MEMBERS PRESENT:	Baker, Bree, Casserly, Clarke, Gormley, Healy, Henry, Keaney, Kilgannon, Maguire, MacManus, MacSharry, Mulvey, O'Boyle, O'Grady, Queenan and Taylor.
CATHAOIRLEACH:	Cathaoirleach, Cllr. H. Keaney, presided.
APOLOGIES:	Apologies were received from Cllr. Lundy
OFFICIALS IN ATTENDANCE:	<ul> <li>Mr. Ciarán Hayes, Chief Executive</li> <li>Ms. Dorothy Clarke, Director of Services</li> <li>Mr. Frank Moylan, Senior Planner</li> <li>Ms. Mihaela Davidescu, A/Senior Executive Planner</li> <li>Mr. Stephen Ward, A/Senior Executive Planner</li> <li>Ms. Leonora McConville, Executive Planner</li> <li>Mr. Noel Ballantyne, A/Executive Technician</li> <li>Mr. Kevin Colreavy, Meetings Administrator</li> <li>Ms. Terri Dunleavy, Clerical Officer</li> <li>Ms. Jo-Anne McGonigle, Asst. Staff Officer</li> </ul>
INTRODUCTION TO SECOND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023:	<ul> <li>The Cathaoirleach advised the Members that it was his intention to deal with the submissions in the following sequence:</li> <li>Volume 1 – Responses to submissions on Volume 1 of the Draft County Development Plan,</li> <li>Volume 2 – Responses to submissions on the draft Mini Plans and</li> <li>Volume 3 – Responses to submissions relating to the Record of Protected Structures.</li> <li>In reply to queries from Members, the Cathaoirleach said it was his intention to deal with matters in sequence. However, Members would also have the opportunity to return to matters at a later stage during the Meeting if they so wished.</li> <li>Due to the amount of work involved, Cllr. Keaney indicated that it was necessary to decide whether to work on and continue this meeting until it was finished or resume at a later date, possibly Wednesday 30th March.</li> <li>It was proposed by Cllr. R. O'Grady</li> <li>Seconded by Cllr. T. MacSharry</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"That this Meeting will continue today until the necessary matters have been dealt with".</li> </ul>

### INTRODUCTION TO SECOND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023:

The Chief Executive confirmed that 176 submissions had been received by the end of November 2016 with 49 of those submissions relating to the Record of Protected Structures. Each of the submissions has to be considered. There had been a number of material changes that had been recommended to the Members for their consideration. These would arise as the discussions continued through each Section. The Members could then make further material changes. All material changes made would then have to go out to public consultation for a further period. Having regard to the role of the Elected Members, the Executive and staff would facilitate this with advice and guidance through the process. The Chief Executive said he was also conscious of the role of Dáil Éireann to exercise their remit through Government policy and legislation. This may be a cause for conflict but the staff's role was to advise the Members.

The Chief Executive indicated that the issue of fracking would be dealt with when that stage was reached in the draft Plan; there has been a relaxation of restrictions on rural housing due to a Case taken at E.U. level. The suggested relaxation in relation to rural housing, however, is subject to the requirement for proper Planning and Development. Issues will arise from access on to national and scenic routes, etc.

A further issue highlighted by the Chief Executive that the Members should be conscious of was the submission made by Sligo County Council in recent days in relation to the National Planning Framework. For that submission to be taken seriously, the Council needs to be consistent. These issues would also be highlighted for the Members as they arose.

Mr. Frank Moylan, Senior Planner, outlined to the Meeting the stages the Plan had been through to date;

- The draft County Development Plan had been on public display for a period of ten weeks to the 30th November, 2016.
- ➤ 176 submissions had been received:
- 56 submissions related to Volume 1 Draft C.D.P.
- 71 submissions related to Vol. 2 (Mini Plans)
- 49 submissions related to Vol. 3 (Record of Protected Structures)
- 2 submissions had been received early and
- 4 submissions had been received late.

The submissions received outside the ten week period had also been addressed in the Report. However, the Members were not obliged to consider those submissions.

The second Chief Executive's Report gives the response to each one of the submissions as to whether it should be modified or not.

INTRODUCTION TO SECOND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023:	Responses in Volume 1 would be dealt with by Ms. Davidescu, those in Volume to by Mr. Ward and Volume 3 by Ms. McConville. The Chief Executive had recommended a number of amendments. There were recommendations relating to errors and matters that needed to be updated. The decision whether to propose amendments to the draft Plan is a function reserved for the Members. Amendments must then go on public display for a minimum of four weeks. All submissions received will be summarised in the third Chief Executive's Report. Members will then finalise and adopt the County Development Plan. There would be a further period of public consultation after the present Meeting if amendments were made to the Draft Plan.
SECOND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023 VOLUME 1 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS ON VOLUME ONE OF THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:	<ul> <li>The Second Chief Executive's Report summarised the submissions by breaking them into issues. The Chief Executive offered an opinion and a recommendation on each issue of each submission. The recommendation was either to keep the Draft Plan unchanged or to make a change to the Draft Plan. Where a change was recommended, the additional text or the text to be deleted was included in the recommendation.</li> <li>It was agreed that the Members consider the Chief Executive's recommendations on each issue of each submission.</li> <li>On the following pages of these Minutes: <ul> <li>where the Members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendation to keep the Draft Plan unchanged, this is marked as "No change".</li> <li>where the Members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendation to change the Draft Plan, this is marked as "Agreed".</li> <li>where the Members rejected the Chief Executive's recommendation for either change or no change, a vote was taken on the respective issue. This is marked as "Proposed by Seconded by" Seconded by" Seconded by" and followed by the outcome, i.e. "AGREED" + the text or modification that was agreed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>where any of the Members put forward a motion for a change to the Draft Plan, a vote was taken on the respective issue. This is marked as "Proposed by Cllr" and followed by the outcome, either "AGREED" + the text or modification that was agreed, or "Lost".</li> </ul>
	Regional Assembly) requesting that the ban on fracking would be removed. In considering this matter, the Chief Executive instanced this as an issue

SECOND CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS RELATING TO THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2017-2023 VOLUME 1 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS ON VOLUME ONE OF THE DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN:	<ul> <li>where conflicts between requirements of national and local Government can arise. The removal from the Draft was not because of the submission by Mr. David Minton on behalf of the N.W.R.A. but that the Department had submitted that it is premature. However, Members could reject the recommendation that had been put before them to remove the ban on fracking and, by doing so, it would simply stay in the Plan.</li> <li>It was proposed by Cllr. D. Bree Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"That the ban on fracking – Section 11.1.10 Unconventional gas exploration and extraction (UGEE) be retained in the Draft Plan".</li> <li>Cllr. Queenan raised a query regarding the proposed 3% levy on vacant sites in the county and this was clarified by Ms. Davidescu as relating to sites specifically designated as regeneration sites. This levy can also be appealed through an independent entity. However, no village in Sligo has been designated for regeneration.</li> <li>In reply to Cllr. MacManus, where he sought clarification regarding the inclusion of lands in the Cranmore Regeneration area, Mr. Moylan confirmed that he would revert to the Members on this matter.</li> </ul>
VOLUME 1 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS	<b>Submission 52</b> – Mr. Niall Cussen, Principal Adviser, Forward Planning Section (Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government).
SECTION I – SUBMISSIONS FROM PRESCRIBED BODIES:	Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – Agreed Issue 3 – Agreed Issue 4 – no change
SUBMISSION 52 –	Issue 5 – Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. S. Maguire
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING, PLANNING, COMMUNITY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT:	AND AGREED: "To reject the recommendation in relation to Unconventional gas exploration and extraction (UGEE)". Issue 6 – Agreed
SUBMISSION 86 –	Submission 86 – Mr. David Minton, Director, N.W.R.A.

