

Minutes Of Special Meeting Of Roscommon County Council
Held in The Council Chamber On
Monday, 7th September, 2026 At 10.00 am.

PRESENT: Councillor Domnick Connolly **PRESIDED**

MEMBERS: Cllr L. Brennan, Cllr V. Byrne, Cllr L. Callaghan, Cllr R. Conboy, Cllr T. Crosby, Cllr L. Cull, Cllr N. Dineen, Cllr V. Duffy, Cllr L. Fallon, Cllr P. Fitzmaurice, Cllr M. Frain, Cllr M. Holland, Cllr J. Keogh, Cllr E. Kelly, Cllr S. Moylan, Cllr M. McDermott and Cllr T. Ward.

OFFICIALS: Shane Tiernan, Chief Executive
Mark Keaveney, Director of Services
Mary Grier, Senior Planner
Brian Farragher, Senior Executive Planner
Karen Hanley, Meetings Administrator
Claudette Collins, Staff Officer
Michaela Finneran, Assistant Staff Officer

Apologies: .

111.26 DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST (SECTION 177 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2001 AS AMENDED)

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly reminded Members to declare any conflict of interest at the relevant stage of the meeting.

112.26 ROSCOMMON COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2022-2028

Cllr. Keogh requested a 15-minute adjournment to allow Members to read the Notice of Motion replies.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Fitzmaurice

It was **AGREED** to adjourn the meeting for 15 minutes.

Following the adjournment, Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly noted that the purpose meeting was to consider Proposed Variation No. 1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, and the report of the Chief Executive on submissions received on the Proposed Variation, as per Section 58 (12) of the Planning and Development Act 2024 (as amended).

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, welcomed the Members to the Special Meeting and outlined that Variation No. 1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan (RCDP) 2022-2028 relates to the entire county but clarified that the land use zoning for the Monksland area of Athlone would be brought forward separately, and together with a Joint Strategy for Athlone would be considered separately under a future Variation No. 2 of the County Development Plan. He explained that the National Planning Framework (NPF) first revision adopted in April 2025 and subsequent Section 28 Guidelines on the NPF Implementation Housing Growth Requirements of July 2025 necessitated the preparation of the proposed Variation No. 1 of the RCDP to ensure consistency with updated national policy objectives particularly in relation to housing delivery.

The Section 28 Guidelines introduced revised population and housing growth requirements, replacing the previous housing supply methodology and requiring the Plan to recalibrate its Core

Strategy accordingly. Consequently, a comprehensive reassessment has been undertaken of the existing zoned settlements in the county, including an examination of infrastructure capacity, existing land availability and the distribution of such available zoned land. This in turn has informed the delivery of this Proposed Variation No. 1 to the current RCDP, which provides for increased housing growth requirements and provides for additional zoned lands, including the application of 'additionality' i.e. further zoning of up to 50% more land capacity than the baseline housing growth requirement of 392 units per annum.

The original 392 units per annum provided for in the adopted Core Strategy already included an additional 50% provision relative to previously predicted population growth and housing need. This currently Proposed Variation is adding a further 50% to that. He highlighted that, under the original adopted plan, in relation to the County's seven key population growth centres, 38 land parcels were zoned for new residential development. Of these, 27 have not experienced any development activity to date.

A total of 55 submissions were received from prescribed bodies and members of the public, Notices of Motion were also submitted by the Elected Members. Each submission will be considered in detail during the meeting for the Council's consideration and approval, as appropriate. The Chief Executive's responses were prepared by Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, Senior Planner, Ms. Mary Grier, Senior Executive Planner, Mr. Brian Farragher, and the Planning Department. These responses were formulated in the interest of achieving the proper and sustainable development of the county, with particular emphasis on compact growth, the utilisation of readily serviceable lands, and the support of existing communities, towns, and urban centres.

The Variation also includes other changes not solely driven by housing requirements but has arisen due to changes in planning legislation regarding for example the status of Local Area Plans and in the interests of rationalising the number of Variations being progressed. Examples of other elements included in the Proposed Variation are Land Use Zoning arising from a Residential Zoned Land Tax submission, a new settlement plan for Boyle, a new settlement plan for Roscommon Town and a Land Use Zoning Strategy for Cortober.

Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly invited the submissions addressed in the Chief Executive's Report to be considered. He noted that some Notices of Motion relate to matters that have been raised through those submissions. Where a matter has been considered and determined as part of that process, it will not be reopened under a Notice of Motion and there will be no further discussion on the matter.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, outlined the procedure for considering submissions, noting that each submission would need to be proposed, seconded and agreed. In the absence of agreement, a roll call vote would be conducted.

It was agreed that Members' Notices of Motion relating to submissions would be considered as the relevant submissions arose during the course of the meeting.

