

Minutes of Special Meeting of Monaghan County Council on Monday 5th November 2012 at 10.00am held in the Council Chamber, M-Tek 1 Building, Knockaconny, Monaghan

Chair: Cllr H. McElvaney, Mayor.

Present: Cllrs Bannigan, Carthy, Carville, Conlon, Connolly, Coyle, Crowe, Gallagher, Keelan, Maxwell, B. McKenna, McNally, McPhillips, Murray, O'Brien, O'Hanlon, and P. Treanor.

Mr. D. Fallon, A/County Manager, Mr. P. Clifford and Mr. D. Treanor, Directors of Service, Mr. A. Hughes, Senior Planner, Mr. J. McGrath, Senior Engineer, Mr. T. Gourley, Senior Executive Planner, Ms. H. Hughes, Assistant Planner, Ms. C. Thornton, Meetings Administrator and Ms. L. Brannigan, Asst. Staff Officer.

Apology: Cllr S. Treanor.

At the outset of the meeting the Mayor commended the Planning staff for their hard work and diligence over the past number of months in preparation for today's meeting.

1. Introduction

Mr. D. Fallon, A/County Manager advised the members as follows:

"The elected members of Monaghan County Council have the responsibility of making the Monaghan County Development Plan (incorporating the Development Plans for the Towns of Monaghan, Carrickmacross, Castleblayney, Clones and Ballybay) for the period 2013-2019. This meeting has been convened under Section 12(5)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) for the elected members to 'consider the draft plan and the report of the manager' on the submissions made in respect of the draft plan.

The adoption of a development plan is one of the most important functions reserved to the elected members. In doing so they are restricted to considering the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to which the development plan relates, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and the relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or any Minister of the Government.

To date the elected members have been fully involved from the start of the process through briefings at council meetings, consultation during the preparation of the Issues Paper and Draft Plan, and the involvement of those elected members on the Strategic Policy Committee for Planning and Economic Development.

In making and adopting the development plan, the elected council, acting in the interests of the common good and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, must, in accordance with the "Code of Conduct for Councillors" prepared under the Local Government Act 2001, carry out their duties in this regard in a transparent manner, must follow due process and must make their decisions based on relevant considerations, while ignoring that which is irrelevant within the requirements of the statutory planning framework.

Under the Local Government Act 2001 elected members must disclose at a meeting of the local authority or of its committees any pecuniary or other beneficial interest, (of which they have actual knowledge) they or a connected person have in, or material to, any matter with which the local authority is concerned in the discharge of its functions, and which comes before the meeting. The councillor must withdraw from the meeting after disclosure and must not vote or take part in any discussion or consideration of the matter.

The elected members will consider the recommendations set out in this document, and may make amendments to the draft development plan taking account of the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government or any Minister of the Government.”

The Mayor reiterated the words ‘acting in the interest of the common good’ from the Manager’s speech.

Mr T. Gourley, Senior Executive Planner, advised the Council as follows:

“Current Stage

We are now three quarters the way through the process of producing a development plan for the period 2013-2019. The current stage of the process involves the elected members considering the Manager’s report on the submissions made in respect of the draft development plan. The members will decide, having considered the response of the Manager to the issues raised whether to adopt the draft plan as the development plan or to make amendments to it.

Amendments

If the members decide to make amendments to the draft plan, these will be subject to public consultation and will be sent to the Minister, and prescribed bodies including the Border Regional Authority for observations. It is expected that the consultation process on the amendments, if required, will begin mid December and conclude in the third week in January. Following the amendments consultation period, the Manager will submit a report to the elected members on the submissions made in respect of the amendments summarising the issues raised and giving his response. The members will decide, having considered the response of the Manager to the issues raised, whether to make a modification to any amendment, and accordingly make the development plan.

The Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended, states that any modification must be minor in nature, and thus not likely to have significant effects on the environment or adverse effects on the integrity of a European site.

A modification cannot result in an increase in the area of land zoned for any purpose or comprise of an addition to or deletion from the Record of Protected Structures.

Zoning

To ensure an orderly and progressive approach to the development of the area, land must be developed in a sequential and co-ordinated manner. Development beyond the outer edges of existing built up areas, when intervening lands lie undeveloped, results in an unsustainable form of development.