NORTHERN AND WESTERN REGIONAL ASSEMBLY (N.W.R.A.):	Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – Agreed Issue 4 – Agreed Issue 5 – no change Issue 6 – no change Issue 7 – no change Issue 8 – Agreed Issue 9 – Agreed Issue 10 – Previously dealt with and rejected Issue 11 – no change.
SUBMISSION 13 – TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (T.I.I.):	Submission 13 – Ms. Tara Spain, Head of land use planning Transport Infrastructure Ireland <i>Issue 1a</i> ) - Agreed <i>Issue 1b</i> ) - Agreed <i>Issue 3</i> – no change <i>Issue 5</i> – Agreed
SUBMISSION 13 – TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (T.I.I.) (CONTINUED):	<ul> <li>Issue 6 –</li> <li>A discussion took place regarding this issue with Members raising their concerns. The Chief Executive referred to having regard to National Policy. The Senior Planner confirmed it referred to developments of a strategic nature, e.g. if a major industry sought access on to a National Primary route.</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. S. Maguire Seconded by Cllr. M. Clarke</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"Insert policy to S.8.2.1 National Primary and Secondary roads – Permit direct access to zoned lands along national roads inside the 50 km speed limit subject to normal planning considerations. Within transitional zones access may be permitted but only in limited circumstances where in the interest of facilitating orderly urban development and subject to a road safety audit carried out in accordance with T.1.1. requirements".</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 42 – AN TAISCE:	<b>Submission 42</b> – Mr. Michael Kirby on behalf of An Taisce North West Local Association <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed

SUBMISSION 42 – AN TAISCE (CONTINUED):	<ul> <li>Issue 2 – no change</li> <li>Issue 3 – no change</li> <li>Issue 4 – Agreed</li> <li>Members raised concerns regarding the definition of a derelict house.</li> <li>The Senior Planner advised the Meeting that Derelict Sites legislation defines a derelict building.</li> <li>In reply to further issues raised by the Members, the Chief Executive said that anyone buying a derelict property would be advised to consult with the Planning Authority and to obtain advice from an Engineer or Architect. If people are going to invest and expend money, they should have due diligence.</li> <li>Issue 5 – no change</li> </ul>
	Issue 6 – Agreed Issue 7 – Agreed Issue 8 – no change Issue 9 – Agreed Issue 10 – Agreed Issue 11 – Agreed Issue 12 – Agreed Issue 13 – no change Issue 14 – no change Issue 15 – Agreed
	Members sought clarification as to the types of illumination referred to and details were furnished by the Senior Planner and Chief Executive. The recommendation was then agreed.
	<i>Issue 17</i> – no change <i>Issue 18</i> – <b>Locating a house in the landscape</b> Several Members had concerns in relation to the paragraphs suggested for inclusion in the Plan and put forward different situations they were aware of that this would affect. The Senior Planner and the Acting S.E.P. confirmed that these are not prescriptive and this is for providing guidance to people.
Proposed by Cllr. P. Taylor Seconded by Cllr. M. Gormley	
	AND AGREED
	"That the full paragraph would be dealt with later".

SUBMISSION 42 – AN TAISCE (CONTINUED):	<ul> <li>Issue 19 – Agreed</li> <li>Issue 20 – Entrances to rural house sites</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke</li> <li>Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li><i>"To add the following text to the first paragraph on Issue 20</i> "and this will have priority".</li> <li>The paragraph to now read: "Proposed vehicular access points will be carefully considered by the Planning Authority with a view to minimising the impact of a safe access on the visual appearance and rural characteristics of the area and this will have priority".</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 49 – FÁILTE IRELAND:	Submission 49 – Ms. Yvonne Jackson – Failte Ireland Issue 1- Agreed
SUBMISSION 74 – DEPARTMENT OF ARTS, HERITAGE, REGIONAL, RURAL AND GAELTACHT AFFAIRS:	Submission 74 – Mr. Michael Murphy, Development Applications Unit – Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 2</i> – no change <i>Issue 3</i> – no change <i>Issue 4</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 5</i> – no change <i>Issue 6</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 7</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 78 – EIRGRID:	<b>Submission 78</b> – Ms. Gael Gibson, Principal Planner Planning and Environmental Unit, Grid Development, Eirgrid <i>Issue 1</i> – no change <i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed
SUBMISSION 80 – ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (E.P.A.):	<b>Submission 80</b> – Dr. Tara Higgins, Scientific Officer, S.E.A. Section Office of Environmental Assessment, Environmental Protection Agency <i>Issue 1</i> – no change <i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed

SUBMISSION 80 – ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (E.P.A.) (CONTINUED):	Issue 3 – Agreed Issue 4 – Agreed Issue 5 – no change Issue 6 – Agreed Issue 7 – Agreed Issue 7 – Agreed Issue 9 – no change Issue 10 – no change Issue 11 – no change Issue 12 – no change Issue 13 – no change Issue 14 - Agreed Issue 15 - Agreed Issue 16 – Agreed Issue 17 – no change Issue 18 - Agreed Issue 19 – Agreed Issue 20 – no change.
SUBMISSION 81 – ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARD (E.S.B.):	<b>Submission 81</b> – Mr. Colm Cummins, Planning and Asset Management, E.S.B. Business Service Centre <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
	Issue 2 – Agreed
SUBMISSION 89 – INLAND FISHERIES	<b>Submission 89</b> – Mr. John Conneely (Director) and Ms. Catherine Kerins (Senior Fisheries Environmental Officer) Inland Fisheries Ireland
IRELAND:	Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – no change Issue 4 – no change Issue 5 – Agreed Issue 6 – no change Issue 7 – no change Issue 8 – no change Issue 9 – no change Issue 10 – no change Issue 11 – no change Issue 12 – no change
SUBMISSION 92 – IRISH WATER:	<b>Submission 92</b> – Ms. Suzanne Dempsey, Spatial Planning Strategy Specialist – Irish Water. <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed

SUBMISSION 125 – MAYO COUNTY COUNCIL:	<ul> <li>Submission 125 – Ms. Dette Cunningham, Senior Executive Planner, Forward Planning Section, Mayo County Council.</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed</li> <li><i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed</li> </ul>
VOLUME 1 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS SECTION II –	SUBMISSIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS, COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS AND PRIVATE COMPANIES
SUBMISSION 1 – DAVITT PLAN & DESIGN:	<b>Submission 1</b> – Mr. Francis Davitt, Davitt Plan and Design <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 3 – CARRAROE AND DISTRICT REGENERATION ASSOCIATION:	<ul> <li>Submission 3 – Mr. Pat Benson on behalf of Carraroe and District Regeneration Association.</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 4 – ENGINEERS IRELAND:	<b>Submission 4</b> – Mr. Damien Owens on behalf of Engineers Ireland <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 6 – SLIGO GAOL:	<ul> <li>Submission 6 – Grace Larkin, Tamlyn McHugh, Tamlyn McHugh (Chairperson of Friends of Sligo Gaol), Janet Benson, Steve Devine, Anna Marie Doherty, Dr. Robert Hensey, Iarlaithe O'Tighearnaigh, Nuala Dineen-Campbell, John Dorrian, Pauline Foley, Deirdre Melvin, Niall O'Connor, Eddie O'Gorman, Fintan Whelan, Michael Devine, Deirdre Molloy, Clare Feerick and Frank Reilly.</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> </ul>
SUBMISSIONS 7, 8, 16, 24, 26 AND 51 – COLLOONEY- BELLAGHY RAILWAY LINE:	<ul> <li>Submissions 7, 8, 16, 24, 26 and 51 – John McCarrick, Pat McCarrick (Chairperson of Sligo Greenway Co-Op.), Brendan Quinn (two separate submissions on the same topic), John Mulligan and Jarlath Gantly.</li> <li>A lengthy discussion took place surrounding this topic and the various groups interested in same.</li> </ul>

