

COMHAIRLE CHONTAE UÍBH FHAILÍ

**MINUTES OF DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT MEETING
OF OFFALY COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD ON MONDAY 24TH MAY 2021 AT 10.00AM**

PRESENT:	Cllr. J. Carroll, Cathaoirleach, Cllrs. C. Claffey (R), J. Clendennen (R), N. Cribbin (R), E. Dooley (R), N. Feighery (R), E. Fitzpatrick (R), J. Foley (R), M. Hackett (R), D. Harvey (R), J. Leahy (R), T. McCormack (R), R. McDermott (R), F. Moran (R), S. O'Brien (R), P. Ormond (R), D. Owens (R), L. Quinn (R) and K. Smollen (R)
IN ATTENDANCE:	Ms. A. Delaney, Chief Executive (R); Mr. T. Shanahan, D.O.S. (R); Ms. S. Kennedy, D.O.S. (R); Mr. S. Duclot (R); Mr. M. Connolly, H.O.F. (R); Ms. A. Dillon S.E.O. (R); Mr. E. Fennell, S.E.O.; Mr. G. Bruton, A/ Meetings Administrator (R); Mr. C. Kelly, S.O.(R); Mr. A. Murray, SP, Ms. L. Mitchell, S.E.P., Mr. J. Condron, E.P., Mr. D. Meehan, P, Mr. J. Egan, A.P. and Ms. L. Carbery, C.O. (R)
PERCUNIARY STATEMENT	<p>Mr. E. Fennell, S.E.O brought the members attention to Section 148.2 of the Planning and Development Act 2000. He advised the members where, at a meeting of a planning authority or of any committee of a planning authority, a resolution, motion, question or other matter is proposed or otherwise arises either pursuant to, or as regards the performance by the authority of a function under this Act or in relation to the acquisition or disposal by the authority of land under or for the purposes of this Act or any other enactment, a member of the authority or committee present at the meeting shall, if he or she has a pecuniary or other beneficial interest in, or which is material to, the matter—</p> <p>(a) at the meeting, and before discussion or consideration of the matter commences, disclose the nature of his or her interest, and</p> <p>(b) withdraw from the meeting for so long as the matter is being discussed or considered,</p> <p>and accordingly, he or she shall take no part in the discussion or consideration of the matter and shall refrain from voting in relation to it.</p>
DRAFT COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN CHIEF EXECUTIVES REPORT	Mr. S. Duclot D.O.S. advised the members that the County Development Plan is a guide for the future growth of the county, providing a strategy framework for development for the next 6 years. He noted that the draft plan was available for public consultation from 27/07/20 to 07/10/2020 and 196 submissions had been received. He informed the members that the Chief Executive's report summarises the issues and responses including recommendations for amendments. He advised the

	<p>draft plan will be amended subject to further public consultation and a further Chief Executive report will then issue and will then be presented to the members for adoption in September 2021. He thanked the members for their input and highlighted that the plan must be in line with Section 11 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, noting that members are restricted by the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area and any relevant policies or objectives for the time being of the Government.</p> <p>Cllrs. P. Ormond, N. Feighery and J. Leahy requested to be excused from the Bord na Móna discussion due to potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>Cllrs. F. Moran and D. Harvey noted they wished to be removed from the Motion previously submitted in relation to Leamonaghan.</p> <p>Mr. G. Bruton brought the members attention to the Ethics and Lobbying Act 2015 in relation to the development and zoning of land, noting that members should advise any lobbyist to register.</p>
<p>CLIMATE ACTION AND ENERGY</p>	<p>J Condrón, E.P. advised the members that the Chief Executive proposes to amend Table 3.1 Decarbonisation Actions and Projects in the Draft Plan to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify specific projects that support decarbonisation aims that may be able to avail of Climate Action Funding; • include an action to develop a Decarbonisation Zone within the county and to develop implementation plan showing how greenhouse emissions can be reduced in the zone. <p>On the proposal of Cllr. J. Leahy, seconded by Cllr. Hackett the members agreed to this amendment.</p> <p>Submission CDP/D/166 Rhode Green Energy Park In response to the detailed submission received from RPS Consultants, who were commissioned by the Council in 2020 to prepare an ‘Opportunity Assessment Report’ for the Rhode Green Energy Park (GEP), outlining the strategic opportunities at a regional and national scale for the GEP, the Chief Executive proposes to include an extended section on the GEP along with specific objectives to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and promote the development of Rhode Green Energy Park for Green Energy, smart specialisation, clustering as well as other complementary green uses such as Green Enterprise, Food Processing, Manufacturing, Logistics, Engineering and Research and Development (listed in Draft Plan) ‘Uses not considered appropriate for the Rhode Green Energy Park’ (listed in