Two aspects of zoning that are central to proper planning and sustainable development are need and sequential development of land.

Need – In relation to housing land this has been established taking account of historical population growth and extrapolating it forward over the lifetime of the plan. The Settlement/Core Strategy sets out the quantum of land required. The quantum of residential land zoned in the settlements is 150 percent of the land required to take account of any difficulties that may arise in developing some of the zoned land.

Sequential development – This is required to ensure a logical approach to the development of land. Zoning of land should:-

- extend outwards from the centre of an urban area with undeveloped lands closest to the core given preference*
- make use of infill opportunities and ensure better use made of under utilised lands*
- be contiguous to (abutt) existing zoned and developed land.*

Decisions to zone land must be clearly justified on the basis of established need and must support the aims and strategy of the plan, particularly the core strategy. If the members decide to make an amendment to the draft plan that is not consistent with the recommendation of the Manager, the members must clearly set out the reason for doing so and this reason must be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

In the event that the members decide to zone land which does not follow the sequential approach as laid out in the Development Plan Guidelines, the exceptional circumstances and justification which merit a departure from the sequential approach must be included in the written statement of the development plan.

Where the members decide not to comply with any recommendation made by the Manager in response to an observation or recommendation from the Minister or the Border Regional Authority, the planning authority is required to inform the Minister and the Regional Authority in writing setting out the reasons for the decision.”

Cllrs Bannigan, Gallagher, O’Brien and McPhillips declared that they may have an interest in certain aspects of the Draft Development Plan being brought before the Council for consideration and that they would formally declare such interest at that stage.

In response to a query from Cllr B. McKenna as to whether any member declared an interest or absented themselves from discussions/meetings prior to this meeting, Mr. A. Hughes, Senior Planner stated that he had no recollection of any such declarations.

Cllrs Bannigan, Gallagher, O’Brien and McPhillips stated that they had not been present at any meetings where issues were discussed that would have required them to declare an interest.

2. Submissions in respect of Environmental Report

Manager’s Report on Submissions in Respect of the Environmental Report

A total of nine submissions were made in respect of the Environmental Report. These were from:

- Border Regional Authority

- Inland Fisheries Ireland (Eastern River Basin District)
- Louth County Council
- Inland Fisheries Ireland (North Western River Basin District)
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Jack Tenison
- Department of Arts, Heritage and Gaeltacht

The issues that were raised in these submissions consisted of:

- Improvement of monitoring and mitigation measures
- Inclusion of a paragraph regarding climate change and the implications for water flows
- Insertion of tables which summarised the evaluation of alternative against the strategic environmental objectives
- Amendment of tables regarding national monuments in state care

As a result it is recommended that the Environmental Report contains an addendum including the recommendations set out in the Manager's Report.

3. Submissions in respect of Draft Development Plan

Item 3.1 Various Issues

- 2. Dermot McCabe – pg 14
- 50. Eamonn Callaghan – pg 148
- 52. Liam Murtagh – pg 150
- 55. CS Pringle – pg 159
- 79. Cootehill Area Development Limited – pg 243
- 95. Cllr Joe Brennan – pg 326

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.2 100 Metre Separation Between Residential Units and Agricultural Buildings

- 3. Terence Buckley – pg 16

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submission.

Item 3.3 Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence

- 4. M Vance – pg 17
- 96. CS Pringle – pg 327

Cllr Bannigan requested that 'marriage breakdown' be included under exceptional circumstances referred to on Page 328.

Cllr B. McKenna queried where this should be discussed now as it comes under Item 3.8 also.

Cllr Bannigan agreed that he would raise it under Item 3.8.

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.4 Landscape Protection

5. Eileen McNally – pg 18
10. Mary McNally – pg 43
11. Gerard McNally – pg 44
12. Martin Traynor – pg 45
13. Noel McGarrell – pg 46
41. Sean Brennan – pg 115
42. PJ Brennan – pg 116

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.5 Protection of Water Courses

6. Inland Fisheries Ireland (North West River Basin District) – pg 19
19. Inland Fisheries Ireland (Eastern River Basin District) – pg 60

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.6 Compliance with Regional Planning Guidelines

7. Border Regional Authority – pg 25

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submission.