	Issue 1 – Agreed	
ADJOURNMENT FOR LUNCH:	The Meeting adjourned at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 2.15 p.m. The Cathaoirleach confirmed that Standing Orders were being suspended to allow the work of the Meeting to continue after 5.00 p.m.	
SUBMISSIONS 9 AND 10	Submissions 9 and 10 – Mr. Pat McCarrick, Ballymote and Cloonacool	
MR. PAT MCCARRICK:	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change	
SUBMISSION 11 -	Submission 11 – Mr. Joe Corcoran on behalf of Sligo Tourism	
SLIGO TOURISM:	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change	
SUBMISSION 27 – DAUGHTERS OF WISDOM (CREGG):	<ul> <li>Submission 27 – Ms. Ann Mulcrone, Reid Associates on behalf of the Daughters of Wisdom (Cregg)</li> <li>Ms. M. Davidescu, A/S.E.P. advised Members, following some enquiries, that the Planning Unit had to go to the Land Registration Authority to clarify lands in question as no map had been provided and no concrete proposal had been submitted to date.</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change.</li> </ul>	
SUBMISSION 29 –	Submission 29 – Mr. John Giblin	
MR. JOHN GIBLIN:	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change	
SUBMISSION 35 –	Submission 35 – Ronan and Maureen McCann	
RONAN AND MAUREEN MCCANN:	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change	
SUBMISSION 36 –	<b>Submission 36</b> – Ms. Gail McGibbon on behalf of Sligo Business Improvement District	
SLIGO BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT:	Issue 1 – no change	
SUBMISSION 39 –	Submission 39 – Mr. Martin Timoney	

MARTIN TIMONEY:	Issue $1 - no$ change Issue $2 - no$ change Issue $3 - no$ change Issue $4 - no$ change Issue $5 - no$ change Issue $6 - no$ change Issue $7 - no$ change Issue $8 - no$ change
SUBMISSION 41 – ALDI STORES (IRELAND) LTD.:	Submission 41 – Mr. John Tierney, Associate Director, John Spain Associates on behalf of Aldi Stores (Ireland) Limited. Issue 1 – no change
SUBMISSION 43 – TBP PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS:	Submission 43 – Mr. Tony Bamford, TBP Planning and Development Consultants Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – no change Issue 4 – no change Issue 5 – no change Issue 6 – no change
SUBMISSIONS 59 AND 60 – JOHN O'HARA AND MICHAEL ROWLEY:	<ul> <li>Submissions 59 and 60 – Mr. John O'Hara and Mr. Michael Rowley</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – while no change had been the Chief Executive's recommendation, it was</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan</li> <li>Seconded by Cllrs. M. Gormley and P. Taylor</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"That we support submissions No. 59 and 60 and that the paragraph in question be deleted from the Draft Development Plan".</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 61 – PARENTS AND GUARDIANS OF CREGG SERVICES (PGCS)	<b>Submission 61</b> – Ms. Heather Taylor on behalf of The Parents and Guardians of Cregg Services (PGCS) <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed

SUBMISSION 63 – AUGHAMORE ROWING CLUB:	<b>Submission 63</b> – Mr. Albert Higgins, Chairperson of Aughamore Rowing Club <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 68 – NIALL CLARKE	<b>Submission 68</b> – Ms. Emma Flanagan, Cunnan, Stratton, Reynolds on behalf of Mr. Niall Clarke <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 2</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 73 – BALLYMOTE SUPERVALU:	<ul> <li>Submission 73 – Mr. Simon Davey – Ballymote Supervalu</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> <li>Cllr. Queenan raised a query regarding the Retail Strategy and the 500 sq. m. limit on extensions to retail premises. This was regarded as far too restrictive.</li> <li>The Senior Planner confirmed that any proposals for a new retail development will be required to be accompanied by a retail impact assessment. Mr. Moylan further confirmed that the text referred to is contained within the Retail Strategy and is referring the existing retail policy in the current County Development Plan as opposed to the retail policy incorporated within the Draft Plan.</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 75 – DISABILITY LINKAGE GROUP (SLIGO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION NETWORK):	<ul> <li>Submission 75 – Ms. Claire Galligan on behalf of the Disability Linkage Group (Sligo Public Participation Network).</li> <li>Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – Agreed Issue 4 – no change Issue 5 – Agreed Issue 5 – Agreed Issue 6 – Agreed Issue 7 – no change</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 77 – PEIGIN DOYLE AND OTHERS:	<ul> <li>Submission 77 – Ms. Peigin Doyle and others</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> <li><i>Issue 2</i> – Chief Executive's recommendation was for no change.</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree</li> <li>Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle</li> </ul>

Having received the withdraw their reso	hts of way included in the submission from Peigin re recorded for protection in the draft Development wed with the locations of the routes in question being bers. referred to the new section in the Development Plan s of way are identified. Those included are where there prima facia evidence that the public right of way hould be fully aware of the risks of inserting routes . The advice given was to only insert those rights of and uncontentious. we concurred that it was prudent, at this point, to only e Plan. Following further discussion, he gave an is would be examined in the first six months of the is undertaking, Cllrs. Bree and O'Boyle agreed to olution.	
SUBMISSION 79 -Submission 79 - LENERCO ENERGY LTD.Enerco Energy LimIssue 1 - Agreed	iam Flynn, McCarthy, Keville O'Sullivan on behalf of nited	
SUBMISSION 84 – Submission 84 – C	Submission 84 – Cecily Gilligan	
<b>CECILY GILLIGAN:</b> <i>Issue 1</i> – no change	2	
	Eddie O'Gorman (Chairperson) and Declan Bruen alf of Grange and Armada Development Association	
SUBMISSION 88 –Submission 88 – MMARICE HENRY:Issue 1 – no change		
	As. Stella Burke, Irish Wind Energy Association	

ASSOCIATION:	Issue 2 Agreed
ASSOCIATION:	<i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 3</i> – no change
	Issue 5 – no change
SUBMISSION 89 –	Submission 89 – Mr. Roger Garland on behalf of Keep Ireland Open
KEEP IRELAND OPEN (KIO)	Issue 1 – no change
(1110)	Cllr. Bree said that Mr. Garland should be complimented on his submissions. The Senior Planner agreed that the submissions are very helpful to the Forward Planning Unit. Mr. Garland examines all County Development Plans and makes suggestions which are taken on board at the start of the review process.
SUBMISSION 95 – LIDL IRELAND GMBH	<b>Submission 95</b> – Mr. Fintan Morrin, Associate, The Planning Partnership on behalf of Lidl Ireland GmbH <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
	<i>Issue I –</i> no change
SUBMISSION 99 – MULLAN FAMILY	<b>Submission 99</b> – Colm McLoughlin, McCutcheon Halley Planning Consultants on behalf of the Mullan family
	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 108 – OAKTREE (OWNERS OF SLIGO RETAIL PARK – CARROWROE):	<b>Submission 108</b> – Mr. Trevor Sadler, Director, McGill Planning Ltd. on behalf of Oaktree, owners of the Sligo Retail Park, Carrowroe <i>Issue 1</i> – no change
PARK – CARROWROE):	Issue 1 – no change Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – no change
SUBMISSION 110 -	<b>Submission 110</b> – Mr. Finbarr Filan on behalf of Renua Ireland (Sligo-Leitrim)
RENUA IRELAND (SLIGO-LEITRIM):	Issue 1 – no change
SUBMISSION 112 -	Submission 112 – Mr. Michael Rowley
MICHAEL ROWLEY:	Issue 1 – Principles of vernacular rural house design
	Members expressed their concerns regarding the content of the table referred to under 13.4.3 Rural house design. Following a lengthy discussion where it was outlined that this was intended as a guide for those members of the public wishing to build a house in a vernacular style, it was agreed that Table 13.A would be deleted.