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, gave a detailed account of the legal requirements as follows:

The Variation of the County Development Plan is being carried out in accordance with Section 58 of the Planning and Development Act 2024 (as amended). Section 58(12) provides that:

- Members shall consider the proposed variation and the report of the Chief Executive.
- *"Where following the consideration of the proposed variation and the chief executive's*

report, it appears to the members of the planning authority that the proposed variation should be made, they may, subject to paragraph (d), by resolution make the proposed variation.”

- *“Where following the consideration of the proposed variation and the chief executive’s report, it appears to the members of the authority that a modified version of the proposed variation should be made, they may, subject to subsection (13), by resolution, make a modified version of the proposed variation.*

Section 58(13) provides if progressing to material alteration stage:

- “Where the members of a planning authority make a modified version of the proposed variation under paragraph (d) of subsection (12) and the modification to the proposed variation constitutes a material alteration of the proposed variation, the variation shall be deemed not to have been made.”
- The Planning Authority shall determine if a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Appropriate Assessment is required in respect of the modifications;
- The Planning Authority shall publish notice of the material alteration of the proposed variation and commence public consultation on the proposed modifications.

Where a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required then the variation process is paused, for a period determined by the Chief Executive, to allow the SEA or AA to be carried out. Following the preparation of the Assessment Reports, the public notice and public consultation process restarts.

One of the main factor likely to trigger a determination that an SEA is required is in relation to the zoning of lands that are within OPW identified Flood Risk areas.

Mr. Keaveney confirmed that the proposed revised Core Strategy and the associated land use zoning strategy as set out in Proposed Variation No. 1 utilises the full extent of the 50% additional provision allowable, distributed to zoned settlements across the county, with the distribution maintaining a focus on assigning proportionately higher growth opportunities to areas of highest population and greatest housing demand.

This is in addition to the range of opportunities that continue to exist throughout the county for the provision of additional residential development, including on lands zoned as ‘Town Core’, ‘Outer Core’ and ‘Existing Residential’ in towns, as well as residential development opportunities that continue to exist within our villages and in the wider rural area.

Members should be aware that adding significant additional lands for New Residential Zoning may lead to the CDP Variation being considered not compliant with the Ministerial Guidelines and could result in Ministerial Directions.

Mr. Keaveney also referenced the future preparation of a new 10 year County Development Plan and outlined a detailed timeline for this:

The Planning and Development (Amendment) Act 2026, which commenced on 20 July 2026, provides clarity that the life of CDPs made between 31 January and 16 May 2022 may be extended for an additional period ending on 30 April 2030.

This means that commencement of the new 10 year plan preparation process will be in late 2027.

Returning to the subject of the Proposed Variation No. 1 he advised that the Chief Executive’s Report, which has been circulated in advance to all Members, is for consideration as well as the

proposed Variation.

The CE Report includes the following:

1. A list of all persons or bodies who made submissions or observations.
2. A summary of all the submissions/observations received within the statutory public consultation period.
3. A response from the Chief Executive on matters raised, taking account of the requirement of the Local Authority to adhere to the strategic principles of proper planning and sustainable development for the area.
4. A recommendation from the Chief Executive in regard to the issues raised and whether or not any further amendments to the Proposed Variation are recommended.

Mr. Keaveney explained that the submissions would be taken in order, starting with the submissions from the Office of the Planning Regulator, followed by the submissions from prescribed bodies, followed by the general submissions.

Submission No. 46 – Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR)

Observation 1

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation 1:

"Amend the information in the following 'Residential Sites' tables set out in Appendix 9 (Settlement Capacity Audit) to include site area extents" (with the CE Report containing the relevant tables)

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Conboy

SECONDED by Cllr. Duffy

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 1.

OPR Recommendation 1 (i), 1 (ii), 1 (ii), 1 (iv), 1 (v)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Fallon

It was **AGREED** that no change be made to the content of the Proposed Variation No. 1 of the RCDP.

OPR Observation 2 (i), 2 (ii), 2, (iii)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes recommended to the content of the Proposed Variation No. 1 of the RCDP.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Callaghan

SECONDED by Cllr. Holland

It was **AGREED** that no changes be made to the content of the Proposed Variation No. 1 of the RCDP.

Members noted that significant investment had been made in flood mitigation measures and emphasised the need for updated assessments to ensure that the most current flood risk information is available.

Cllr. Keogh further suggested that Notice of Motion S1:26 be deferred to the September Plenary Meeting, at which a request would be made to the Department for funding to undertake a review of flood risk assessments conducted on a county-wide basis.

OPR Recommendation 2 (i), 2 (ii), 2 (iii)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation 2 (i):

(i) Proposed Amendment No. 59 – Roscommon Settlement Plan

Incorporate the following text and policy objectives into the proposed *Roscommon Settlement Plan*, between the sub-sections entitled 'Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk and Protection' and re-number all subsequent policy objectives accordingly.

LAND USE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION

The delivery of sustainable land use plans and residential settlement policies have a significant effect on influencing where people live and also how they travel to and from places of work, education, recreation etc..

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY OBJECTIVES

RN XX

Work collaboratively with all stakeholders to prepare a Local Transport Plan for Roscommon Town, in order to inform the future planning of the county town in the next County Development Plan.