Item 3.7 Tier 6 Settlements Policy (Bawn)

14. Crann – pg 47
17. Malcolm Greenan – pg 57
18. Nuala Greenan – pg 59
20. Roisin McGeough – pg 63
21. John McGeough – pg 65
22. Rosemary McGeough – pg 66
25. Joseph Crawford – pg 70
26. Patricia McGeough – pg 71
27. Seamus McGeough – pg 72
28. Jacinta Long – pg 73
29. McArdle Family – pg 74
30. Gerard Nolan – pg 75
31. Patricia Wrightson – pg 77
32. Geoffrey Quinn – pg 79
33. Irish Historic Houses Association Limited – pg 81
34. Jack Tenison – pg 86
35. Jim Coyle – pg 104
36. Bawn Rural Protection Society 2012 – pg 106
37. Ellen Coyle – pg 107

38. A & B McEntee – pg 109
39. Fionnuala Byrne – pg 111
40. Thomas William Jordan – pg 113
44. Henry Weir – pg 122
45. Robert O’Byrne – pg 125
51. History Festival of Ireland – pg 149
68. Patrick Kerrigan – pg 205
70. An Taisce – pg 208
81. Lough Bawn Trustees – pg 246

Cllr Murray raised the concern of so many submissions. He asked that Planners confirm that all requests were dealt with.

Cllr Carthy mentioned those who made contributions and raised concerns over remarks made in relation to social housing tenants in Bawn. Cllr Carthy was critical of the submission received from An Taisce which questioned the zoning of a significant area of land at Bawn when there was no land zoned at Bawn. He stated that he intends to challenge these comments. He also criticised An Taisce for making submissions on behalf of someone who did not want their neighbours to build in their own area. The Council should confront An Taisce and the role they are playing in rural Ireland. There is a role for a body which has concerns about heritage but An Taisce are not fulfilling that role. He believed they were a vehicle through which rich people could object to the planning submissions of their neighbours. He further stated that judging by the submission it would appear that An Taisce had not read the relevant section of the Draft Plan.

Cllr Keelan supported Cllr Carthy’s statement with regard to the Bawn area. He said that some of the submissions received in relation to Bawn were from people who were not from the area or who had little or no interest in it. Many of the submissions were derogatory to the people of Bawn and are ill informed. One said that Bawn had no handball alley when in fact there are two handball areas and Derrygooney hall which is used every Thursday as a community centre. He commended the residents of Bawn for their work over the years.

Cllr McNally stated that there was the possibility that submissions were made by people who had been put under pressure to make a submission, the instigator of this does not live in the area on a full time basis. He felt that the comments made in the submissions ‘looked down their noses at people who lived in local authority houses’. He said it was unfortunate that the word ‘ghettoised’ was used in one instance. Bawn is largely an unspoiled area where natural beauty remains for the people to enjoy. The Council had been involved in work on the Billy Fox Memorial Park. An Taisce has an absolute disconnect with reality both on the ground and in the Draft Plan itself. The people who made the submissions may not have appreciated that they were becoming part of someone else’s agenda. The Council is the ultimate protector of Bawn – the eight local authority houses already there were accommodating people from the local area. Cllr McNally commended Bawn Development Association who have engaged in small and medium size projects helping to make Bawn a better place.

Mr. Gourley explained that the 2007 County Development Plan indicated a certain amount of land within a development envelope for Bawn but he said that was subject to certain criteria. The 2013 Plan rowed back from that and recognised Bawn as a dispersed rural community with one-off rural housing. The 2013 Plan did not propose to zone any land in Bawn and that

it would allow for organic development in the village. There are no plans to construct social housing either.

On the proposal of Cllr Carthy, seconded by Cllr Keelan it was agreed that Monaghan County Council write to Minister Phil Hogan highlighting the fact that An Taisce has made a submission relating to the Draft Monaghan County Development Plan based on false facts and that we ask the Minister to review the special status afforded to An Taisce in the planning process.