SUBMISSION 112 – MICHAEL ROWLEY (CONTINUED):	Proposed by Cllr. M. Gormley Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor and Cllr. J. Queenan AND AGREED <i>"To remove Table 13A"</i> .
SUBMISSION 113 –	Submission 113 – Mr. Jim Sheridan
JIM SHERIDAN:	Issue 1 – Agreed
SUBMISSION 115 – S.S.E. (RENEWABLES) IRELAND LTD.	<ul> <li>Submission 115 – Ms. Eimear Lenehan, Lead Consent Manager on behalf of S.S.E. (Renewables) Ireland Ltd.</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> <li><i>Issue 2</i> – no change</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 118 –	Submission 118 – Mr. Jarlath Taheny
JARLATH TAHENY	Issue 1 – no change
SUBMISSION 119 – TESCO IRELAND LIMITED	<ul> <li>Submission 119 – Mr. Simon Bradshaw, G.V.A. Planning and Regeneration Ltd. on behalf of Tesco Ireland Limited</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – no change</li> <li><i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed</li> <li><i>Issue 3</i> – no change</li> </ul>
SUBMISSION 121 –	Submission 121 – Mr. John Bailey
JOHN BAILEY:	Issue 1 – no change
SUBMISSION 122 –	<b>Submission 122</b> – Mr. Peter Bowen-Walsh on behalf of West=on=Track
WEST=ON=TRACK:	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change
SUBMISSION 127 – TOBERCURRY SUPERVALU:	<b>Submission 127</b> – Mr. Gearóid Surlis – Tobercurry Supervalu <i>Issue 1</i> – no change

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BEFORE OR	Early submission no. E-1 – Martin Timoney
AFTER THE PUBLIC	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change
CONSULTATION PERIOD:	<b>Late submission no. L-1</b> - <i>Inspector Padraic Burke</i> , Acting Superintendent – Ballymote Garda District Office
	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change <i>Issue 2</i> – no change <i>Issue 3</i> – no change
	<b>Late submission no. L-2</b> – Anne Marie Finnerty on behalf of Skreen and Dromard Community Council
	Issue 1 – no change
SECTION III –	Chapter 5 – Housing
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S	CESR 5-1 – Agreed
SUPPLEMENTARY	CESR 5-2 – Agreed
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	CESR 5-3 – Agreed
	Chapter 6 – Community facilities
	CESR 6-1 – Agreed
	CESR 6-2 – Agreed
	CESR 6-3 – Agreed
	Chapter 7 – Heritage
	CESR 7-1- Agreed
	CESR 7-2 – Agreed
	CESR 7-3 – Agreed
	Chapter 8 – Transport and mobility
	CESR 8-1 – Agreed
	CESR 8-2 – Agreed
	Chapter 10 – Environmental quality
	CESR 10-1 – Agreed
	CESR 10-2 – Agreed
	CESR 10-3 – Agreed
	CESR 10-4 – Agreed
	CESR 10-5 – Agreed CESR 10-6 – Agreed
	CEST IV-V - Agreed

SECTION III -	CESR 10-7 – Agreed
	CESR 10-8 – Agreed
<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S</b>	CESR 10-9 – Agreed
SUPPLEMENTARY	CESR 10-10 - Agreed
RECOMMENDATIONS	
(CONTINUED):	Chapter 13 – Development standards
	Chapter 15 – Development standards
	CESR 13-1 – Agreed
	CESR 13-2 – Agreed
	CLSR 15-2 - Agreed
	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
	CESR – SFRA-1 – Agreed
<b>RESOLUTIONS:</b>	At this stage of the Meeting, the Cathaoirleach indicated that he would
	deal with the resolutions which had been presented to him during the
	course of the previous discussions.
	Proposed by Cllr. S. Maguire
	Seconded by Cllr. M. Clarke
	AND AGREED
	"Insert policy to S.8.2.1 National Primary and Secondary roads – Permit direct access to zoned lands along national roads inside the 50 km speed limit subject to normal planning considerations. Within transitional zones access may be permitted but only in limited circumstances where in the interest of facilitating orderly urban development and subject to a road safety audit carried out in accordance with T.I.I. requirements".
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke
	Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor
	AND AGREED
	"To add the following tout to the first surgery 1 and 1 and 20 " and 1 i
	"To add the following text to the first paragraph on Issue 20 "and this will have priority"
	will have priority".
	The paragraph to now read: "Proposed vehicular access points will be
	carefully considered by the Planning Authority with a view to minimising
	the impact of a safe access on the visual appearance and rural
	characteristics of the area and this will have priority".
	characteristics of the area and this will have priority.
	Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan
	Seconded by Cllrs. M. Gormley and P. Taylor

	AND AGREED
	"That we support submissions No. 59 and 60 and that the paragraph in question be deleted from the Draft Development Plan".
	The Senior Planner sought clarification that, rather than amend it, the entire paragraph on page 84 was to be deleted and this was agreed.
	Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle
	"That the three rights of way included in the submission from Peigin Doyle and others be recorded for protection in the draft Development Plan".
	Cllrs. Bree and O'Boyle confirmed that they wished to withdraw this resolution .
SUBMISSION 118 – JARLATH TAHENY	It was noted that Cllr. Healy had an interest in this submission and would address this matter at a later stage in the Meeting.
REMOVAL OF TABLE 13A	Proposed by Cllr. M. Gormley Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor and Cllr. J. Queenan
	AND AGREED
	"To remove Table 13A".
ADJOURNMENT:	The Meeting was adjourned by the Cathaoirleach at 5.00 p.m. and it resumed at 5.20 p.m.
INSERTION IN SP-Z-4	Proposed by Cllr. H. Keaney Seconded by Cllrs. S. Maguire, S. Kilgannon, T. MacSharry and R. O'Grady
	AND AGREED
	"To insert the following in SP-Z-4
	Housing on residentially zones lands adjacent to existing residential developments within Sligo environs plan area where the land is serviced with adequate capacity. Student accommodation".

GREEN BELTS – REVIEW OF ENNISCRONE LOCAL AREA PLAN:	In reply to an enquiry from Cllr. J. Queenan, the Senior Planner said he had given an assurance to the Councillor that, when reviewing the Enniscrone Local Area Plan, the extent of the green belts would be examined. In the preparation of the draft mini-plans, a similar exercise had been carried out and the majority of green belts had been reduced in size.
VOLUME 2 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT MINI PLANS:	Mr. S. Ward, A/S.E.P. advised the Meeting that 71 submissions had been received.
SECTION I –	BALLINACARROW MINI PLAN
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE BALLYMOTE- TOBERCURRY MUNICIPAL DISTRICT:	Submission 14 – Frank Keane on behalf of Margaret Keane <i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed <i>Issue 2</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	CURRY MINI PLAN
	Submission 33 – Raymond Lenehan
	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	EASKY MINI PLAN
	Submission 18 – David Rolston on behalf of Patrick and Joe Rolston
	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllrs. J. Queenan and D. Mulvey
	"To zone 'A' as residential use and re-zone 'B' as green belt, as marked in the Easkey zoning map". – <b>Agreed</b>
	GORTEEN MINI PLAN

SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE	Submission 70 – Tommy Conlon Issue 1 – Agreed
BALLYMOTE- TOBERCURRY	Submission 87 – Madeline O'Dowd
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT:	Issue 1 – Recommendation was for no change
	Proposed by Cllr. P. Taylor Seconded by Cllrs. M. Gormley and K. Henry
	AND AGREED
	<i>"To zone the lands referred to in submission 87 to Community facilities in Gurteen Mini Plan".</i>
	Submission 124 – Gerard Wilson
	Issue 1 – No change
	RIVERSTOWN MINI PLAN
	<b>Submission 30</b> – Joe Carty (Vincent Hannon, Architects, on behalf of Tony Gormley
	Issue 1 – no change
SECTION II –	BALLINCAR MINI PLAN
SUBMISSIONS	Submission 25 – Adrian Tansey
RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT:	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	Submission 28 – George Draper
	Issue 1 – no change
	Submissions 34, 47, 48, 55, 98 and 101 – Residents of Ballincar
	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission were agreed.
	<b>Submission 37</b> – D. A. Harte and Associates on behalf of P. Rattigan, B. Mullen, T. Porter and M. Horan
	Issue 1 – Agreed