Draft Plan) will not be encouraged in the Rhode Green Energy Park.

- Ensure proposed developments adhere to Guiding Principles for the GEP; (1) Integration (2) Shared Approach – Wastewater, SUDS, offices/meeting room (3) Design Approach/Coherence (4) Community Integration – Recreation, Connections and Green Infrastructure (5) Sustainable Design Approach (6) Technology/WiFi zone and (7) Future Expansion/Phased Growth.
- Support and facilitate the infrastructural upgrades and works in conjunction with the development of the Rhode Business Park.
- Prepare a Design Statement, Green Infrastructure Masterplan and Energy Efficiency and Climate Change Adaptation Design Statement for the Rhode GEP.

On the proposal of Cllr. L. Quinn, seconded by Cllr. M. Hackett the members agreed to this amendment.

Submission CPD/D/149 Peatland Rehabilitation - the Chief Executive proposes to include the following policy in Chapter 3 Climate Action and Energy; ‘It is Council policy to proactively encourage the Bord na Móna Peatlands Rehabilitation Scheme ... to deliver on potential amenity and tourism benefits for example complimenting the delivery of the Midlands Cycling Destination – Offaly, where routes pass through the rehabilitated bogs, subject to environmental, biodiversity and hydrological requirements’.

On the proposal of Cllr. E. Dooley, seconded by Cllr. P. Ormond the members agreed to this inclusion.

Submission CDP/D/149 Wilderness Corridors - the Chief Executive proposes to include the following objective; ‘It is an objective of the Council to work with stakeholders such as Bord na Móna, Coillte, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Waterways Ireland and Just Transition related groups to examine the feasibility of developing a Wilderness Corridor on rehabilitated peatlands linked to routes identified in Figure 6.14 ‘Midlands Cycling Destination, Offaly Network Map at;

- i. Cavemount, Esker, Ballycon, Derrycricket, Clonsast North, Clonsast and Derryounce Bogs in East Offaly; and
- ii. Blackwater, Ballaghurt and Belmont Bogs in West Offaly, from Clonmacnoise in the direction of Belmont village in West Offaly’.

On the proposal of Cllr. E. Dooley, seconded by Cllr. J. Leahy the members agreed to this inclusion.

Motion no. EMD26 - On the proposal of Cllr. E. Dooley, seconded by Cllr. D. Owens the members adopted the motion to replace Policy CAEP-21 with below:

“Offaly County Council recognises the significant economic and social impact of the cessation of peat harvesting in parts of County Offaly and the added impact of the closure of associated power stations in some areas. The Council also recognises that it is imperative that these impacts be mitigated to the greatest extent possible. The re-casting of the economic role of those areas most affected is a crucial element of this mitigation and it is the Council policy to lead a collaborative approach between all relevant organisations and the affected communities to implement appropriate responses.

In that context, it is Council policy to support the application of the ‘Just Transition’ concept in the affected areas and in particular to ensure that National Programmes and the EU Programme for Coal Regions in Transition are leveraged to the maximum possible extent to support the regeneration of those communities in County Offaly which have been dependent on the peat industry and the electrical power generation industry using fossil fuels for over eight decades. In pursuing the implementation of this policy, the Council will seek to ensure that the national and European funding streams focus on those areas of activity which are likely to be most affected in mitigating the negative impacts referred to.

