan regarding tourism, including the policies and objectives for Tourism and Leisure under Section 4.5.0, it is accepted that ‘Recreational Facility’ and ‘Sports Club/Facility’ uses should be listed as ‘Open for Consideration’ under the HA-LV zoning objective of the Draft Plan, subject to restriction/caveats regarding their location/premises, scale, assessment of their landscape impact, and set back from the bank of the River Liffey.Nursing Home, Camp Site and Boarding Kennel UsesThe Liffey Valley is a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) and is also subject to a Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO). As a key element of the County’s Green Infrastructure network, policies contained in the Draft Development Plan sets out to protect and enhance the visual, recreational, environmental, ecological, geological and amenity value of the Liffey Valley and to implement the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO).It is within the context of the above that it is accepted that Boarding Kennel uses should be listed as ‘Not Permitted’ under both the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objectives, however, nursing home and camp site uses would, in general, not be in keeping with the policies of the Draft Development Plan.Furthermore, the location of nursing homes within the Liffey Valley would undermine the approach of the Draft Plan policy to encourage integrated communities and provide viable and attractive alternatives for older people within their own communities or existing communities. The Core Strategy already ensures that there are sufficient zoned lands in appropriate areas of the County to provide for all the housing needs of the County including housing for older people thus negating the need for additional nursing homes in a peripheral area that is sensitive to development and is not zoned for residential development.Additional CaveatWith regard to the proposed additional caveat, it is unclear as to which uses that it is proposed that it be applied to and for what purpose. All development will be subject to rigorous assessment against the policies and objectives pertaining to pNHAs, SAAO and protection of the Liffey Valley area as contained in the Draft Plan and it is not considered necessary to include additional caveats with regards to the management of uses. The proposed caveat is also considered to be vague and imprecise and is not linked to specific policy of the Draft Plan and is therefore not considered to be necessary.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:List ‘Recreational Facility’ and ‘Sports Club/Facility’ uses as ‘open for consideration’ under the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objective of the Draft Plan, subject to restriction/caveats regarding their location/premises, scale, assessment of their landscape impact, and set back from river banks.List ‘Boarding Kennel’ uses as ‘not permitted’ under the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objectives.Following contributions from Councillors G. O’Connell, F. Timmons, P. Gogarty, E. Ó’Broin, K. Mahon and M. Murphy, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM185/0216 Item ID:47879**It was proposed by Councillor W. Lavelle and seconded by Councillor V. Casserly**Liffey Valley**To support minor changes to the HA-LV zoning matrix as proposed by the Liffey Valley Park Alliance in their submission DRAFTDEVPLAN0248.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly, Higgins***REPORT:**Submission 0248Submission 0248 on the Draft Plan proposes alterations to the uses that area listed as Open for Consideration and Not Permitted under Table 11.3 of the Draft Development Plan (HA-LV: Liffey Valley) as follows:- move the following uses and caveats from ‘Not Permitted’ to Open for Consideration: Garden Centre (a); Nursing Home (f, g); Sports Club / Facility (f, g, h); Recreational Facility (f, h)- move the following uses from ‘Open for Consideration’ to ‘Not Permitted’: Boarding Kennels; Traveller Accommodation.- add a caveat to Agricultural Uses that requires such uses to be ‘in accordance with the Council's flora, fauna and ecological policies’.Previous Motion – Traveller AccommodationA motion requesting that Traveller Accommodation uses be moved from ‘open for consideration’ to ‘not permitted’ was submitted to the June 2015 Development Pan Meeting under Motion 297 (ID 45109). Following a vote the motion fell.Recreation and Sport/Club UsesHaving regard to the Draft Plan regarding tourism, including the policies and objectives for Tourism and Leisure under Section 4.5.0, it is accepted that ‘Recreational Facility’ and ‘Sports Club/Facility’ uses should be listed as ‘Open for consideration’ under the HA-LV zoning objective of the Draft Plan, subject to restriction/caveats regarding their location/premises, scale, assessment of their landscape impact, and set back from the bank of the River Liffey.Nursing Home, Garden Centre and Boarding Kennel UsesThe Liffey Valley is a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) and is also subject to a Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO). As a key element of the County’s Green Infrastructure network, policies contained in the Draft Development Plan sets out to protect and enhance the visual, recreational, environmental, ecological, geological and amenity value of the Liffey Valley and to implement the Liffey Valley Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO).It is within the context of the above that it is accepted that Boarding Kennel uses should be listed as ‘Not Permitted’ under both the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objectives, however, nursing home and garden centre uses would, in general, not be in keeping with the policies of the Draft Development Plan.Furthermore, the location of nursing homes within the Liffey Valley would undermine the approach of the Draft Plan policy to encourage integrated communities and provide viable and attractive alternatives for older people within their own communities or existing communities. The Core Strategy already ensures that there are sufficient zoned lands in appropriate areas of the County to provide for all the housing needs of the County including housing for older people thus negating the need for additional nursing homes in a peripheral area that is sensitive to development and is not zoned for residential development.Agricultural UsesWith regard to Agriculture uses, which are listed as ‘open for consideration’, such development will be subject to rigorous assessment against the aforementioned policies and objectives pertaining to pNHAs, SAAO and protection of the Liffey Valley area as contained in the Draft Plan and it is not considered necessary to include additional caveats with regards to the management of such uses. The proposed caveat in relation to Agricultural uses is considered to be vague and imprecise and is not linked to specific policy of the Draft Plan and is therefore considered to be unnecessary.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:List ‘Recreational Facility’ and ‘Sports Club/Facility’ uses as ‘Open for Consideration’ under the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objective of the Draft Plan, subject to restriction/caveats regarding their location/premises, scale, assessment of their landscape impact, and set back from river banks.List ‘Boarding Kennel’ uses as ‘Not Permitted’ under the HA-LV and HA-DV zoning objectives.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM186/0216 Item ID:48049**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor L. O’Toole.On page 152 include additional text: The Council will take the initiative in inviting Fingal, Dublin City Council and Kildare to work collaboratively and positively for its development  and shall bring forward firm proposals.**REPORT:**It is not fully clear in relation to what aspect of HCL Policy 10 (Liffey Valley and Dodder Valley) that the motion refers to. In relation to Liffey Valley, a strategy (Towards a Liffey Valley Park, 2007) for the development of a Liffey Valley Park has been produced in partnership between the Office of Public Works, Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, South Dublin County Council and Kildare County Council.This is strengthened by HCL 10 Objective 4, which seeks to facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected greenway and park with further collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW. The detailed aspects of such collaboration is beyond the strategic land use function of the County Development Plan and cannot be actioned or achieved through the Plan.It is accepted that HCL 10 Objective 4 should be amended to make reference to Towards a Liffey Valley Park, 2007.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Amend HCL 10 Objective 4 of the Draft County Development Plan to read:To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected greenway and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups (including the Liffey Valley Park Alliance) to include for the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations *in accordance with ‘Towards a Liffey Valley Park’ (2007) or any superseding plan*. (New text in *italics*)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM187/0216 Item ID:48050**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’ConnellOn page 152  Include additional Objectives:1 Secure the preservation of the Liffey Valley and its landscapes as a major resource for tourism and develop paths and walkways, where appropriate. Seek to have the lands brought into public ownership during the lifetime of the Plan.2  Promote and develop in line with the policies and objectives of the OPW document “Towards a Liffey Valley Park” (2008) during the lifetime of the Plan.**REPORT:**Previous MotionsPrevious Motions in relation to the acquisition of privately owned lands for the creation of a Liffey Valley Park (Motion Nos.309, 310 and 311) were raised at the June 2015 County Development Plan meeting and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, were withdrawn.Liffey Valley ParkThe acquisition of privately owned lands for the creation of a Liffey Valley Park is beyond the strategic land use function and budgetary constraints of the County Development Plan and cannot be achieved or actioned through same.A strategy for the development of a Liffey Valley Park has been produced in partnership between the Office of Public Works, Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, South Dublin County Council and Kildare County Council. Further to the publication of Towards a Liffey Valley Park, 2007. Objectives contained in the Draft Development Plan supports the strategy by seeking the development of uninterrupted and coherent parklands including walking and cycling routes and supporting  the development of an interconnected greenway in collaboration with the OPW, adjoining local authorities, landowners and community groups.Further to the Landscape Character Assessment of South Dublin County (2015), the Draft Plan also seeks to preserve and enhance the character of the County’s landscapes particularly areas that have been deemed to have a medium to high Landscape Value or medium to high Landscape Sensitivity such as Liffey Valley.Liffey Valley is also designated as a pNHA and is within an SAAO, and further policies and objectives in the Development Plan seek to ensure that these designations are supported by the careful management of development. The policies and objectives contained in the Draft Development Plan are therefore considered sufficient to help secure the preservation of Liffey Valley and its landscapes.It is accepted that HCL 10 Objective 4 should be amended to make reference to Towards a Liffey Valley Park, 2007.