The Manager's recommendations were agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.8 Access onto National Roads

15. National Roads Authority – pg 48

96. CS Pringle – pg 327

Cllr Bannigan stated that he was alarmed at the submission from the National Roads Authority recommending a 'blanket policy' regarding access onto national routes. The NRA submission suggested the consideration of the following policy in respect of Objectives NR07 and RP09 "Prohibit the creation of any new access to the national road network or the intensification of existing accesses to national roads in areas outside where a reduced speed limit applies in the interest of road safety and in accordance with the provisions of DECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012)." He confirmed that he would not be able to support such a policy.

Cllr Bannigan proposed, Cllr Murray seconded, that this Council retain the exemptions currently in place for access and intensification of access onto our National Roads NRP1, NRP2, NRP3, NRP4 and that they be retained in the Draft Development Plan 2013-2019.

Cllr McNally stated that much thought is needed if the Council are to consider expanding the list of reasons as to who gets access onto national routes. He stated that it was unfortunate that the NRA felt the necessity to make such a submission. The Council has been very considerate when dealing with planning permissions on national routes and only in very exceptional cases has it allowed development. If the Council were to reject the NRA blanket policy and on the other hand extend the considerations for extenuating circumstances for granting permission then we would be sending out the wrong signal. He referred to the inconsistency by the NRA in relation to signs on the M1 (Costa Coffee/Burger King). He asked who in the NRA is devising signage policy and who is enforcing it and why the other counties are getting away with not enforcing signage policy.

Cllr Connolly supported the proposal of Cllr Bannigan. He said that there is always a demand for housing in rural areas. A recent IFA survey had identified that 48% of farmers under 50 have not identified a successor. If we don't encourage people to build on their farms it is not encouraging people to carry on working on farms.

Cllrs Connolly, Crowe, Gallagher, Keelan, Murray, B. McKenna and McNally supported the proposal by Cllr Bannigan.

Cllr Gallagher raised the query of how big an issue this is. How many applications granted e.g. in the past 12 months were affected?

Mr. Hughes confirmed that there were approximately 2 applications per year (20 in 10 years). The Planning & Development Act requires that the Plan must be consistent with any guidelines issued by the Minister - this proposal is not consistent with the guidelines. Mr. Hughes stated that he is required to advise the members of this.

The Manager then read an excerpt from the Spatial Planning and National Roads – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2012, as follows: ***“Proper planning is central to ensuring road safety: The creation of new accesses to and intensification of existing accesses to national roads gives rise to the generation of additional turning movements that introduce additional safety risks to road users. Therefore, from a road safety perspective, planning authorities, the NRA, road authorities and the Road Safety Authority must guard against a proliferation of roadside developments accessing national roads to which speed limits greater than 50-60 kmh apply as part of the overall effort to reduce road fatalities and injuries.”***

Cllr Bannigan stated that all national routes in Monaghan are well protected.

The Mayor put Cllr Bannigan’s proposal to the meeting and it was agreed unanimously.

Cllr Bannigan proposed, Cllr Carville / Cllr Crowe seconded ‘that marriage breakdown be considered as compelling special domestic or personal circumstances under Policy NRP3’.

Cllr Bannigan stated that he was not proposing the consideration of circumstances of marriage breakdown as an additional exception, but rather its incorporation under the existing policy of special compelling personal or domestic circumstances.

Mr. Hughes stated that this proposal is inconsistent with guidelines.

The Manager stated that any law based on an exception is a bad law.

A vote by show of hands on Cllr Bannigan’s proposal resulted in 5 for; 8 against; 5 abstentions. The Mayor declared the proposal defeated.

Item 3.9 Comments from Adjoining Planning Authorities

- 43. Louth County Council – pg 117
- 91. Meath County Council – pg 310

The Manager’s recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.10 Public Rights of Way

- 46. Keep Ireland Open – pg 130

Cllr Crowe requested that cognisance is taken of Minister Jan O’Sullivan’s letter regarding public rights of way. (Cllr Crowe stated he did not have a copy of the letter to hand).

Cllr McPhillips mentioned the possibility of carrying out an audit on Rights of Way in order to make people aware of their locations.

Mr. Gourley confirmed that the Development Plan includes a map and list of public rights of way.

Mr. Clifford confirmed a notice is published every Christmas in the paper to preserve private rights of way along the Monaghan way. There is a formal process in place to declare a public right of way.