These focuses will include but will not necessarily be limited to:

- The provision of funding to support projects which will contribute to the social and economic resilience of those towns, villages and rural areas of County Offaly which have suffered loss of employment due to the cessation of peat harvesting, the knock-on impacts on associated industries such as briquette manufacture and horticulture and the cessation of peat as a fuel for power stations.
- Delivery of the ‘Midlands Cycling Destination – Offaly’ which is essentially a c.300 km network of cycling and walking paths overlain on rehabilitated peatlands, waterways and other primarily publicly owned lands, with key links to adjoining counties and National and Regional Greenways.
- Appropriate re-use of some (where identified within an overall strategic framework) former industrial peatlands and associated infrastructure/works sites with a focus on sustainable employment generation, community resilience, tourism facilities and amenities.
- Provision of technical support to affected communities in the form of project management, community planning, community resource activation and similar to enable them to play a full partnership role in their regeneration.

In considering which projects and/or programmes to prioritise, the Council will have regard, amongst other matters, to the level of the impact of the closures involved on a particular settlement or community and will give priority, all things being equal, to

	<p>those projects or programmes which will benefit those communities most affected.”</p>
<p>AREA SOUTH OF CLOGHAN AND THE BIRR ENVIRONS – WIND ENERGY POTENTIAL AREA 7</p>	<p>Submission CDP/D/156 RWE Renewables Ireland Ltd Mr. J. Condrón, brought the members attention to the Section 28 Wind Energy Guidelines 2006 and the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines which do not make provision for exclusion zones around Radio Observatories and broadcast communication, and accordingly it is not considered appropriate to include an exclusion zone around the I-LOFAR station for wind energy developments as a specific policy or objective in the Plan.</p> <p>He advised the members it is proposed to remove reference to I-LOFAR as a constraint in Wind Potential Area 7 in Table 3: Assessment of Wind Energy Potential Areas in the CWES in the Draft Plan by removing the following sentence from this section relating to the ‘Area generally south of Cloghan and Birr Environs’ and its constraints; ‘the internationally important Irish Low Frequency array (I-LOFAR) in Birr Castle which is particularly sensitive to wind turbines in its vicinity due to the Doppler effect which masks the radar signal and produces backscatter’.</p> <p>He further advised the members it is proposed also to amend DMS-109 to require planning applications for wind farms to detail the; “Impact of the development on radio observatories and broadcast communication in the area” in addition to a provision stating that “Where impacts are predicted to arise as a result of the development proposed, suitably detailed mitigation measures shall be proposed.”</p> <p>On the proposal of Cllr. J. Leahy, seconded by Cllr. T. McCormack the members agreed to the amendments.</p> <p>Submission CDP/D/159 The I-Lofar Consortium Mr. J. Condrón informed the members of the CE recommendation that it is not appropriate to provide for an exclusion zone as neither the existing Wind Energy Guidelines or the Draft Guidelines provides for such a provision. Rather it is considered appropriate to add in a requirement in DMS 109 Wind Farms and DMS 110 Solar Farms requiring developer to take account of the potential impact of the proposed development on Radio Observatories and broadcast communication and to include proposed mitigation measures in this regard.</p> <p>Section 7 of CE Report Mr. J. Condrón brought the members attention to the Miscellaneous Change (s) on pages 585-586 of the CE report which proposed to make the following amendment to Wind Potential 7 ‘Area generally south of Cloghan and Birr Environs’ in the County Wind Energy Strategy in the Draft Plan:</p>

“There are a number of constraints in this area relating the proximity of the following Special Protection Areas;

- The Dovegrove Callows Special Protection Area (SPA), a feeding site for an internationally important flock of Greenland White-fronted Goose, a species that is listed on Annex I of the E.U. Birds Directive;
- The River Little Brosna Callows (SPA) of special conservation interest for the following species: Whooper Swan, Greenland White-fronted Goose, Wigeon, Teal, Pintail, Shoveler, Golden Plover, Lapwing, BlackTailed Godwit and Black-Headed Gull. The site is also of special conservation interest for holding an assemblage of over 20,000 wintering waterbirds; and
- All Saints Bog SPA, 3.5 km from the site, as it was known to be utilised in the past by part of an internationally important population of Greenland White-fronted Goose (It should be noted that NPWS site synopsis states that the last record of Greenland White-fronted Goose within the site was 75 individuals in 1993/94). Merlin has been seen on the bog during the breeding season and may breed there.”