SECTION II –	The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO	<b>Submission 102</b> – Enda Duignan (Future Analytics Consulting Ltd.) on behalf of Joan O'Beirne
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT (CONTINUED):	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change recommended.
	Proposed by Cllr. S. Kilgannon Seconded by Cllrs. R. O'Grady and T. MacSharry
	<i>"Submission no. 102 – That this site at Ballincar, Co. Sligo be included within the Development Plan".</i>
	This motion was withdrawn and no change agreed.
	BALLINTOGHER MINI PLAN
	<b>Submission 96</b> – Seamus McCormack on behalf of Ballintogher Tidy Towns
	Issue 1 – Agreed Issue 2 – no change Issue 3 – Agreed
	The Chief Executive's recommendations A, B and C in relation to this submission were agreed.
	<b>Submission 120 -</b> Seamus McCormack on behalf of Ballintogher Tidy Towns
	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change <i>Issue 2</i> – no change
	BALLYGAWLEY MINI PLAN
	Submission 65 – Mary Callaghan
	Issue 1 – no change
	Submission 103 – Sean O'Brien
	Issue 1 - No change
	Submission 120 – Kieran Carol on behalf of Ballygawley Tidy Towns
	Issue 1 – No change

	Issue 2 – No change
SECTION II –	Issue 3 – No change
SUBMISSIONS	Issue 4 – No change
RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED	BALLYSADARE MINI PLAN
WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	Submission 5 – Anthony McGarry
(CONTINUED):	Issue 1 – No change
	<b>Submission 46</b> – Patrick Barrett (Duggan Barrett Consulting Engineers Ltd.) on behalf of DMG Promotions Ltd.
	Issue 1 – No change
	Submission 62 – Peter Bowen-Walsh
	Issue 1 – No change
	<b>Submission 64</b> - Patrick Barrett (Duggan Barrett Consulting Engineers Ltd.) on behalf of Eillis Barrett
	Issue 1 – No change
	Submission 82 – Sinead Gallagher on behalf of Ballysadare Tidy Towns
	Issue 1 - No change
	<i>Issue 2</i> – No change
	<i>Issue 3</i> – No change
	Issue $4 - No$ change
	Issue 5 – Agreed
	The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	Submission 97 – Joe Carty (Vincent Hannon Architects) on behalf of Hugh McGarry
	Issue 1 – No change
	Submission 104 - Joe Carty (Vincent Hannon Architects) on behalf of Cathal O'Connor
	Issue 1 – No change recommended - see resolution agreed hereunder Issue 2 – No change
	Submission 105 – Declan O'Connor
	Issue 1 – No change Issue 2 – No change recommended - see resolution agreed hereunder

SECTION II –	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. S. Maguire
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT (CONTINUED):	"I propose to zone 104 and 105 as purposes of mixed use".
	Vote on submissions 104 and 105 resulted as follows:
	FOR: Cllrs. Baker, Casserly, Clarke, Gormley, Henry, Kilgannon, Maguire, MacSharry, Mulvey, Queenan and Taylor (11)
	AGAINST: Cllrs. Bree, Healy, Keaney, MacManus and O'Boyle (5)
	ABSTAINED: Cllr. O'Grady (1)
	The resolution was deemed to have been carried.
	Submission 106 – Declan O'Connor
	<i>Issue 1</i> – no change recommended.
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey
	AND AGREED
	"Submission 106 – Declan O'Connor Regarding the Ballisodare Mini Plan, we propose to zone map marked 'A' as residential use and to re-zone map marked 'B' as open spaces".
	<b>Submission 116</b> – Peter Kinghan (SLR Consulting Ireland) on behalf of Harrington Concrete
	<i>Issue 1 – Agreed</i> The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission were agreed.
	<b>Submission 120</b> – Sinead Gallagher (on behalf of Ballysadare Tidy Towns)
	Issue 1 - Agreed
	CARNEY MINI PLAN
	Submission 94 – Haran Associates on behalf of Jim Kerrigan
	<i>Issue 1 – Agreed</i> The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.

SECTION II –	CLIFFONY MINI PLAN
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI	Submission 20 – Liam McHugh
RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<i>Issue 1 - Agreed</i> The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
(CONTINUED):	Submission 40 – Martin and Mary Timoney
	Issue 1 - Agreed
	<b>Submission 107</b> – Haran and Associates on behalf of Mary O'Donnell Gambrell
	Issue 1 – Agreed
	Submission 109 – Haran and Associates on behalf of Martin Oates
	Issue 1 - Agreed
	COLLOONEY MINI PLAN
	Submission 45 – Eamon Barrett
	<i>Issue 1 – Agreed</i> <i>Issue 2 - Agreed</i> The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission were agreed.
	Submission 69 – Kathy Clark on behalf of Collooney Village Redevelopment Ltd.
	Issue 1 –Agreed Issue 2 – No change Issue 3 – No change Issue 4 – No change Issue 5 – No change Issue 6 – Agreed Issue 7 – No change Issue 8 – No change Issue 9 – No change A discussion between S. Ward and Cllr. T. Healy in relation to carparking. No specific Issue number noted but "Agreed" at end of discussion.
	The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this

SECTION II –	submission were agreed.
SUBMISSIONS	Submission 120 – Daniel Gallagher on behalf of Collooney Tidy Towns
RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	Issue 1 – No change Issue 2 - No change
(CONTINUED):	DRUMCLIFF MINI PLAN
	Submission 44 – Jill Barber
	Issue 1 – No change
	<b>Submission 50</b> – Jarlath Gantly on behalf of Drumcliff Development Association
	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	<b>Submission 83 -</b> Jarlath Gantly on behalf of Drumcliff Development Association
	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	Submission 114 – Joan Swift on behalf of Sligo Cycling Campaign
	Issue 1 – Dealt with previously under Submission no. 50.
	GRANGE MINI PLAN
	Submission 22 – Patrick Gilmartin
	<i>Issue 1</i> – No change
	Submission 53 – Martin Gilroy
	<i>Issue 1</i> – No change recommended – see resolution agreed hereunder.
	Submission 54 – Ronan Gilroy
	Issue 1 – No change
	Submission 71 – Michael Connolly

SECTION II – SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT (CONTINUED):	<ul> <li>Issue 1 – No change recommended – see resolution agreed hereunder.</li> <li>Submissions 53 and 71 –</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. S. Kilgannon</li> <li>Seconded by Cllrs. R. O'Grady, M. Casserly and H. Keaney</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"Submission 71 and 53 – that the land at these areas be zone for Tourism related uses".</li> <li>Submission 76 – Haran and Associates on behalf of John Joe Donlon</li> </ul>
	Issue 1 - Agreed
	MULLAGHMORE MINI PLAN
	Submission 21 – Liam McHugh
	Issue 1 - No change
	Submission 23 – Ross Gallagher and Niamh McHugh
	Issue 1 – No change
	Submission 39 – Martin Timoney
	Issue 1 – Agreed
	RATHCORMAC MINI PLAN
	<b>Submission 100</b> – Jimmy Collins and Jimmy Mulvey on behalf of Rathcormac Sewerage Scheme Committee
	<i>Issue 1 – Agreed</i> The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	ROSSES POINT MINI PLAN
	Submission 12 – John Robinson
	<i>Issue 1 -</i> Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was agreed.
	Submission 58 – Colm McLoughlin, McCutcheon Halley Planning

	Consultants on behalf of Eileen Carty
SECTION II –	
	Issue 1 – Agreed
SUBMISSIONS	The Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission was
RELATING TO MINI	agreed.
PLANS LOCATED	
WITHIN THE SLIGO	Submission 111 – John Monahan on behalf of Rosses Point
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	Development Association
(CONTINUED):	
	Issue 1 – Agreed
	Issue 2 - Agreed
	Issue 3 - Agreed
	Issue 4 – Agreed
	Issue 5 – Agreed
	Issue 6 – Agreed
	Issue 7 – Agreed
	Issue 8 - Agreed
	Issue 9 – Agreed
	Issue 10 – Agreed
	Issue 11 – Agreed
	Issue 12 – Agreed
	The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this
	submission were agreed.
	STRANDHILL MINI PLAN
	Prior to considering individual submissions, there was a lengthy discussion on the contents of the Strandhill mini-plan focusing on the extent of land zoned for residential development. Stephen Ward indicated that the population in Sligo has remained stagnant while Strandhill has grown significantly. There is a danger that there will be no growth in Sligo for the next 10 to 15 years, whereas growth will continue to occur in villages like Strandhill, Grange and Collooney. If the Council allow this to occur, it would conflict with contents of our National Planning Framework submission. The Chief Executive said that we can't be seen to change the Development plan to dilute the primary message of our NPF submission that Sligo should be the growth centre for the north- west region.