Cllrs B. McKenna and Coyle stated that it would be hugely expensive for this Council to conduct a survey to ascertain where all the public rights of way are located. Unless there is funding available it may not happen.

The Acting County Manager confirmed that such a list, if compiled, would come before the elected members as a variation to the County Development Plan.

Cllr McNally stated that there has been no outcry for this to happen (map all public rights of way) – it would be of more interest to tourism groups.

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.11 National Bodies

- 48. Health Service Executive – pg 144
- 49. DAA – pg 147
- 70. An Taisce – pg 208
- 76. IPCC – pg 228
- 84. EPA – pg 269
- 85. IWEA – pg 289

The Manager's recommendations were agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

- 88. EirGrid – pg 297

Cllr Bannigan disagreed with the issue of EirGrid seeking to remove two aspects from the Development Plan regarding environmental impact. Cllr Bannigan commended the Manager's report. He referred to the statement by EirGrid that their application is still in the planning process (North/South Interconnector) which is not the case. EirGrid had submitted an application but have since withdrawn it.

On the proposal of Cllr Bannigan seconded by Cllr Keelan it was agreed that we write to Eirgrid to inform them that they had withdrawn their planning application for the North/South Interconnector from An Bord Pleanala. That any future planning application will be treated as a new application and must adhere to the recently published Government Policy Statement.

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the EirGrid submission.

Item 3.12 Cross Border Bodies

- 56. Irish Central Border Area Network – pg 160

The Manager's recommendation was agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submission.

Cllr P. Treanor mentioned that ICBAN provide functions other than those stated. The Council had received a presentation earlier this year on a Cross Border Development Zone and had given a commitment towards exploring this matter further.

Cllr Crowe welcomed funding of €17.5m received for the proposed Narrow Water Bridge between Warrenpoint and Omeath which was possible only through cooperation from all bodies involved.

Item 3.13 Ribbon Development

- 65. Gordon McKenna – pg 199
- 96. CS Pringle – pg 327

The Manager's recommendations were agreed by the members in relation to the foregoing submissions.

Item 3.14 Legal Agreements for Visibility Splays

- 67. Irish Farmers Association – pg 204

Cllr Bannigan referred to the fact that we are one of only three counties in the country requiring legal agreements for visibility splays to be registered as a burden on the title deed - rules and regulations in one county having a different interpretation in another county – should be national policy/guidelines. Lands and Deeds are a very emotive issue – in Monaghan agreement (re: visibility splays) has to be mentioned as a burden of the Deed.

Cllr Bannigan proposed and Cllr Connolly seconded that in relation to visibility splays where a sight distance requirement is outside the ownership of the applicant then a legal agreement with the third party will be required in order to grant planning. There will not be a requirement to register the agreement as a burden on the Deeds.

Cllr Connolly agreed with Cllr Bannigan and stated that Monaghan County Council are looking for something that's above and beyond what's required nationally.

Cllr McKenna mentioned that this issue has been raised in meetings with the IFA, (with all parties), and he comes to a different conclusion than the other speakers. Cllr McKenna stated that there are people who cannot get planning as a result of this (visibility splays). The issue arises down the line if a couple separate and the house is put up for sale, where planning permission doesn't comply with a legal agreement the house cannot be sold. Cllr McKenna stated that in the interest of the broad majority of people who have got planning permission under these conditions, it should be maintained.

Cllr Carthy stated that while he is in favour of Cllr Bannigan's proposal he is also in agreement with Cllr McKenna. He wants people to be in a position to build in their own area and to come and go from their house in a safe and secure manner. He stated that some people may use this agreement as an excuse to avoid signing something (legal agreement). He asked if there are issues in other counties where a house cannot be sold because of this issue.

Cllr Crowe is opposed to a burden on anybody's property and thus supports Cllr Bannigan's proposal.

Cllr Murray mentioned the possibility of another option – that the Council introduce by-laws that would stop people impeding another person's sight distance which has already been achieved as part of a planning application.

Cllr McPhillips disagreed with Cllr Bannigan's proposal and commended the Planners for operating best practice at present. Cllr McPhillips agreed with Cllr Murray in that there must be another solution. She asked what powers the Council has regarding asking someone to trim their hedges?