On the proposal of Cllr. M. Hackett, seconded by Cllr. J. Leahy the members agreed to the amendment.

Mr. J. Condrón also brought the members attention to the Miscellaneous Change (r) on pages 583-585 of the CE report which proposed to change a significant proportion of the “Area South of Cloghan” from “Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development” to “Not Deemed Suitable for Wind Energy Development” in Map No. 10 of the County Wind Energy Strategy. As it was noted that areas which formed part of the Lough Boora AHA and were in the vicinity of Protected View V12 from the Draft Plan, were erroneously not excluded as originally intended, the Chief Executive proposes its omission from the “Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development” in the Draft Plan.

On the proposal of Cllr. E. Dooley, seconded by Cllr. J. Clendennen, the members agreed to the Miscellaneous Change (r)

Motion EMD03

On the proposal of Cllr. J. Carroll, seconded by Cllr. P. Ormond the members agreed that should there not be any change to remove the area of land adjoining the site (as recommended by CE in Misc. Change (r) of CE Report) from the “Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development” area then the site outlined at Derrinlough should be included in the “Area Open for

	<p>Consideration for Wind Energy Development” in the County Wind Energy Strategy in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>As Misc, Change (r) was agreed by the members, this motion as withdrawn. Mr. A, Murray, S.P. advised the members that since 2008 and the first draft wind energy strategy there were two single Wind development areas, one in East and West. Adding isolated areas detached from the main area would be a major change of our direction from last number of years.</p> <p>Motion EMD28</p> <p>On the proposal of Cllr. J. Carroll, seconded by Cllr. P. Ormond having regard to the proposed developers having expressed an interest in providing for community enhancement including ownership of a turbine and the preparation of a report by consultants that nearby SPAs would not be impacted, the members agreed subject to assurance that no interference be caused to the I-LOfar project in Birr, to include lands in the townlands of Galross and Cush townlands as referenced in Submission CDP/D/183 as an “Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development” in the County Wind Energy Strategy in the Draft Plan.</p>
<p>LEAMONAGHAN BOG</p>	<p>Motions EMD13 and EMD20</p> <p>It was noted that no submissions were received on Lemanaghan bog.</p> <p>Cllr. K. Smollen, seconded by Cllr. S. O’Brien brought motion EMD13:</p> <p>“We propose that Lemanaghan Bog be removed from Area 5 and excluded as an area open to consideration for Wind Energy Development. Lemanaghan Bog has never been specifically mentioned anywhere in the County Wind Energy Strategy Draft 2021-27 or in the previous County Wind Energy Strategy 2014-2020. As the County Development Plan has gone through two rounds of consultations, and because Lemanaghan Bog was not mentioned in the text of the document, local residents were denied the opportunity to make submissions to Offaly County Council. Lemanaghan is a place of natural beauty and is extremely rich in heritage for over 1,400 years. It is a sacred place of great antiquity and its has a long tradition of devotional practice. It is listed as a ‘Special Area of Conservation’ on the map of European and National Designated Sites in County Offaly.”</p> <p>In addition, it was noted that Cllr Noel Cribbins motion, EMD20 stated that; “I am receiving many emails over Lemanaghan Bog which many residents are concerned over its inclusion in an area considered ok for windfarms and from what I read it’s hard to argue with their points of view.”</p>