Cllr. R. O'Grady suggested that there were people sitting on land banks in Strandhill. A site on the top road had over 80 families turned away. In Rosses Point numbers have gone down at the National School. We can't go down the same road as Rosses Point. People want to live in Strandhill and this should be encouraged. Councillors have a duty of care to the people they represent.

Cllr. T. MacSharry indicated that all the Councillors had been approached about land in Strandhill. People want to come to live there and the price goes up.

SECTION II – SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT (CONTINUED):	Stephen Ward replied there is planning permission for 120 houses at the moment. That is sufficient land to accommodate development in Strandhill over the duration of the plan. The growth rate in recent times is not sustainable. There is an onus on the Council to respect the views of people living there already who have expressed concerns about the overdevelopment of the village.
	village should be respected. She referred to the existing infrastructural deficiencies including the long awaited upgrade to the wastewater plant.
	The CE stated that if we want to be taken seriously at National level we can't dilute the message outlined in the National Planning Framework submission.
	Submission 2 – Patrick Scanlon
	Issue 1 – Agreed Issue 2 - Agreed Issue 3 - Agreed
	Submission 15 – Virginia and Pat Curran
	Issue 1 – No change Agreed
	<b>Submission 17</b> – Michael and Mary McGoldrick on behalf of James McGoldrick
	Issue 1 – No change Agreed
	<b>Submission 19</b> – Anne Ruane (Principal) on behalf of Board of Management of Scoil Asicus Naofa
	Issue 1 – No change Agreed
	<b>Submission 31</b> – Sean McCarthy (McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan) behalf of Brendan Gerard Henry
	Issue 1 – No change Agreed
	<b>Submission 32</b> - Sean McCarthy (McCarthy Keville O'Sullivan) behalf of Kilcawley Construction Ltd.

SECTION II –	Issue 1 – No change to recommendation Agreed
SUBMISSIONS	<b>Submission 38</b> – Colm McLoughlin (McCuthcheon Halley) on behalf of RPS Construction Builders Ltd.
RELATING TO MINI PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT (CONTINUED):	F. Moylan stated that there is sufficient land zoned in Strandhill to accommodate the planned growth rate set out the Core Stategy. He strongly recommended that large tracts of land as proposed to be rezoned in this submission should remain in strategic reserve. There is a need for the Council to show that they are being consistent in their decision- making particularly with regard to the recently agreed submission to the National Planning Framework. He also indicated that to zone this extent of land would not be consistent with previous decisions on other submissions. S. Ward said that it is a 5 hectare site that has the potential to yield in excess of 100 houses. The school is already at capacity, there would be additional cars around an already congested area, and it would add to urban sprawl. There would be concern for over development of area. Cllr S. Maguire said that it would completely detract from quality of living there. F. Moylan said that the addition of that extent of development would completely undermine the National Framework submission.
	The meeting stopped at 8.40pm to reconvene in 10 minutes to further consider issues relating to Strandhill.
	The meeting re-convened at 8.55pm
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. After assurances that this issue will be looked at again in two years during the statutory review on the progress achieved in securing the objectives of the County Plan. F. Moylan, Senior Planner said that if there is evidence to show that landowners are sitting on residentially zoned land in 2 years we will consider releasing other lands from the strategic reserve to replace those lands that are not being developed. The Chief Executive said if it is still the case that zoned lands are not been used in 2 years we will bring it back to this chamber.
	Issue 1 – No change Issue 2 - No change
	Submission 56 – Tony McCaul
	Issue 1 – Agreed
	Submission 57 – James McGoldrick Issue 1 – Agreed

SECTION II –	Submission 66 – Robin Hurley
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO MINI	<i>Issue 1 – no change to recommendation Agreed</i>
PLANS LOCATED WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<b>Submission 67</b> – Jim Sheridan Architectural Services on behalf of Ciaran Carty
(CONTINUED):	<i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed The Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission were agreed.
	Submission 72 – DAT Property Development Ltd
	Issue 1 – Agreed
SUBMISSION NO. 77:	Submission 77 – Peigin Doyle and others
	Issue 1 – Agreed Issue 2 - Agreed Issue 3 - Agreed Issue 4 – Agreed Issue 5 – Agreed Issue 6 – Agreed Issue 7 – Agreed Issue 8 - Agreed
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission.
	Submission 93 – Adrian Kenny
	Issue 1 – Agreed Issue 2 - Agreed
	<b>Submission 117</b> – David McCoy & Mick McEnroe on behalf of Strandhill Development Association
	Issue 1 – Agreed Issue 2 - Agreed Issue 3 - Agreed Issue 4 – Agreed Issue 5 – Agreed Issue 6 – Agreed
	The Members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendation in relation to this submission.

	<ul> <li>Submission 123 – Robbie Henneberry on behalf of Strandhill Golf Club</li> <li><i>Issue 1</i> – Agreed</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations A and B in relation to this submission.</li> <li>Submission 126 – Michael Connolly</li> <li><i>Issue 1 – No change</i> Agreed.</li> </ul>
SECTION III CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S	Chapter 18 – Riverstown Mini-Plan
EXECUTIVE S SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS	CESR 18-1 Agreed
(CESR) REGARDING MODIFICATIONS TO VOLUME 2 MINI-	<b>Chapter 19</b> – Tourlestraun Mini-Plan
PLANS	CESR 19–1 Agreed
	CESR 19-2 Agreed
	Chapter 29 – Mullaghmore Mini-Plan
	CESR 29-1 Agreed
	CESR 29-2 Agreed
	Corrections to Volume 2
	The members agreed with the Corrections a, b, c & d to Volume 2.
	Volume 2 Finished.

VOLUME 3 –	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.1:</b>
<b>RESPONSES TO</b>	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
SUBMISSIONS	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 90 – Thatched
RELATING TO THE	cottage, Cabragh (Tireragh Barony), Easkey.
	conage, Cabragh (Theragh Darony), Laskey.
RECORD OF	
PROTECTED	
<b>STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):</b>	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.4:</b>
	Issue No. 1
SUBMISSIONS	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
RELATING TO	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 275 & 341.
STRUCTURES WITHIN	Ŭ
THE BALLYMOTE-	Issue No. 2
TOBERCURRY	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 292.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.5:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 71.
	6
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.11:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 139 – Roslea
	Cottage, Easkey, Co. Sligo
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.12:</b>
	Dermott McDermott
	CDP RPS No. 214 – Church View, Gorteen
	CDI M 5 No. 214 Charlen View, Goneen
	Igna 1 no shanga had been recommended
	<b>Issue 1</b> – no change had been recommended
	Deven and her Ciller IV. Harris
	Proposed by Cllr. K. Henry
	Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor
	AND AGREED
	"To remove RPS 214 Church View, Gurteen from list of protected
	structures (Submission no. 12)."
	Cllr. D. Bree abstained from this resolution.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 14:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to the CDP R.P.S. no. 354 – St.
	Joseph's (Rockfield) Church RC.