Cllr Keelan stated that most people would not have difficulty giving written consent but going down the route of a burden on the Deed makes life difficult for young couples starting out.

Cllr McNally agreed that the status quo should remain. It is difficult for Council Engineers to go out and deal with these applications. Many letters have been given down the years which are not being adhered to now. Regarding the existing policy, Cllr McNally stated that for 20% that fail, 80% of planning applications are successful.

Cllr B. McKenna stated that the current procedure is in favour of people making a planning application, not against them. He asked how enforceable is the trimming of hedges along public roads – under the Roads Act.

The Manager confirmed that if a visibility splay is not needed, we are not concerned with it. Nothing that obscures the line of vision can encroach on visibility splay.

Cllr Maxwell stated that a legal agreement is still required regardless of whether there is a hedge, telegraph pole, etc.

Cllr O'Hanlon asked if the ESB can be required to move a telegraph pole if it affects the visibility splay.

The Mayor responded that this is correct.

Cllr Murray asked if the applicant owns the field does this still apply.

Mr Clifford confirmed that the requirement is a protection for the owner if he hopes to sell.

Mr Hughes, in response to Cllr Carthy's query, (issues in other counties where houses cannot be sold because of no legal agreement), stated that he has spoken with Planners in other counties who confirm that this is a major problem for them.

Cllr Carthy then asked for evidence of this.

The Manager stated that this policy relates to Co. Monaghan.

Mr Hughes stated that primarily this issue is about road safety, not re-sale of houses.

Cllr Gallagher agreed with Cllr McKenna, if we are serious about this issue we must continue with what we are doing. Unfortunately there is no other legal way of doing it, (except through burden of deed). Other local authorities may follow suit.

Cllr McKenna stated that we want to do the right thing. We don't need to ask the question why other counties don't do it. Until someone tells us there is a better way of doing it we must continue with it.

Cllr O'Hanlon stated that the main issue is road safety. It is incumbent on Roads Section that they take a survey regarding hedges, telegraph poles, issues relating to safety, and bring this to the attention of the Council members.

Cllr Coyle stated that all members are working with people locally and we must act in the best interest of the people regarding this. He complimented the work of the IFA for all their work. The best advice we can give people is what Monaghan County Council is currently doing. When ESB poles are erected, do they consult with Roads Section? We need to take more responsibility to ensure landowners cut their hedges.

The Manager stated that statutory bodies (ESB) do consult with local authorities but in accordance with the Telegraphy Act permits them to erect poles where required.

In response to the queries raised by the members Mr Hughes stated that this is not an issue which arises every day, it is a fairly irregular occurrence, for something that doesn't occur regularly it should not be changed.

The Mayor put Cllr Bannigan's proposal to the meeting. A recorded vote was taken which resulted as follows:

For: Cllrs Bannigan, Carthy, Carville, Connolly, Crowe, McElvaney, Murray. **Total 7**

Against: Cllrs Conlon, Coyle, Gallagher, B. McKenna, McNally, McPhillips, O'Brien, O'Hanlon and P. Treanor. **Total 9**

Abstention: Cllr Keelan. **Total 1**

The Mayor declared Cllr Bannigan's proposal defeated.

Cllr O'Hanlon proposed, Cllr Gallagher seconded, that a survey be taken by Monaghan County Council in relation to all roads – by-roads coming out on to other roads, that there is no issue with site distance in relation to ditches, telegraph poles, ESB poles.

The Mayor replied that Members should take any issue to the Planners / Engineers. If these are not dealt with, then bring the matter to the Council meeting.

The Manager stated that Roads Area Staff will assist with this.

Cllr B. McKenna proposed an amendment to Cllr O'Hanlon's motion –

“That Cllr O'Hanlon's proposal be costed and brought to a Roads Area Meeting where the members can agreed to proceed/not proceed with the survey.”Cllr Connolly seconded the amendment.

A vote by show of hands on the amendment resulted in 15 for. The Mayor declared the amendment adopted.

The meeting then concluded – the balance of the agenda to be dealt with at an adjourned Meeting scheduled for Monday 19th November 10.00am – 1.00pm, with the Corporate Policy Group meeting being moved to 2.00pm on that date.