	<p>Cllr. J. Leahy and Cllr. N. Feighery excused themselves from the discussion.</p> <p>Cllr. K. Smollen highlighted the importance of protecting this historical area, and should not consider large developments. He stated it is their responsibility to conserve the Slieve Mor pilgrim path for future generations. Cllr. S. O’Brien noted the historic value with its early monastic site, proximity to holy well and medieval trackway and the potential for tourism.</p> <p>Cllr. F. Moran sought clarity on the sites previous classification in the County Development Plan.</p> <p>Mr. J. Condrón noted that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lemanaghan Bog area was included in the ‘Wind Energy Development Area’ in the Wind Strategy from both the 2009-15 and 2014-20 County Development Plans; • Lemanaghan Bog is not a European Designated site (Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area) nor is it a Natural Heritage Area or proposed Natural Heritage Area. • The area shown in the Wind Strategy in the Draft Plan remains the same; • It can be observed from following the sequence of maps in the sieve mapping analysis in the County Wind Energy Strategy in the draft plan that the subject area was under consideration. <p>A counter motion was proposed by Cllr. F. Moran, seconded by Cllr. D. Harvey</p> <p>“that a protection zone of 500 meters north of the disused railway line, known locally as “The Banagher Line,” and 700 metres in each direction from Lemonagan/ Pollagh junction East (towards Ballycumber) and West (towards Ferbane) be introduced. We think this is a fair balance. We wish also to request the correction of a drafting error in the draft Wind Energy Strategy, the wording in the first line of the description of ‘Area 5’ should be amended by the substitution of ‘east’ for ‘west’ to read as follows – ‘Area generally west of Doon and north east of Ferbane.</p> <p>The members debated the motions and on the proposal of Cllr. P. Ormond, seconded by Cllr. E. Dooley, the members agreed to adjourn the decision until the afternoon session.</p>
<p>ROLL CALL - QUORUM REACHED FOR MEETING</p>	<p>Cllr. J. Carroll, Cathaoirleach advised the members that this is a public meeting and he welcomed the press to the re-commencement of the meeting.</p>
<p>2 KM SETBACK DISTANCES BETWEEN</p>	<p>Motion EMD14 proposed by Cllr S. O’Brien, Cllr K. Smollen, Cllr D. Owens, Cllr D. Harvey, Cllr T. McCormack and Cllr F.</p>

TURBINES AND SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES

Moran sought to amend the recommendation from the Chief Executive. Ref. CDP/124 which proposed to remove the 2km setback distance between turbines and settlement boundaries of towns and villages from Policy CAEP-35 in Chapter 3 and in DMS 109 in Chapter 13 instead proposing its retention in the Draft Plan.

Motion EMD25 proposed by Cllr J. Foley stated that he had reservations in relation to Ref. CDP/D/157 section c, and the response from the CE. I would not be in favour of the removal of the 2km distance limit.

Mr J. Condrón provided the members with the details below of references to 2km distances from turbines to town and village boundaries:

- the Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities, DoEHLG, (2006) and any amendments to the Guidelines which may be made; and
- the Wind Energy Strategy Designations Map from the County Wind Energy Strategy showing areas identified as ‘Areas Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Developments’ and ‘Areas not deemed suitable for Wind Energy Developments’, and specific policy for wind development in these areas as outlined in Section 8 of the County Wind Energy Strategy;
- 2 km separation distance from turbines to town and village boundaries in the county as required by policy CAEP-35 of this Plan...”

Mr. J. Condrón referred the members to the OPR Submission which stated that the Draft Plan is inconsistent with the Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR) in the Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change (2017) because;

- it does not acknowledge the full extent of national policy on renewable energy;
- it does not indicate how the implementation of the development plan will contribute to realising national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation and in particular wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource in megawatts; and
- it proposes to introduce mandatory setback distances of 2km between wind turbines and the settlement boundary of towns and villages.

In addition, Mr. J. Condrón referred the members to OPR Specific Recommendation (14) contained in their submission which stated that:

“The planning authority is required to remove reference to the mandatory setback distance of 2km between wind turbines and