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	<ul> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 16: The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the CDP R.P.S. no. 281 – Aclare Pharmacy, Aclare.</li> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 17:</li> </ul>
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE BALLYMOTE- TOBERCURRY MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. To delete this structure CDP RPS 277 – Lisconny House Servants Quarter from the R.P.S.
	<b>RPS Submission no. 18:</b> Patrick Kilcullen CDP RPS no. 112 – Single-storey cottage, Main Street, Enniscrone
	Issue 1 – no change had been recommended
	Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey
	AND AGREED
	"To exclude the following structure from RPS RPS no. 112 Submission 18."
	Cllr. D. Bree abstained from this resolution.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.19:</b> Paul Williams
	CDP RPS no. 105 – Former Carrowcrory National School
	<b>Issue 1</b> – no change had been recommended
	Proposed by Cllr. K. Henry Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor
	AND AGREED
	"To remove RPS 105 Carrowcrory National School from list of protected structures (Submission 19)."
	Proposed by Cllr. C. MacManus Seconded by Cllr. T. Healy
	AND AGREED
	"To remove CDP RPS no. 105 from the list of protected structures (RPS

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):

SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE BALLYMOTE-TOBERCURRY MUNICIPAL DISTRICT Submission no. 19) as this building is of no significant historical interest".

## **RPS SUBMISSION NO.20:**

*Rita Flannery* Proposed protected structure P-24 Springmount, Tubbercurry

Issue 1 – no change had been recommended

### Proposed by Cllr. M. Gormley Seconded by Cllr. M. Clarke

## AND AGREED

"Recognising that property at Springmount, Tubbercurry is no longer of significant importance, I propose that the structure P-24 be deleted from the list of Protected Structures".

### **RPS SUBMISSION NO. 23:**

The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for Proposed protected structure P-21- Former Easkey Barracks.

## **RPS SUBMISSION NO. 24:**

The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the CDP R.P.S. no. 209 – Limestone farm building, Easkey

## **RPS SUBMISSION NO.25:**

Michael Conmy, Plan Design Associates on behalf of Desmond Clarke

Proposed protected structure P-22 - St. Mary's Church, Enniscrone

Issue 1 – no change had been recommended

Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey

## AND AGREED

*"To exclude the following structure from RPS P22 – St. Mary's Church, Main Street, Enniscrone".* 

Cllrs. D. Bree and S. Maguire abstained from this resolution.

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	RPS SUBMISSION NO.27: John Doddy-CDP RPS no. 53 – Doddy's shop and house Issue 1 – no change had been recommended Proposed by Cllr. K. Henry Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE BALLYMOTE- TOBERCURRY MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<ul> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>To remove RPS no. 53 Doddy's Shop and House, Ballymote from list of protected structures (Submission 27) Page 14".</li> <li>Cllr. Bree abstained from this resolution.</li> </ul>
	RPS SUBMISSION NO.29: Roger Maye-CDP RPS no. 391 - House Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey AND AGREED "To exclude the following structure from RPS RPS no. 391 Enniscrone Submission page 14".
	<ul> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 30</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 142 St. Mary's Church, Dromore West.</li> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 32</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the CDP RPS no. 62 – Bunnanaddan Mill</li> </ul>
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 33:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for P28 – Old Emlaghfad Church, Ballymote.

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.): SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE BALLYMOTE- TOBERCURRY MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<ul> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO.37: David McMunn on behalf of William McMunn Proposed protected structure P-23 South Lodge, Enniscrone</li> <li>Issue 1 – no change had been recommended</li> <li>Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey</li> <li>AND AGREED</li> <li>"To exclude the following house from RPS Record of Protected Structure Submission 37 P-23 The South Lodge, Enniscrone".</li> </ul>
	RPS SUBMISSION NO.39: Michael Conmy (PlanDesign Associates) on behalf of Reverend Noel Regan CDP RPS no. 213 – Thatched cottage, Ballintrillick Issue 1 – no change had been recommended Proposed by Cllr. S. Kilgannon Seconded by Cllr. T.MacSharry
	<b>AND AGREED</b> <i>"RPS Submission no. 39 that this thatched cottage at Ballintrillick be removed from the list of Protected Structures".</i>
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Casserly Seconded by Cllr. M. Clarke AND AGREED
	"Protected Structure at Gorteen, Ballintrillick – 213 To delist that structure at Gorteen, Ballintrillick, Co. Sligo". Proposed by Cllr. M. Baker
	AND AGREED
	"To remove RPS 213 – Thatched cottage Ballintrillick from Record of Protected Structures (Submission 39)."
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.44:</b> Dermot Freeman-CDP RPS no. 328 – Thatched cottage, Parke Td.,

	Enniscrone
VOLUME 3 –	
<b>RESPONSES TO</b>	<b>Issue 1</b> – no change had been recommended
SUBMISSIONS	
<b>RELATING TO THE</b>	Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan
<b>RECORD OF</b>	Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey
PROTECTED	
STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	AND AGREED
	"To exclude the outbuildings from RPS Record of Protected Structures – Submission 44 RPS no. 328 Parke, Enniscrone".
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 47:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 2 – Achonry Parochial Hall.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 2</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission.
	A. Amend the entry for CDP RPS no. 137 – Clogherevagh House and
	Gate Lodge
	B. Add Holywell Gate Lodge to the RPS.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 3</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 357 – Blackrock Lighthouse
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 6</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to SEDP RPS no. 270 – 16 Wolfe
	Tone Street, Sligo.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.7:</b>
	Michael Mullaney-SEDP RPS no. 162 – 1 Teeling Street, Sligo
	<b>Issue 1</b> – no change had been recommended
	Proposed by Cllr. T. MacSharry Seconded by Cllr. R. O'Grady
	AND AGREED
	"Re. RPS 162 submission No. 7

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS	Propose that the facade only of this building at 1 Teeling Street, Sligo be included on the RPS for the county".
<b>RELATING TO THE</b>	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.8:</b>
<b>RECORD OF</b>	Tamlyn McHugh (building on the corner of Lower Quay Street)
PROTECTED	
STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	<b>Issue 1</b> – no change had been recommended
SUBMISSIONS	Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree Seconded by Cllr. M. Casserly
<b>RELATING TO</b>	
STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO	"That the building (Submission no. 8) be included in the Record of Protected Structures".
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	A vote resulted as follows:
	<b>FOR:</b> Cllrs. Baker, Bree, Casserly, Healy, Keaney, MacManus and O'Grady (7)
	<b>AGAINST:</b> Cllrs. Clarke, Henry, Kilgannon, Mulvey, O'Grady, Queenan and Taylor (7)
	As the vote result was 7 for and 7 against, the Cathaoirleach used his casting vote as "for" and the resolution was deemed to have been <b>carried</b> .
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 9:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to SEDP RPS no. 87 – House, John Street, Sligo.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 10:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for Proposed protected structures P-2 and P-3 – Wine Street, Sligo
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 13:</b>
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in
	relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for Proposed protected structures P-9 – Farmhouse, Lower Rosses Point.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 15:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	<ul> <li>relation to this submission. No change to SEDP RPS no. 113 – Wehrly Brothers, O'Connell Street, Sligo.</li> <li><b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 21:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 364 – Streedagh House Gate Lodge.</li> </ul>
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<ul> <li>RPS SUBMISSION NO.22: The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue no. 1 of this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 283 Lissadell House.</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue no. 2 of this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 283 Lissadell House.</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue no. 3 of this submission. No change to CDP RPS no. 283 Lissadell House.</li> <li>The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue no. 3 of this submission.</li> <li>A. Amend CDP RPS no. 283 by deleting the NIAH registration number B. Add a new item to the RPS: Former saw mill 1870-1910, NIAH Reg. No. 32400804</li> </ul>
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 26:</b> Chris and Lynne Jermyn         SEPD RPS No. 294 – Rathbraughan House         Issue 1 – no change recommended.         The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.28:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for Proposed protected structures P-9 – Farmhouse, Lower Rosses Point
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 31:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. Retain CDP RPS no. 336 on the RPS and amend entry by replacing house to two cottages.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.34:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS	relation to this submission from An Taisce but made a commitment to look at buildings identified the next time.
RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.35:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to SEDP RPS no. 118
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.36:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to the Proposed additions and deletions document for Proposed protected structures P-4 – 39 High Street, Sligo.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.38:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. No change to SEDP RPS no. 174 and 175 – Temple Street, Sligo.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.40:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue 1 of this submission. No change to CDP RPS. The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue no. 2 of this submission.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.42:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.43:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission. It was agreed to re-issue Notices in respect of no. 12 and no. 14 Wolfe Tone Street to both Louis and Sheila Doherty.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.45:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to issue this submission.
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.46:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	RPS SUBMISSION NO.48: John Monahan, Rosses Point Development Association Issue 1 – no change had been recommended Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle
SUBMISSIONS	AND AGREED
RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	"That the Pilot House (along coastal walk, south of Jackson's Pier) as referred to in the submission received from the Rosses Point Development Association be included in the Record of Protected Structures".
	Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle
	AND AGREED
	"That the Pilot House (North of Co. Sligo Golf Club House) as referred to in the submission received from the Rosses Point Development Association be included in the Record of Protected Structures".
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO.49:</b> The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.
	EARLY RPS SUBMISSION NO.E-1
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.
	LATE RPS SUBMISSION NO. L-1
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.
	LATE RPS SUBMISSION NO. L-2
	The members agreed with the Chief Executive's recommendations in relation to this submission.