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Amend HCL 10 Objective 4 of the Draft County Development Plan to read:To facilitate and support the development of the Liffey Valley (Zoning Objective ‘HA – LV’) as an interconnected greenway and park in collaboration with Dublin City Council, Fingal County Council, Kildare County Council, the OPW, existing landowners and community groups (including the Liffey Valley Park Alliance) to include for the identification and designation of possible future new pedestrian routes and footbridge locations *in accordance with ‘Towards a Liffey Valley Park’ (2007) or any superseding plan*. (New text in *italics*)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM188/0216 Item ID:48012**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.Page 157 – include the following rights of way into the plan 1. [Dublin-Wicklow Border](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=6c80076b-8dc2-4b89-83d4-a59401246b0c). 2. [02 Killakee](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=b2eb2edf-212a-4b70-8dbe-a5940124bffc). 3. [03 Brittas](http://membersnet.sdublincoco.ie/viewdocument.aspx?id=d2969667-bb6c-4ef4-88ab-a5940124ed2e).**REPORT:**In accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.With the exception of the subject motion, no suggested public rights of way have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation. This includes all submissions received during the County Development Plan review stage at pre-draft and draft stage.It is advised that the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way as part of the Development Plan under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is no longer achievable. The identification of the suggested public right of way will require the local authority to verify proof of the rights of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Proof of permission from the landowner also needs to be clear and precise in terms of what land is involved and for what purpose the right of way exists. Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands for a minimum period of 6 weeks who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.Most of the routes that are suggested under the subject motion appear to relate to paths that are currently open and can be used by the public. It is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate the areas of the Dublin-Wicklow Border, Kilakee and Brittas for the purpose of creating public a right of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert an action under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate the areas of the Dublin-Wicklow Border, Kilakee and Brittas for the purpose of creating possible public rights of way.Following contributions from Councillors F.N. Duffy and E. Higgins, Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM189/0216 Item ID:48045**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.On page143  Replace Objective 5 by:Protect, maintain and provide public access to historicgraveyards and historic burial grounds(including those identified in the RMP)**REPORT:**Previous MotionsThe provision of access to historic sites were raised under Motion 295 (42726) of the February 2015 Development Plan and Motion 303 (ID 45236) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting. The responses of the Chief Executive to both motions were agreed at each of the meetings.Motion 305 (ID 45240) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting also sought the identification of public rights of way and subsequent to the report of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Creation of Access to LandsIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.HCL 16 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 also seeks to promote and improve access, in partnership with the relevant landowners, to all the historic sites in the County and seek to maximise their tourism potential in partnership with the relevant landowners. The partnership approach towards achieving access is considered to be a more realisable objective compared to the more complex and lengthy legal proceedings involved in creating public rights of way.Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, this requires proof or verification of the right of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.No mapped public rights of way to cemeteries have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and, under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way is no longer achievable at this stage of the Development Plan making process.In response to the subject motion and motion 48021, it is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate Lucan Village Cemetery for the purpose of creating public a right of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert an action under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate Lucan Village Cemetery for the purpose of creating a possible public right of way.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM190/0216 Item ID:48021**It was proposed by Councillor L. O'Toole and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.**Motion: Cllr L O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell, Cllr P. Gogarty**That this council supports Submission # 0144 page 223 # 4 to provide for a public right of way to various derelict cemeteries across the country including for example the Lucan village cemetery, allowing for preservation and restoration of these historic sites.**REPORT:**Previous MotionsThe provision of access to historic sites were raised under Motion 295 (42726) of the February 2015 Development Plan and Motion 303 (ID 45236) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting. The responses of the Chief Executive to both motions were agreed at each of the meetings.Motion 305 (ID 45240) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting also sought the identification of public rights of way and subsequent to the report of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Creation of Access to LandsIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.HCL 16 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 also seeks to promote and improve access, in partnership with the relevant landowners, to all the historic sites in the County and seek to maximise their tourism potential in partnership with the relevant landowners. The partnership approach towards achieving access is considered to be a more realisable objective compared to the more complex and lengthy legal proceedings involved in creating public rights of way.Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, this requires proof or verification of the right of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.No mapped public rights of way to cemeteries have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and, under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way is no longer achievable at this stage of the Development Plan making process.In response to the motion, it is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate Lucan Village Cemetery for the purpose of creating public a right of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.Restoration of Historic SitesThe identification, funding and carrying out of works to historic structures or acquisition of such structures is beyond the strategic land use planning functions of the County Development Plan. This issue has also been addressed at previous County Development Plan Meetings.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert an action under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate Lucan Village Cemetery for the purpose of creating a possible public right of way.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM191/0216 Item ID:48046**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 143  Include additional Objectives:1Protect**,** promote, facilitate, encourage, improve and enhance, where feasible, existing public rights of way to  archaeological sites and designate traditional walking routes as public rights of way in consultation with the NMS. In other cases, routes will be acquired by agreement with landowners or by way of compulsory powers.2  Recognising the importance of archaeology and National Monuments as part of our heritage and inheritance, provide, promote, enhance, facilitate, encourage, support, improve and protect public access to archaeological sites National Monuments, battlefields and sites of historic interest, in direct ownership, guardianship  or control of the Council and/or the State or private ownership including those listed in the RMP and seek to maximise their tourism potential. Appropriate signage will be put in place. Information on access to sites will be made be available on the Council’s web-site.(Insert address).**REPORT:**Previous MotionsThe provision of access to historic sites were raised under Motion 295 (42726) of the February 2015 Development Plan and Motion 303 (ID 45236) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting. The responses of the Chief Executive to both motions were agreed at each of the meetings.Motion 305 (ID 45240) of the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting also sought the identification of public rights of way and subsequent to the report of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Wording of MotionThe Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion, however, the proposed wording is unstructured and complex and is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly.Rights of WayIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.HCL 16 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 also seeks to promote and improve access, in partnership with the relevant landowners, to all the historic sites in the County and seek to maximise their tourism potential in partnership with the relevant landowners. The partnership approach towards achieving access is considered to be a more realisable objective compared to the more complex and lengthy legal proceedings involved in creating public rights of way.Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, this requires proof or verification of the right of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.With the exception of those submitted under Motion ID48012, no mapped public rights of way to cemeteries have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and, under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way is no longer achievable at this stage of the Development Plan making process.In response to the subject motion and motion 48021 and 48012, it is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate identified areas of the County for the purpose of creating public a right of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.Archaeological HeritageThe objectives set out under HCL Policy 2 of the Draft Development Plan are sufficiently framed to recognise and protect the importance of archaeological heritage and the issues of unilaterally creating access to historic sites are dealt with above.The Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion, however, the wording is unstructured and complex and it is considered that the insertion of the proposed objectives would hinder and detract from the quality, structure and implementation of the policy on archaeological heritage as contained in the Draft Development Plan.The acquisition of lands and sites and the provision of signage is also beyond the strategic land-use function of the County Development Plan and therefore cannot be actioned or achieved through the Draft Pan.It is accepted, however, that HCL 2 Objective 4 should be amended to include for the protection of any of any discovered battlefield sites of significant archaeological potential within the County.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Amend HCL 2 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan to include for the protection of any discovered battlefield sites of significant archaeological potential within the County.Insert an action under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate the areas of Lucan Village Cemetery, the Dublin-Wicklow Border, Kilakee and Brittas for the purpose of creating possible public rights of way.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM192/0216 Item ID:48047**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 143  Include additional Objectives:1Protect**,** promote, facilitate, encourage, improve and enhance, where feasible, existing public rights of way to  archaeological sites and designate traditional walking routes as public rights of way in consultation with the NMS. In other cases, routes will be acquired by agreement with landowners or by way of compulsory powers.2  Recognising the importance of archaeology and National Monuments as part of our heritage and inheritance, provide, promote, enhance, facilitate, encourage, support, improve and protect public access to archaeological sites National Monuments, battlefields and sites of historic interest, in direct ownership, guardianship  or control of the Council and/or the State or private ownership including those listed in the RMP and seek to maximise their tourism potential. Appropriate signage will be put in place. Information on access to sites will be made be available on the Council’s web-site.(Insert address).**REPORT:**See response to same motion under Motion ID 48046.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Amend HCL 2 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan to include for the protection of any discovered battlefield sites of significant archaeological potential within the County.Insert an action under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate the areas of the Dublin-Wicklow Border, Kilakee and Brittas for the purpose of creating possible public rights of way.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM193/0216 Item ID:48055**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 157  Delete  Permissive Access Routes from the Title of 9.4.0 and include these routes in Walking & Cycling in 6.30. page 103**REPORT:**Permissive access routes have proved to be a more successful arrangement for providing access to high amenity areas as opposed to the more lengthy and legal process for the attempted creation of public rights of way, which have been proved to be problematic.Permissive Access Routes such as the Dublin Mountain Way and the Western Greenway in Mayo are considered to be extremely successful from a tourism, recreation and amenity perspective.Policies and objectives in relation to Permissive Access Routes are therefore directly relevant to the Heritage, Conservation and Landscapes Chapter of the Draft Plan and should be coupled with policies in relation to Public Rights of Way as part of a multi-faceted approach to improving access to places of high amenity and recreational value**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM194/0216 Item ID:48056**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 157  Replace 1st para 1st sentence by: The preservation of public rights of way which give access to seashore, mountain, lakeshore, riverbank or other place of natural beauty or recreational utility, which public rights of way shall be identified both by marking them on at least one of the maps forming part of the development plan and by indicating their location on a list appended to the development plan.On page 157  Include additional text: Public Rights of Way have existed over the centuries and  constitute an important recreational amenity for local people and visitors and an economic asset. They enable the enjoyment of high quality landscape and cultural heritage and provide a valuable link to natural assets such as lakes, bogs and forests. A public right of way is a person’s right of passage along a road or path, even if the route is not in public ownership. Council recognises the importance of maintaining and protecting Public Rights of Ways.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA similar motion was submitted to the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motion 305, ID 45240) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Rights of WayIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council. Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, notice must be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court. It is advised that the identification of a public right of way requires proof or verification of the right of way.The proposed replacement text fails to take cognisance of the fact that identifying a public right of way can encounter complex and lengthy legal proceedings. With the exception of motions submitted to this Development Plan Meeting, no public rights of way have previously been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and the timeframe for creation of such rights of way under the Development Plan process has lapsed. Furthermore, there are no seashores located within the County. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.The proposed insertion of unbalanced narrative in relation to the creation of public rights of way, which does not acknowledge the legal implications of such, is considered improper and would be misleading.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM195/0216 Item ID:48058**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 158 Objectives1  Replace this by: Preserve public rights of way and include an Interim List in the Development Plan.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA similar motion was submitted to the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motion 305, ID 45240) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Rights of WayIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council. Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, notice must be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court. It is advised that the identification of a public right of way requires proof or verification of the right of way.The proposed replacement text fails to take cognisance of the fact that identifying a public right of way can encounter complex and lengthy legal proceedings. With the exception of motion submitted this meeting, no public rights of way have previously been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and the timeframe for creation of such rights of way under the Development Plan process has lapsed.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM196/0216 Item ID:48059**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 158 Include additional Objectives:1  Encourage and facilitate the creation of additional rights of way and extend existing ones to facilitate the development of waymarked ways and loop walks, by undertaking a review of walking and cycling routes and bringing forward proposals within two years of the adoption of the Plan, either by agreement or by the use of compulsory powers, for the creation of public rights of way particularly in areas of high amenity and  to areas of high amenity, uplands, lake shores, river banks, forests, heritage sites, areas of historic or archaeological importance, National Monuments, to create a meaningful network. Provide linkages from built up areas to the countryside and to link with public rights of way in adjoining counties.2  Provide adequate signposting and way marking on rights of way.3  Protect and promote Greeenways and consider designating them as public rights of way.4  Identify and map on an ongoing basis public rights of way and incorporate them in the Plan by way of  a Variation.5  Recognizing the importance of established public rights of way for the common good, especially in tourist areas and those which provide access to archaeological sites, National Monuments, lakeshores, riverbanks, upland areas, water corridors or other places of natural beauty or recreational utility and to encourage cycling and walking, maintain, preserve, protect, conserve, enhance, promote and improve them. Ensure that they are effectively maintained by controlling undergrowth, trees and bushes.6Prohibit development and keep free from obstruction existing rights of way, and take legal action if necessary, to prevent any attempt to close them off.7Existing Public Rights of Way and established walking routes shall be identified prior to any new forestry planting, new infrastructural, energy/telecommunications or golf course developments and any other development capable of affecting the respective right of way.8  Development will not be permitted where a public right of way will be affected unless its character and convenience is maintained by:  (i) the footpath/bridleway being diverted by the minimal practical distance and the route continues to be segregated from vehicular traffic;(ii) Appropriate legal procedures have been undertaken to extinguish the existing right of way and to establish the new right of way to replace it.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA similar motion was submitted to the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motion 305, ID 45240) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Rights of WayIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council. Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, notice must be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court. It is advised that the identification of a public right of way requires proof or verification of the right of way.The proposed replacement text fails to take cognisance of the fact that identifying a public right of way can encounter complex and lengthy legal proceedings. With the exception of motions submitted to this meeting, no public rights of way have previously been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and the timeframe for creation of such rights of way under the Development Plan process has lapsed.Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.HCL 16 Objective 4 of the Draft Plan 2016-2022 also seeks to promote and improve access, in partnership with the relevant landowners, to all the historic sites in the County and seek to maximise their tourism potential in partnership with the relevant landowners. The partnership approach towards achieving access is considered to be a more realisable objective compared to the more complex and lengthy legal proceedings involved in creating public rights of way.The provision of directional signage along public rights of way is beyond the strategic planning and land use function of the County Development Plan and therefore cannot be achieved or actioned through same. The identification, funding and provision of such should be directed towards the County Tourism Strategy.IE4 Objective 6 of the Draft Plan already requires the identification of adjacent Public Rights of Way and established walking routes by applicants prior to any new telecommunication developments (including associated processes) and to prohibit telecommunications developments that impinge thereon or on recreational amenities, public access to the countryside or the natural environment. This objective was inserted into the Draft Plan subsequent to Motion 271 of the June 2015 County Development Plan Meeting.It is considered that the insertion of additional objectives into the Draft Plan that seeks to further limit development within the County prior to the resolution of unrelated and complex legal matter in relation to public rights of way would be overly restrictive and would adversely impact on development within the County.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM197/0216 Item ID:48060**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 158 include an Action: Identify the existing public rights of way which give access to mountains, lake shores, riverbanks or other places of natural beauty or recreational activity using the following methodology:Place an advert in local papers seeking submissions from the public to identify public rights of way which give access to mountains, lakeshores, riverbanks or other places of natural beauty or recreational utility.Identify existing rights of ways, paths, and access points to mountains, lakeshores, riverbanks or other places of natural beauty or recreational activity.Identify access points to mountains, lakeshores, riverbanks or other places of natural beauty or recreational activity which the Council have maintained or repaired with a view to identifying public rights of way.Carry out a desktop analysis of public records, maps, aerial photographs and newspaper accounts to identify reputations of public rights of way.Once the list is compiled, advertise and put it on display. The public will be invited to make submissions on the validity of the public rights of way.Endeavor to verify and list the public rights of way and begin the formal process for designating rights of way under Section 14 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). Vary the Plan to include the list and map showing the public rights of way.**REPORT:**Previous MotionA similar motion was submitted to the June 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motion 305, ID 45240) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.Rights of WayIn accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Development Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council. Where a planning authority proposes to include the preservation of a specific public right of way in a development plan, notice must be given to the owner or occupier of the lands who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court. It is advised that the identification of a public right of way requires proof or verification of the right of way.The proposed replacement text fails to take cognisance of the fact that identifying a public right of way can encounter complex and lengthy legal proceedings. With the exception of motions submitted to this meeting, no public rights of way have previously been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation and the timeframe for creation of such rights of way under the Development Plan process has lapsed.Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM198/0216 Item ID:48062**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. On page 160  Include additional Objective: Encourage, promote, preserve, facilitate and support access and public rights of way to geological and geo-morphological features and systems of heritage and co-ordinate the continuing development of strategic walking routes, trails and other recreational activities in geo parks.We submit that you should include additional sub sections onA  MASSEY WOODSPolicy  It is the policy of the Council to enter into immediate negotiations with the Forest Service to take over the management and/or ownership of Massy Woods.B  BOHERNABREENA RESERVOIRSObjectiveInvestigate the feasibility of adopting a joint management structure with Dublin City Council and Irish Water to protect the natural and recreational amenities of this unique area.**REPORT:**Reference to providing access to geological and geo-morphical features under HCL 16 Objective 1 (public rights of way) was inserted into the Draft Plan through Motion 304 of the June 2015 County Development Plan Meeting. This was considered to be appropriate in the context that HCL 16 Objective 1 relates to the provision of access to heritage features. This reflects a holistic approach to promoting and protecting heritage features throughout the County Development Plan from a variety of perspectives.The acquisition of lands is beyond the strategic land use function of the County Development Plan and cannot be actioned or achieved through the County Development Plan.H23 Objective 2 of the Draft Plan seeks to generally prohibit development within restricted areas identified on the Bohernabreena/Glenasmole Reservoir Restricted Areas Map contained in Schedule 4 of the Draft Plan and this is considered sufficient to protect the natural and recreational amenities of the area. The creation of management structures is beyond the scope of the County Development Plan, which is a strategic land use document.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M198 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50730)Following a contribution from Councillor F.N. Duffy, the Chief Executive Mr D. McLoughlin responded to queries raised.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM199/0216 Item ID:48148**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 210 (iii)  FencingReplace by: It is a requirement of the Planning Regulations 2001 Art 9(I)(a)(x) that the fencing or enclosure of land open to or used by the publicduring the ten years preceding such fencing or enclosure requires planning permission. Wire fencing constitutes visual pollution and destroys the “away from it all” feeling which makes upland areas such an attraction for both local people and visitors. There has been a large increase in the amount of new fencing in upland areas. Barbed wire has been used in most of this new fencing, which, in the absence of stiles or gates, makes access for recreational users of our countryside almost impossible. Traditional hill-sheep farming rarely required fencing, but since the introduction of REPS(now AEOS), sheep-farmers must, \*in certain circumstances, stock-proof their land. The challenge is to ensure that such fencing will be done in a manner that will meet the requirements of AEOS without impinging on access for hill walkers.2nd para  Insert: unless such fencing is essential to the viability of the farm after *areas*.**REPORT:**Section 11.5.5 (iii) already summarises the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations in relation to fencing. Full reiteration of the contents of Planning and Development Regulations and the provisions under REPS/AEOS is not considered necessary or appropriate and would add to the volume and complexity of the County Plan, which is a strategic land-use document.The subject motion also conflicts with motion with 48000.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** **DPM200/0216 Item ID:47835**It was proposed by Councillor F. Timmons and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. That the site known as Mount St. Joseph Cemetery be taken in charge by SDCC as an area of huge local interest to the people of Clondalkin**REPORT:**A motion to take St. Joseph's Cemetery on Monastery Road under the control of SDCC was submitted to the February 2015 Development Plan Council Meeting (Motion 279) and was subsequently withdrawn.Saint Joseph’s Graveyard is within private ownership. The taking in charge of lands is not a matter for the County Development Plan review process and cannot be achieved or actioned through the County Development Plan, which is a strategic land use document.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M200 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50694)[M200 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50789)Following contributions from Councillors F. Timmons and E. Ó’Broin.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM201/0216 Item ID:47871**It was proposed by Councillor V. Casserly and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan**Weirview - RPS**To support submission DRAFTDEVPLAN0182 by Weirview Residents Association to reverse the proposed removal of 20 properties at Weirview Cottages from the Record of Protected Structure, on the basis of their historic and cultural importance and previous enforcement issues.*Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly***REPORT:**Previous MotionThe proposed removal of Weirview Cottages from the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) and inclusion within an extended Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) for Lucan was subject to Motion that was on the agenda of the June 2015 County Development Plan Meeting (No. 306 -ID 45119) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, the motion was withdrawn.ACA DesignationThe proposed ACA designation and RPS removal has been informed by the ‘Appraisal of Candidate Architectural Conservation Areas’ (2015), which was carried out as an independent assessment of groups of structures of special interest within the County as part of the County Development Plan Review. This informed the ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015).The ACA Appraisal advises that ACA designation will provide a more appropriate level of protection for terraces or groupings of dwellings that were designed and built as distinct entities. It is further advised that where such terraces are designated as protected structures (such as Weirview Cottages), these should be removed from the RPS in recognition of the nature of their special visual interest or value and the appropriate level of protection that will be provided under ACA designation.This approach is in line with the recommendations of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2004, which recommends that ACA designation should be used to protect the setting and exterior appearance of structures that are of special interest where their interiors do not merit protection and that deletions from an RPS will take place where it has been decided that a more appropriate method of protection is through inclusion within an ACA.ACA designation will continue to afford statutory protection to the special interest of Weirview Cottages under Planning and Development Legislation, namely the external appearance and coherent visual setting created by these structures and negates the need for inclusion in the RPS.Removal from the RPS will provide flexibility for residents to carry out internal improvements and renovation without the need to apply for planning permission. This is considered to be appropriate in the context that Weirview Cottages consists of vernacular workers cottages where their special interest lies in their external appearance and not to their interiors.The retention of Weirview Cottages within the RPS would also be inconsistent with the proposed removal of Millbank Cottages from the RPS, which are located in the same proposed ACA extension area and are similar in style, age and appearance to Weirview Cottages. The proposed motion would place an inequitable and unnecessary burden on existing and future residents of Weirview Cottages compared to the residents of Millbank Cottages and other groups of dwellings within the County that are proposed for ACA designation.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M201 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50818)It was agreedto take Motion 201 in conjunction with Motion 202**DPM202/0216 Item ID:47997**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell. **Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**"That Nos 1-22 Weirview Cottages, Lucan be retained on the Record of Protected Structures" on the basis of their historic and cultural importance and long-standing and outstanding enforcement issues.**REPORT:**Previous MotionThe proposed removal of Weirview Cottages from the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) and inclusion within an extended Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) for Lucan was subject to Motion that was on the agenda of the June 2015 County Development Plan Meeting (No. 306 -ID 45119) and, subsequent to the response of the Chief Executive, was withdrawn.ACA DesignationThe proposed ACA designation and RPS removal has been informed by the ‘Appraisal of Candidate Architectural Conservation Areas’ (2015), which was carried out as an independent assessment of groups of structures of special interest within the County as part of the County Development Plan Review. This informed the ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015).The ACA Appraisal advises that ACA designation will provide a more appropriate level of protection for terraces or groupings of dwellings that were designed and built as distinct entities. It is further advised that where such terraces are designated as protected structures (such as Weirview Cottages), these should be removed from the RPS in recognition of the nature of their special visual interest or value and the appropriate level of protection that will be provided under ACA designation.This approach is in line with the recommendations of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2004, which recommends that ACA designation should be used to protect the setting and exterior appearance of structures that are of special interest where their interiors do not merit protection and that deletions from an RPS will take place where it has been decided that a more appropriate method of protection is through inclusion within an ACA.ACA designation will continue to afford statutory protection to the special interest of Weirview Cottages under Planning and Development Legislation, namely the external appearance and coherent visual setting created by these structures and negates the need for inclusion in the RPS.Removal from the RPS will provide flexibility for residents to carry out internal improvements and renovation without the need to apply for planning permission. This is considered to be appropriate in the context that Weirview Cottages consists of vernacular workers cottages where their special interest lies in their external appearance and not to their interiors.The retention of Weirview Cottages within the RPS would also be inconsistent with the proposed removal of Millbank Cottages from the RPS, which are located in the same proposed ACA extension area and are similar in style, age and appearance to Weirview Cottages. The proposed motion would place an inequitable and unnecessary burden on existing and future residents of Weirview Cottages compared to the residents of Millbank Cottages and other groups of dwellings within the County that are proposed for ACA designation.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M202 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50668)Following contributions from Councillors V. Casserly, P. Gogarty, G. O’Connell, L. O’Toole, D. O’Brien, Mr. E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning & Transportation responded to queries raised.A show of hands vote on the Motions followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 26(TWENTY SIX)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0(ZERO)**The Motions **AS PUT** were **CARRIED** **DPM203/0216 Item ID:48006**It was proposed by Councillor R. McMahon and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.Re Schedule 2 Protected Structures - Add Carthys Castle to the RPS in order to save what is left of it, as it was a significant building in its day.**REPORT:**A similar request to add ‘Carthy’s Castle’ to the Record of Protected Structures was the subject of a submission on the Draft County Development Plan (CE Report Ref 0210).Under the Planning development Act 2000 (as amended), a structure can only be designated as a protected structure where it is, in the opinion of the planning authority, of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest. The Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2004 also advise that it is only considered appropriate to give protection through the RPS to structures that may be subject to re-use. The criteria for determining the special interest of a structure are also set out under the guidelines.As part of the review of the Draft Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned an independent review of its Record of Protected Structures, with a view to identifying structures that merit addition or deletion including those within existing and proposed Architectural Conservation Areas. The review (entitled ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’, 2015) was carried out by a Conservation Consultant and a total of 180 structures were inspected for the purpose of this review. As part of the appraisal the special interest of each structure proposed for inclusion on the Record of Protected Structure was provided.The subject structure was included in the independent review and, from an analysis of historic mapping, it appears that ‘Carthy’s Castle’ comprises the ruins of the corner section of a former house (Montpelier House) that has long been demolished. The remaining structure is not recorded in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht) and is also not listed as a Recorded Monument under the Record of Monuments and Places, which is maintained by the National Monuments Service and largely relates to archaeological sites dating to before 1700.It is considered that the remaining ruinous section of the former Mountpelier House is extremely unlikely to be re-used and is not of sufficient interest to merit designation as a Protected Structure when assessed against the requirements of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the recommendations of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M203 - Image](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50685)[M203 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50678)Following contributions from Councillors R. McMahon, D. Looney, C. King and C. O’Connor.A show of hands vote on the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 26(TWENTY SIX)****AGAINST: 0(ZERO)****ABSTAIN: 0(ZERO)**The Motion **AS PUT** was **CARRIED** **DPM204/0216 Item ID:48200**It was proposed by Councillor P. Donovan and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.I wish to support a resident who is opposed to a proposed Record Protected Structure for her property at 13 Rathfarnham Village, Dublin 14 as referenced in Dev plan submission 0072.  I understand from the Residents submission that the property is already included in a ACA and I would be satisfied that the exterior of the building is what is of historic value to the village and that internal works shouldn’t be restricted and am calling for the RPS to be removed.**REPORT:**Identification of Protected StructuresSubmission 0072 on the Draft County Development Plan relates to Rathfarnham Post Office, 13 Main Street, Rathfarnham.Part IV of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the ‘Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2004) requires every development plan to include a record of protected structures comprising structures that are, in the opinion of the planning authority, of special interest. It is stated under the legislation that the planning authority may add a structure to its record of protected structures where the authority considers that the addition is necessary or desirable in order to protect a structure, or part of a structure, of special interest.As part of the review of the Draft Plan, South Dublin County Council commissioned an independent review of its Record of Protected Structures, with a view to identifying structures that merit addition or deletion including those within existing and proposed Architectural Conservation Areas. The review (entitled ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’, 2015) was carried out by a Conservation Consultant and a total of 180 structures were inspected for the purpose of this review. As part of the appraisal the special interest of each structure proposed for inclusion on the Record of Protected Structure was provided.A separate ‘Appraisal of Candidate of Architectural Conservation Areas’ (2015) was also carried out and helped to inform the Review of Protected Structures.The ‘Review of Record of Protected Structures 2014/15’ (2015) included for the assessment of a number of structures within the Rathfarnham Architectural Conservation Area (ACA) for possible inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures (RPS). This is in line with the recommendations of the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2004, which advises that individual structures within a proposed ACA that are of special importance should be considered for inclusion in the RPS, in addition to being included within a designated ACA.No. 13 Main Street was recommended under the independent review as being worthy of inclusion in the Record of Protected Structures in addition to its inclusion in the Rathfarnham ACA by reason of its special interest particularly in relation to its rare 1930s stained glass shop front, which has a distinctive Art Deco influence. The Council’s Architectural Conservation Officer concurs with the recommendation and the building is considered to be of special architectural, technical and cultural interest.It is therefore recommended that 13 Main Street be added to the Record of Protected Structures in line with the recommendations of the independent review and in order to provide for an enhanced level of protection under Planning and Development Legislation in addition to its designation within an ACA. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M204 - Images](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50682)[M204 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50859)The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM205/0216 Item ID:48073**In the absence of Councillor J. Lahart the following Motion **FELL:**That the Development Plan 2016-2022 incorporates an intention to refurbish the outbuildings at Rathfarnham Castle and to fully develop the tourist/heritage and amenity value of these buildings and the Castle Grounds**REPORT:**Previous MotionsA range of motions in relation to the use, development and refurbishment of Rathfarnham Castle including its outbuildings and historic features were put to the February 2015 Development Plan Meeting (Motions 137, 141, 143, 144, 382, 383, 384, 385). The motions were either withdrawn or amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief Executive.Ownership & Development of Rathfarnham CastleRathfarnham Castle is currently within the ownership of the OPW. The acquisition, use and development of the Castle is beyond the scope of the County Development Plan.The identification, funding and carrying out of works within the grounds of Rathfarnham Castle would be more relevant and realisable in partnership with the OPW under the South Dublin County Heritage Plan and the South Dublin County Council’s Tourism Strategy.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.[M205 - Location map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=50756)**DPM206/0216 Item ID:48042**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.That on page 143  Policy 1  Replace Objective 1 with: Protect, conserve, preserve, manage, enhance, safeguard and, where appropriate restore, natural, built and cultural heritage features the quality and character of the environment and natural amenity assets as non-renewable resources and in particular, National sites designated, proposed for designation and any future designations and maintain/develop linkages between them, for the benefit  for current and future generations in association with stakeholders while maximising their recreational, amenity and tourism potential for the present generation by resisting development that may have a negative impact. Create opportunities in suitable locations for active recreation and the provision of visual relief from the built environment. Avoid unnecessary harm and reduce the effect of harm where it cannot be avoided. Implement the provisions of the Planning and Development Act 2000(as amended) which protects the natural heritage. Engage with local communities and other relevant stakeholders in the protection of the natural heritage.**REPORT:**HCL Policy 1 is an overarching policy that introduces the Heritage, Conservation and Landscape Chapter of the Draft Development Plan. The policy relates to the protection, conserve and enhancement of natural, built and cultural heritage features within the County and provides support the objectives and actions of the County Heritage Plan. As an overarching policy it is considered it is appropriately clear, succinct and precise in relation to drawing together, safeguarding and enhancing the various aspects of heritage.The Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion, however, the proposed wording is unstructured and complex and is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly.Furthermore the wording of the motion, as a proposed overarching policy statement, is excessive, imprecise and not appropriate to Chapter 9 in that it attempts to cover a multitude of elements that are either:* already covered by other more appropriate policies contained in Chapter 9 of the Draft Plan (national sites);
* covered by other chapters contained in the Draft Plan (non-renewable resources, recreation, amenity, tourism); or
* are not relevant or actionable through the Draft Plan (public consultation on matters relating to natural heritage).

The wording of the proposed motion would therefore hinder and detract from the quality, structure and implementation of the overarching policy on heritage as contained in the Draft Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adoptedThe Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** **DPM207/0216 Item ID:48043**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 143  Include additional Objective: Recognizing the role played by natural amenities and landscape, as part of our heritage and as a major resource both for visitors and local people, identify, provide, support, maintain, promote, encourage, protect, preserve, improve, safeguard and enhance public access to our natural heritage including mountains, commonage and other hill land, moorlands, forests, rivers, lakes, valleys, nature reserves other natural amenities and to the countryside generally by creating a meaningful network of access routes as the opportunity or need arises. This will be done in co-operation with state agencies, other interested bodies and local community groups.**REPORT:**The Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion, however, the proposed wording is unstructured and complex and is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly.The objectives contained under HCL Policy 2 of the Draft Development Plan relate to the protection of the Archaeological Heritage of the County. The proposed motion is considered to be excessive, imprecise and not appropriate to Archaeological Heritage in that it attempts to cover a multitude of elements that are either:- already covered by other more appropriate policies contained in Chapter 9 of the Draft Plan (landscapes, natural heritage features, public access);- covered by other chapters contained in the Draft Plan (access routes/heritage trails); or- are not relevant or actionable through the Draft Plan (consultation on matters relating to access routes/heritage trails).The wording of the proposed motion would therefore hinder and detract from the quality, structure and implementation of policy on Archaeological Heritage as contained in the Draft Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****DPM208/0216 Item ID:48048**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 148  Include additional Objective: Preserve, maintain, safeguard and protect the amenity value, visual integrity and rural character of open/unfenced landscape of the uplands, areas of rough grazing and commonage and secure access thereto. Discourage inappropriate development in open countryside and prohibit developments which are likely to have significant adverse visual impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on the character of the uplands, unless there is no overriding need for the development to be in that particular location. Where an overriding need is demonstrated ensure that it is appropriate in bulk and scale and is sited, designed and landscaped in a manner which minimises potential adverse impacts on the landscape. Ensure that development will not significantly interfere or detract from scenic uplands and that particular regard is had to potential impacts of new developments and require that proposed developments demonstrate that every effort has been made to reduce visual impacts (including site selection and design) and that visually prominent sites have been avoided to minimise visibility from scenic routes, walking trails, public amenities, settlements and roads. Have particular regard to the potential impacts of development on sensitive upland areas and materially consider the difficulty of establishing and maintaining screening vegetation.**REPORT:**Wording of MotionThe Chief Executive agrees with the sentiment of the motion, however, the proposed wording is unstructured and complex and is not consistent with policy contained with ‘Taking Steps to be a Literacy Friendly Local Authority’ (SDCC and National Adult Literacy Agency, 2012) in relation to the use of simple, plain and clear language that is literacy friendly.Landscape Character Assessment Further to the Landscape Character Assessment of South Dublin County (2015), HCL Policy 7 relates to the preservation and enhancement the character of the County’s landscapes particularly areas that have been deemed to have a medium to high Landscape Value or medium to high Landscape Sensitivity. This is followed by HCL 7 Objective 1 and 2, which seeks to protect and enhance the landscape character of the County.The policy and objectives are further supported by Section 11.5.5, which requires proposals in high amenity zones and sensitive landscapes to be accompanied by Landscape Impact Assessment that demonstrates visual impact and outlines mitigation measures that ensure that existing features such as geological features are retained. It is also a requirement for proposals on sites with steep or varying topography to be accompanied by a comprehensive site analysis, concept proposal, design statement and sections that demonstrate how proposals incorporate the natural slope of sites.The aforementioned negates the need to reiterate the need protect upland areas, discourage inappropriate development, and ensure that development will not detract from visual amenity. The proposed motion would therefore result in repetition and needlessly ad to the volume and complexity of the Draft Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** **DPM209/0216 Item ID:48051**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 152 include an additional Objective:  Protect, preserve, maintain, improve and enhance the national heritage, recreational and amenity value (including walking and cycling) of the Grand Canal corridor its towpaths by controlling development and by co-operating with WI and neighbouring local authorities.**REPORT:**The range of objectives set out under HCL Policy 11 aims to strike a balance between recreational use and habitat protection along the Grand Canal. This is strengthened by HCL Policy 13 Objectives 1 and 2, which seek to ensure that development proposals within or adjacent to pNHAs are sited and designed to minimise impact on biodiversity and is restricted to development that is directly related to the area’s amenity potential.HCL 11 Objective 7 of the Draft Plan already provides for the extension of the Grand Canal Green Route in partnership with Waterways Ireland and Kildare County Council.The policy and objectives contained in the Draft Plan therefore already satisfy the objectives sought in the subject motion.The proposed motion would therefore needlessly add to the volume of the Draft Plan with repetition.