	<p>the settlement boundary of towns and villages from the draft development plan as the inclusion of such mandatory separation distances would restrict the potential for wind farm development in the county, would undermine other policy objectives supporting wind farm development and be contrary to national policy and Ministerial guidance on wind farm development.”</p> <p>A motion to retain the 2km set back distance was proposed by Cllr. S. O’ Brien, seconded by Cllr. K. Smollen.</p> <p>A roll call was taken on Cllr. S. O’Brien’s proposal:</p> <p>In favour: Cllrs. C. Claffey, J. Foley, M. Hackett, S. O’ Brien and K. Smollen Against: Cllrs. J. Carroll, J. Clendennen, N. Cribbin, E. Dooley, E. Fitzpatrick, D. Harvey, T. McCormack, R. McDermott, F. Moran, P. Ormond, D Owens and L. Quinn Absent: Cllrs. N. Feighery and J. Leahy</p> <p>The motion was defeated. Cllr. P. Ormond, seconded by Cllr. L. Quinn, proposed to accept the recommendation of the Chief Executive, a roll call was taken:</p> <p>In favour: Cllrs. J. Carroll, J. Clendennen, N. Cribbin, E. Dooley, E. Fitzpatrick, D. Harvey, T. McCormack, R. McDermott, F. Moran, P. Ormond, D Owens and L. Quinn Against: Cllrs. C. Claffey, J. Foley, M. Hackett, S. O’ Brien and K. Smollen Absent: Cllrs. N. Feighery and J. Leahy. The motion was carried.</p> <p>CDP/D/183 Gaeltech Energy Services No change recommended.</p>
<p>LEMANAGHAN BOG (Contd)</p>	<p>Cllr. F. Moran proposed the following motion amending Motion EMD13;</p> <p>“We propose that a protection zone of 500 meters north of the disused railway line, known locally as “The Banagher Line,” and 700 metres in each direction from Lemonagan/ Pollagh junction East (towards Ballycumber) and West (towards Ferbane) be introduced. We think this is a fair balance. We wish also to request the correction of a drafting error in the draft Wind Energy Strategy, the wording in the first line of the description of ‘Area 5’ should be amended by the substitution of ‘east’ for ‘west’ to read as follows – ‘Area generally west of Doon and north east of Ferbane.’”</p> <p>This proposal was seconded by Cllr. D. Harvey.</p> <p>Cllr. S. O’Brien made the following proposal;</p>

	<p>“We propose that Lemanaghan Bog be removed from Area 5 and excluded as an area open to consideration for Wind Energy Development. Lemanaghan Bog has never been specifically mentioned anywhere in the County Wind Energy Strategy Draft 2021-27 or in the previous County Wind Energy Strategy 2014-2020 and as the County Development Plan has gone through two rounds of consultations, and because Lemanaghan Bog was not mentioned in the text of the document, local residents were denied the opportunity to make submissions to Offaly County Council. Lemanaghan is a place of natural beauty and is extremely rich in heritage for over 1,400 years. It is a sacred place of great antiquity and its has a long tradition of devotional practice. It is listed as a ‘Special Area of Conservation’ on the map of European and National Designated Sites in County Offaly.”</p> <p>The proposal was seconded by Cllr. K. Smollen.</p> <p>Cllr. P. Ormond sought clarification on OPR role in the process, as the decision has to be consistent with national planning framework.</p> <p>Mr. A. Murray S.P. advised the members that the OPR’s main role is to ensure consistency with national and regional plans and policy. The OPR can issue a recommendation to the Minister to give Offaly County Council a direction</p> <p>A roll call was taken on the proposal of Cllr. F. Moran, seconded by Cllr. D. Harvey Vote: In Favour: Cllrs. J. Carroll, E. Dooley E. Fitzpatrick, D. Harvey, T. McCormack, R. McDermott, F. Moran, P. Ormond and D. Owens Against: Cllrs. C. Claffey, J. Clendennen, N. Cribbin, J. Foley, M. Hackett, S. O Brien, L Quinn and K. Smollen Abstain: Cllr. N. Feighery and Cllr. J. Leahy The motion was carried.</p> <p>A roll call was taken on Cllr. S. O’Brien’s proposal, seconded by Cllr. K. Smollen: In Favour: Cllrs. C. Claffey, J. Clendennen, N. Cribbin, J. Foley, M. Hackett, S. O Brien, L Quinn and K. Smollen Against: Cllrs. J. Carroll, E. Dooley E. Fitzpatrick, D. Harvey, T. McCormack, R. McDermott, F. Moran, P. Ormond and D. Owens. Abstain: Cllr. N. Feighery and Cllr. J. Leahy This motion was defeated.</p>
CORRACULLIN BOG	<p>Motion EMD11 On the proposal of Cllr. F. Moran, seconded by Cllr. D. Harvey “We note the CE Report proposed to insert Area 4 as an ‘Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development’. We</p>