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS	Proposed by Cllr. M. Baker Seconded by Cllr. R. O'Grady
<b>RELATING TO THE</b>	AND AGREED
RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	<i>"To remove RPS 229 building on Wine Street from Record of Protected Structures".</i>
CUDMICCIONC	A vote resulted as follows:
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO	<b>FOR:</b> Cllrs. Baker, Clarke, Gormley, Henry, Kilgannon, Mulvey, O'Grady, Queenan and Taylor (9)
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	AGAINST: Cllrs. Bree, Healy, Keaney, MacManus and O'Boyle (5).
	ABSTAINED: Cllr. Casserly (1)
	Proposed protected structure P-25 Glenburne House
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey
	"To exclude the following house P-25 – Glenburne House – from RPS".
	A vote resulted as follows:
	<b>FOR:</b> Cllrs. Baker, Casserly, Clarke, Gormley, Henry, Kilgannon, Mulvey, O'Grady, Queenan and Taylor (10)
	AGAINST: Cllrs. Bree, Healy, Keaney, MacManus and O'Boyle (5)
	The motion was deemed to be <b>carried.</b>
	Proposed protected structure P-26 Ballymeeny Armstrong
	Proposed by Cllr. M. Clarke Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey
	<i>"To exclude the following houses from the RPS – Ballymeeny Armstrong P-26".</i>
	A vote resulted as follows:
	<b>FOR:</b> Cllrs. Baker, Casserly, Clarke, Gormley, Henry, Keaney, Kilgannon, MacManus, Mulvey, O'Grady, Queenan and Taylor (12)

VOLUME 3 – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO THE RECORD OF PROTECTED STRUCTURES (R.P.S.):	AGAINST: Cllrs. Healy and O'Boyle (2) ABSTAINED: Cllr. D. Bree (1) The motion was deemed to be <b>carried.</b>
SUBMISSIONS RELATING TO STRUCTURES WITHIN THE SLIGO MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	Proposed by Cllr. M. Gormley Seconded by Cllr. P. Taylor "Noting that Kesh Church No. 206 is not included in the NIAH. This Council resolves to remove it from the Record of Protected Structures". A vote resulted as follows:
	<ul> <li>FOR: Cllrs. Baker, Casserly, Clarke, Gormley, Henry, Kilgannon, Mulvey, Queenan and Taylor (9)</li> <li>AGAINST: Cllrs. Healy, Keaney, O'Boyle and O'Grady (4)</li> <li>ABSTAINED: Cllrs. Bree and MacManus (2)</li> <li>The resolution was deemed to have been carried.</li> </ul>
	RPS SUBMISSION NO 11 WAS DISCUSSED AGAIN: Proposed by Councillor M. Clarke, Seconded by Councillor J. Queenan AND AGREED "That this house is excluded from the protected structures CDP RPS No 139 Roslea Cottage Easkey" The members agreed to delete CDP RPS no. 139 – Roslea Cottage, Easkey, Co. Sligo.
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BEFORE OR AFTER THE PUBLIC	RPS SUBMISSION NO. 29 WAS DISCUSSED AGAIN RPS Submission no. 29 – Roger Maye CDP RPS no. 391 - House Proposed by Cllr. J. Queenan Seconded by Cllr. D. Mulvey AND AGREED "To exclude the following structure from RPS RPS no. 391 Enniscrone

	E CHAMBER, COUNT I HALL, RIVERSIDE, SEIGO	
CONSULTATION PERIOD	Submission page 14".	
PERIOD		
	<b>RPS SUBMISSION NO. 26 WAS DISCUSSED AGAIN:</b>	
	Submission 26 – Chris and Lynne Jermyn	
	SEPD RPS No. 294 – Rathbraughan House	
	Proposed by Cllr. D. Bree	
	Seconded by Cllr. G. O'Boyle	
	AND AGREED	
	<i>"That Rathbraughan House (RPS 294) be removed from the Record of Protected Structures".</i>	
ADDITIONAL MOTIONS		
	Landscape Characterisation Map	
3 MOTIONS RELATING TO	Scenic Routes	
LANDSCAPE	To delete the following routes from being a scenic route, 46. Coast Road	1
CHARACTERISATION MAP	from R-297 at Dromore West to N59 at Beltra (L-2302 – L2204) and 48, Deer Road L-6215 from junction with Beltra-Dromore West coastal road	
	L-2204 to sea shore as marked on map attached.	L
	Proposed by Michael Clarks	
	Proposed by: Michael Clarke Seconded by: Dara Mulvey Lost	
	A vote resulted as follows:	
	FOR: Cllrs. Baker, Clarke, Gormley, Kilgannon, Mulvey, Queenan and	
	Taylor (7)	
	<b>AGAINST:</b> Cllrs. Bree , Healy, Henry, Keaney, MacManus , O'Boyle and O'Grady (7)	
	As the vote result was 7 for and 7 against, the Cathaoirleach used his casting vote as "against" and the resolution was deemed to have been <b>lost</b> .	
	That the new proposed scenic routes in the Sligo County Council development not be included in this plan.	
	Proposed by: Seamus KilgannonSeconded by: Michael ClarkeLost	
	A vote resulted as follows:	
h	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

	<ul> <li>FOR: Cllrs. Baker, Clarke, Gormley, Kilgannon, Queenar (6)</li> <li>AGAINST: Cllrs. Bree, Healy, Keaney, MacManus, O'Bo O'Grady (6)</li> <li>ABSTAINED: Cllrs. Henry, Mulvey (2)</li> <li>As the vote result was 6 for and 6 against, the Cathaoirleact casting vote as "against" and the resolution was deemed to lost.</li> <li>That the following scenic route road be deleted from the lat characterisation map as part o the CDP 2017-23 L6804, Kr</li> </ul>	byle and h used his have been ndscape
	Proposed by: Dara Mulvey Seconded by: Michael Clarke	Withdrawn
	Proposed by Cllr. R. O'Grady Seconded by Cllr. S. Kilgannon AND AGREED "Having considered the Draft Sligo County Developme 2023 and the Second Chief Executive's Report on su observations under the Planning and Development amended), and taking account of the proper planning a development of the area, the statutory obligations of the and any relevant policies or objectives for the time Government or of any Minister of the Government, it is he amend the Draft Plan in accordance with the Second Ch Report, subject to the further amendments proposed and Special Meeting of Sligo County Council held on 27 March It is further considered that the proposed amendments, if n material alteration of the Draft Plan and it is hereb accordance with the Planning & Development Act 2000 that the proposed amendments be put on public display j not less than 4 weeks."	bmissions and Act 2000 (as nd sustainable local authority being of the reby agreed to ief Executive's adopted at the 2017. made, will be a py resolved in (as amended),
CONCLUSION OF MEETING:	The meeting concluded at11.40 p.m.	

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Meetings Administrator

Date:
-------

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

· - - - -Cathaoirleach