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED** **DPM210/0216 Item ID:48052**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.On page 156 include an additional sub section: PROSPECTIVE SAAOsObjectiveActively propose the designation of areas within the Dublin Mountains including the Bohernabreena Reservoirs and High Amenity Area and the Liffey Valley Zones with a view to making SAAOs and seek an Order to that effect and undertake a feasibility study to report on other areas considered worthy of designation to report within one year of the adoption of the Plan.**REPORT:**The designation of a Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO) comprises a process that is separate and independent to the County Development Plan Review process that statutorily requires public consultation and includes a statutory timeframe thus negating the need to amend policy, objectives or actions in the Draft County Development plan in relation to these aspects of making an Amenity Area Order. This separate function is therefore beyond the scope of the County Development Plan and therefore cannot be achieved or Action through the County Development Plan.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **ACCEPTED****Energy****DPM211/0216 Item ID:47890**It was proposed by Councillor V. Casserly and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.**High-Power line**To include a new local objective under E11 or E12*: “To work in conjunction with EirGrid to seek to continue the undergrounding of the 220kv power line between Foxborough and the County boundary, including in the Balgaddy and Ronanstown areas.”**Co-sponsored by Cllr. Casserly, Egan***REPORT:**It is recognised that the undergrounding of the 220Kv power lines at this location could benefit the future development of lands zoned for development in the surrounding area. The Council shall continue to work in partnership with EirGrid and all relevant stakeholders to explore the undergrounding of power lines and other related opportunities at these locations.It is noted that, An Bord Pleanala is currently considering a Strategic Infrastructure planning application for the development of the West Dublin 220/100 kV substation and associated works project, which includes for the removal of approximately 3 kilometres of the existing Inchicore-Maynooth 220 kV double circuit overhead line and the undergrounding of electricity cables along regional roads, local roads and adjoining lands in the vicinity. The project is located in South Dublin County and extends across the following townlands: Gollierstown, Finnstown, Adamstown, Ballymakaily, Grange, Clutterland, Kilmactalway, Milltown, Ballybane, Kilbride, Kilcarbery, Nangor, Kilmahuddrick, Esker South and Kishoge. The development includes works to be carried out within the Clonburris SDZ, Adamstown SDZ and Grange Castle Business Park.  South Dublin County Council will issue a submission with regard to this application to An Bord Pleanala by 22nd February 2016, as provided for under the Planning and Development (Strategic Infrastructure) Act 2006.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.Insert E11 Objective 1To work in conjunction with EirGrid to seek to continue the undergrounding of the 220kv power line between Foxborough and the County boundary, including in the Balgaddy and Ronanstown areas.[M211 - Location Map](http://www.sdublincoco.ie/sdcc/departments/corporate/apps/cmas/documentsview.aspx?id=51004)The Motion was **AGREED****DPM212/0216 Item ID:48005**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan.Page 219 - insert 'or equivalent ' after CEM III/a on the first line.To support and promote the use of CEM III/a or equivalent cement classification. The use of green building methods such as BREEAM and LEED ensures a whole life cycle approach to building design including operational carbon and embodied carbon. This holistic approach results in low energy demand buildings with a significantly reduced carbon footprint and a higher commercial value.**REPORT:**This motion proposes the insertion of the word ‘equivalent’ as a means of supporting the use of alternative cement classification types in the construction of new buildings across South Dublin County. This is considered acceptable.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted.The Motion was **AGREED****DPM213/0216 Item ID:48064**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.On page 171 Policy  Include additional Objective: Identify existing public rights of way and walking routes and prohibit development which would interfere with them and with access to the countryside or recreational amenity.**REPORT:**Energy (E) Policy 9 Wind Energy on page 171 of the Draft Plan states:It is the policy of the Council to restrict large scale wind energy infrastructure in the rural hinterland and mountain areas of the County, to protect the overriding visual and environmental value of these landscapes.The evidence based analysis carried out to assess the potential of large commercial windfarm development in the County (undertaken to inform the Draft Plan) concludes, ‘there is no realistic or practical potential for economic wind farm development, without having significant and overriding adverse visual and environmental impacts on landscapes’ (Draft Plan, page 171).As such, an additional objective is not required under Energy (E) Policy 9 Wind Energy on page 171 of the Draft Plan.In accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.No public rights of way have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation. This includes all submissions received during the County Development Plan review stage at pre-draft and draft stage.In the context of the proposed insertion of public rights of way at this stage of the plan making process, it is advised that the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way as part of the Development Plan under the Planning and Development Act 2000 - 2015 (as amended) is no longer achievable. The identification of public right of way will require the local authority to verify proof of the rights of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Proof of permission from the landowner also needs to be clear and precise in terms of what land is involved and for what purpose the right of way exists.Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands for a minimum period of 6 weeks who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.It is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate relevant areas of the County for the purpose of creating publics right of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert an action under HCL Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) *to investigate relevant areas of the County for the purpose of creating public rights of way.*The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM214/0216 Item ID:48065**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins.On page 172We submit that you should include additional sub section: HYDRO ENERGYObjective Have regard to the impacts of Hydro Energy Schemes on public rights of way and walking routes.**REPORT:**Small scale hydro-electricity projects are addressed in Section 10.2.6 of the Draft Plan (page 169). Energy (E) Policy 8 states:It is the policy of the Council to encourage the roll-out of small-scale hydroelectric projects on the rivers, watercourses, dams and weirs across the County, where they do not impact negatively on freshwater species, biodiversity and natural or built heritage features.As such, an additional objective is not required under Energy (E) Policy 8.In accordance with the provisions of Planning and Development Legislation, HCL 16 Objective 1 of the Draft Plan seeks to preserve and map public rights of way as they come to the attention of the Council.No public rights of way have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Planning Authority for investigation. This includes all submissions received during the County Development Plan review stage at pre-draft and draft stage.In the context of the proposed insertion of public rights of way at this stage of the plan making process, it is advised that the minimum prescribed timescale for making public rights of way as part of the Development Plan under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is no longer achievable. The identification of public right of way will require the local authority to verify proof of the rights of way normally in the form of statement of permission from the landowner or ‘dedication’ at some point in time. Proof of permission from the landowner also needs to be clear and precise in terms of what land is involved and for what purpose the right of way exists.Notice must also be given to the owner or occupier of the lands for a minimum period of 6 weeks who has a right of appeal to the Circuit Court.It is recommended that an action be inserted under Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate relevant areas of the County for the purpose of creating public rights of way. Section 207 of the Planning and Development At 2000 (as amended) provides for the creation of public rights of way outside of the Development Plan process.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is adopted with amendment:Insert an action under HCL Policy 16 of the Draft County Development Plan (Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes) to investigate relevant areas of the County for the purpose of creating public rights of way. The Chief Executive’s recommendation was **AGREED****DPM215/0216 Item ID:47994**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**Given that we need to reduce water runoff and given that green roofs have numerous social, economic and environmental benefits and can contribute positively to issues surrounding climate change, flooding, biodiversity and declining green space in urban areas - Add in E2 Objective 6 to read: "To ensure all new commercial, industrial and public buildings include green roofs and/or solar panels or a mix of the two for flood alleviation, insulation and the supply of low carbon renewable energy and/or heating alternatives."