	<p>wish to leave this Area 4 as it is in the current CDP and not include it as an ‘Area Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development’. We do not feel it necessary that this area be incorporated within the Draft Plan.”, the members agreed unanimously to remove Corracullin Bog from the ‘Areas Open for Consideration for Wind Energy Development’ in the County Wind Energy Strategy in the Draft Plan.</p>
<p>ESKER MAPPING</p>	<p>Mr. J. Condrón, brought the members attention to New Esker Mapping and outlined the Chief Executive’s response to submission received from Geological Survey Ireland CDP/D/75:</p> <p>He noted that Geological Survey Ireland have confirmed that the new esker mapping as represented in red on the map provided, will replace the old esker mapping represented in blue entirely. He also advised the members that Area of Eskers will increase from 1,612 hectares in 2014-20 CDP to 2,002 hectares in Draft CDP if proposal accepted.</p> <p>Having regard to the revised esker areas identified in new geological, aggregate and mineral mapping developed by the GSI, the Chief Executive proposes to incorporate the new esker areas identified (shown in red) into the Draft Plan as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miscellaneous Change (q) in CE Report (p.578) proposes to incorporate Updated GSI Esker Mapping in a revised ‘Location of Esker Systems Map’ in Figure 4.7 along with an additional paragraph in Section 4.6.2 stating that; “Figure 4.7 shows the location of the esker systems in the county. This map is based on revised Quaternary geological and geomorphological mapping prepared by the GSI that is based on high resolution digital elevation models, high resolution aerial imagery, national subsoil permeability data, field mapping in certain low confidence areas and academic literature.” • in response to Submission CDP/D/75 (p. 256 CE report) it is proposed to amend the following maps to take account of new esker mapping; Landscape Classification, Green Infrastructure and Open Countryside Housing Policy. • Miscellaneous Change (q) (p. 582 in CE Report) also proposes to incorporate the new esker mapping in a revised ‘Areas of High Amenity in County Offaly Map’ in Figure 4.18 of Chapter 4 Biodiversity and Landscape while Misc. Change (v) (p. 589 of CE Report) proposes to amend the Wind Strategy map in the County Wind Energy Strategy to take account of the new esker mapping also. <p>The members raised queries on the implication of the mapping changes to the overall plan.</p>

	<p>In response to the members queries Mr. J. Condrón advised that eskers are considered Areas of High Amenity as they tend to be located in prominent positions in the landscape with important natural features. He noted that quarrying applications will be viewed on their own merits taking economic development and biodiversity into account. He advised the members that there is extensive criteria set out in Chapter 13 on how quarry applications will be evaluated and existing quarries are licenced. He noted that GSI mineral mapping outlines a lot of minerals/sand/gravel that are available that are not esker sites with planning and possibly EIS being required.</p> <p>The members agreed to the Chief Executives proposals on New Esker Mapping.</p> <p>EMD06 Cllr. E. Fitzpatrick referred to agreement on Eskers and he agreed to withdraw the motion EMD06.</p>
<p>RHODE GREEN ENERGY PARK</p>	<p>J. Condrón that there were two conflicting wordings in the CE Report for proposed policy ENTP-27. In response a replacement objective was proposed at the meeting;</p> <p>“It is an objective of the Council to support and promote the development of Rhode Green Energy Park for green energy, smart specialization and clustering and other complimentary green uses as outlined as ‘Uses Considered Appropriate for the Rhode Green Energy Park’ in Table 5.3. ‘Uses not considered appropriate for the Rhode Green Energy Park’ as outlined in Table 5.3 will not be encouraged.”</p> <p>On the proposal of Cllr. Cribbin and seconded by Cllr. Hackett the members agreed on the new objective.</p>

This concluded the business of the meeting.

MINUTES CONFIRMED: _____
CATHAOIRLEACH **RUNAÍ**

18th October 2021