**REPORT:**Having regard to the requirement for solar panels on all new commercial, industrial and public buildings, it is noted that the energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements for the construction of new non-residential buildings are currently addressed in the Building Regulations Part L (2008) and relevant national policy and guidelines. In consideration of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010, it is considered that the function of County Development Plan policies and objectives in this regard, is to support incremental changes to the Building Regulations Part L, national guidelines and other guidance, that may occur over the lifetime of the Development Plan, without duplicating or introducing specific requirements on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies that may conflict with or impede the implementation of the Building Regulations on any specific site for development.It is recommended that the Draft Plan 2016-2022 policies and objectives continue to support any future changes to the Building Regulations and national guidance, such as for example, Towards Nearly Zero Energy Buildings in Ireland: Planning for 2020 and Beyond, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, (2012).Having regard to the above, it is considered that the energy performance of new buildings is sufficiently addressed in Energy (E) Policy 4 and Chapter 11 Implementation, of the Draft Plan.Under Energy (E) Policy 4, the Council aims to ensure that all new development is designed to take account of the impacts of climate change, and that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures are considered in accordance with national building regulations, policy and guidelines.As such it is considered that the Draft Plan adequately addresses the energy performance of new buildings in South Dublin County.The inclusion of green roofs in new developments can make significant contributions to managing and draining surface water in an environmentally friendly way, and as part of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS).  In this regard Green Infrastructure (G) Policy  5 – Objective 2 of the Draft Plan, states: ‘to promote the provision of Green Roofs and/or Living Walls in developments where expansive roofs are proposed such as industrial, retail and civic developments.  Furthermore, having regard to Development Management implementation standards, Section 11.6.1 (iii) states that: ‘in general all new developments will be required to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)’. Green roofs are listed in this section as devices that can be included in a Sustainable Urban Drainage System.  **As such it is considered that the Draft Plan adequately addresses the opportunities for the inclusion of green roofs in new buildings in South Dublin County.**In consideration of the motion proposal to ensure that all new commercial, industrial and public buildings include green roofs and/or solar panels or a mix of the two, such a **mandatory requirement** would increase the cost of constructing commercial development, and as such would place South Dublin County at a competitive disadvantage in attracting and generating employment growth across the County.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.Following contributions from Councillors P. Gogarty, G. O’Connell, F.N. Dufy, , D. O’Brien, K. Mahon, J. Graham, E. Higgins, P. Donovan, D. Looney, T. Gilligan, E. Ó’Broin, S. Holland, M. Murphy. Mr D. McLoughlin Chief Executive and Mr E. Taaffe, Director Land Use Planning and Transportation responded to queries raised.An amendment to the Motion was proposed by Councillor T. Gilligan and seconded by Councillor E. Higgins"To promote all new commercial, industrial and public buildings to include green roofs and/or solar panels or a mix of the two for flood alleviation, insulation and the supply of low carbon renewable energy and/or heating alternatives."A show of hands vote on the Amended Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 10(TEN)****AGAINST: 13(THIRTEEN)****ABSTAIN: 1(ONE)**The Motion **FELL**.A second Amendment to the Original Motion was proposed by Councillor E. Ó’Broin and seconded by Councillor D. O’Brien "To ensure all new public buildings include green roofs and/or solar panels or a mix of the two for flood alleviation, insulation and the supply of low carbon renewable energy and/or heating alternatives and to actively promote these measures where appropriate in new commercial and industrial buildings."A show of hands vote on the second proposed Amendment to the Motion followed, the result of which was as follows:**FOR: 15(FIFTEEN)****AGAINST: 7(SEVEN)****ABSTAIN: 3(THREE)****The** Motion **AS AMENDED** was **AGREED.****DPM216/0216 Item ID:47998**It was proposed by Councillor P. Gogarty and seconded by Councillor G. O’Connell.**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell**"Amend 11.6.1 Water management section (iii) Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) to read:In general all new developments will be required to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS). Sustainable Drainage Systems include devices such as swales, permeable pavements, filter drains, storage ponds, constructed wetlands, soakways and green roofs. In some exceptional cases and at the discretion of the Planning Authority, where it is demonstrated that SuDS devices are not feasible, approval may be given to install underground attenuation tanks or enlarged pipes in conjunction with other devices to achieve the required water quality. Such alternative measures will only be considered as a last resort.All new commercial, industrial and public buildings shall be required to incorporate a green roof into their development.Watercourses should remain open in their natural valley and culverting shall be confined to road crossings. In exceptional circumstances and at the discretion of the Planning Authority, approval may be given to install a culvert within a development where it is demonstrated that this is the most appropriate design response based on site specific constraints/circumstances."**Motion: Cllr P. Gogarty Cllr L. O’Toole, Cllr G. O’Connell****REPORT:**The Motion includes text already in the Draft Plan, apart from **All new commercial, industrial and public buildings shall be required to incorporate a green roof into their development.**The inclusion of green roofs in new developments can make significant contributions to managing and draining surface water in an environmentally friendly way, and as part of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS). In this regard Green Infrastructure (G) Policy  5 – Objective 2 of the Draft Plan, states:‘to promote the provision of Green Roofs and/or Living Walls in developments where expansive roofs are proposed such as industrial, retail and civic developments. Furthermore, having regard to Development Management implementation standards, Section 11.6.1 (iii) states that:‘in general all new developments will be required to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)’.Green roofs are listed in this section as devices that can be included in a Sustainable Urban Drainage System.  As such it is considered that the Draft Plan adequately addresses the opportunities for the inclusion of green roofs in new buildings in South Dublin County.In consideration of the motion proposal to ensure that all new commercial, industrial and public buildings include green roofs, **such a mandatory requirement** would increase the cost of constructing commercial development, and as such would place South Dublin County at a competitive disadvantage in attracting and generating employment growth across the County.**Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.Councillor P. Gogarty **AGREED** to **WITHDRAW** the Motion**DPM217/0216 Item ID:48019**It was proposed by Councillor F.N. Duffy and seconded by Councillor G. O’ConnellPage 165 – Include in 10.2.2 - SDCC require the passive house standard or equivalent for all new build in the county.**REPORT:**The energy efficiency and renewable energy requirements for the construction of new residential and non-residential buildings are currently addressed in the Building Regulations Part L (2008 and 2011) and relevant national policy and guidelines.In the context of the Planning and Development Act 2000 2015 (as amended) it is considered that the function of County Development Plan policies and objectives in this regard, is to support incremental changes to the Building Regulations Part L, national guidelines and other guidance, that may occur over the lifetime of the Development Plan, without duplicating or introducing specific requirements on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies that may conflict with or impede the implementation of the Building Regulations on any specific site for development.It is recommended that the Draft Plan 2016-2022 policies and objectives continue to support any future changes to the Building Regulations and national guidance, such as for example, Towards Nearly Zero Energy Buildings in Ireland: Planning for 2020 and Beyond, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, (2012).Having regard to the above, it is considered that the energy performance of new buildings is sufficiently addressed in Energy (E) Policy 4 and Chapter 11 Implementation, of the Draft Plan. Under Energy (E) Policy 4, the Council aims to ensure that all new development is designed to take account of the impacts of climate change, and that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures are considered in accordance with national building regulations, policy and guidelines. As such, it is considered that the Draft Plan adequately addresses the energy performance of existing and new buildings in South Dublin County.In consideration of the motion proposal to require the passive house standard or equivalent for all new build in the County, attention is drawn to the letter from the Minister for the Environment, Community and Local Government to the Chief Executives of the Dublin local authorities in June 2015. This letter has regard to the delivery of residential developments in the Dublin area and the role of Development Plan policy. In particular, the letter states:*‘Viability of new development and therefore supply, will be placed at risk by insertion of unreasonable or excessive requirements in relation to the standard of housing or ancillary services and facilities that, in turn, impact adversely on the economic viability of commercial investment in and deliverability of new housing development over the plan period’.*Having regard to contents of the Minister’s letter and the other issues raised above, it is considered that the inclusion of this motion would impact negatively on the cost and timely delivery of residential development in South Dublin County and would impede with the implementation of the Building Regulations Part L on individual sites for development across the County. Furthermore, it is noted that Passive House is a trademark and not a recognised design standard that should be made mandatory over and in place of, the existing Building Regulations in Ireland. **Recommendation**It is recommended that this motion is not adopted.It was AGREED by Councillor F.N Duffy to amend the motion to read;Page 165 – Include in 10.2.2 - SDCC support the passive house standard or equivalent for all new build in the county.The Motion **AS AMENDED** was **AGREED****DPM4/0216 Item ID:48266**Proposed by Land Use Planning & Transportation **Resolution to next stage** It was proposed by Councillor S. Holland and seconded by Councillor T. Gilligan and **AGREED**The Meeting concluded at 8.48pm.Signed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ MayorDate \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
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