RN XX

Promote and encourage the development of smart mobility and active travel schemes in order to support a modal shift towards more sustainable and carbon friendly movement for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Recognise the need to ensure all such initiatives incorporate the principles of universal design to ensure inclusion for people with access and mobility requirements.

RN XX

Facilitate and encourage appropriate new infrastructure development that will improve accessibility and movement around Roscommon town and its hinterland, reduce dependency on private car transport and increase permeability and connectivity in the town.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fallon

SECONDED by Cllr. Conboy

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 2 (i).

Chief Executive's Recommendation 2 (ii):

Proposed Amendment No. 60 – Boyle Settlement Plan

Incorporate the following text and policy objectives into the proposed Boyle Settlement Plan, between the

sub-sections entitled 'Infrastructure' and 'Flood Risk and Protection' and re-number all subsequent policy objectives accordingly.

LAND USE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION

The delivery of sustainable land use plans and residential settlement policies have a significant effect on influencing where people live and also how they travel to and from places of work, education, recreation etc.. In order to ensure the appropriate integration of land use and transport planning, the Boyle Settlement Plan has been informed by the preparation in advance of the Boyle Local Transport Plan (LTP). Devised from a comprehensive Area Based Transport Assessment, the finalised Local Transport Plan has guided the land use zoning framework set out in this Settlement Plan. In addition, the LTP sets out recommendations and options for future project delivery, aimed at providing and improving sustainable linkages, mobility and access throughout Boyle, with a strong emphasis on safe pedestrian and vehicular movement within and around the town.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICY OBJECTIVES

BOY XX

Support and promote the progression of measures and options outlined in the Boyle Local Transport Plan, subject to detailed feasibility, site-specific consideration and public consultation, in order to facilitate safe and sustainable patterns of growth and movement in Boyle.

BOY XX

Work collaboratively with all stakeholders to deliver smart mobility and active travel schemes as detailed in the Boyle Local Transport Plan in order to support a modal shift towards a more sustainable and carbon friendly movement for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Recognise the need to ensure all such initiatives incorporate the principles of universal design to ensure inclusion for people with access and mobility requirements.

BOY XX

Facilitate and encourage appropriate new infrastructure development that will improve accessibility and movement around Boyle town and its hinterland, reduce dependency on private car transport and increase permeability and connectivity in the town.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Moylan

SECONDED by Cllr. Cull

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 2 (ii).

Chief Executive's Recommendation 2 (iii):

Proposed Amendment No. 28 – Athlone Joint Strategy

Ms Mary Grier, Senior Planner explained the formatting of recommended text (including red strikethroughs and green highlighted text as identified in the published Proposed Variation) and with the recommended additional content being identified in blue on page 29 of the Chief Executive's Report.

Add the following text to **Policy Objective CS 2.9:**

In collaboration with Westmeath County Council and key stakeholders, prepare a Local Transport Plan to inform the Joint Strategy and associated land use zoning frameworks.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Ward

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 2 (iii).

Members discussed the following:

- It was noted that a Joint Traffic Assessment had been undertaken in Athlone a number of years previously to inform the Joint Urban Area Plan. Clarification was sought as to whether the proposed amendment constituted a separate plan or would duplicate work already undertaken.
- Clarification was sought on whether the existing transport plan for the Athlone and Monksland area remained in effect and how the proposed amendment related to it.
- Members expressed disappointment that Monksland was not included within the scope of the current Variation and emphasised the urgency of progressing the relevant planning measures for the area.

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, responded that the earlier work was an area-based plan undertaken for the overall Athlone area and work has more recently been undertaken in preparing a specific strategic transport assessment for the Co. Roscommon area of Athlone, and that a draft report is nearing completion.

Mr. Keaveney also advised that the Variation relating to Monksland is at an advanced stage and is expected to be published shortly. He noted that the Core Strategy contained within the current Variation takes account of projected housing and population growth in Monksland, as it applies to the county as a whole.

Submission No. 35 – National Transport Authority (NTA)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No additional amendments are recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Brennan

It was **AGREED** that no additional amendments would be made.

SUBMISSIONS FROM PRESCRIBED BODIES

Submission No. 2 – Maritime Area Regulatory Authority (MARA)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 5 – Health and Safety Authority (HSA)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fallon
SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby
It was **AGREED** to that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 9 – Office of Public Works (OPW)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:
No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Brennan
SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan
It was **AGREED** to that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 10 – Department of Education and Youth

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:
No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice
SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh
It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 15 – Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:
No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh
SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby
It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 16 – Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:
Recommendation No. 3

Amend Map 1 and Map 3 the proposed Cortober Land Use Zoning Framework (Amendment No. 58) to include the Carrick-on-Shannon Bypass and Traffic Management Plan Corridor.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Byrne
SECONDED by Cllr. Cull
It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 3.

Submission No. 31 – Uisce Éireann (UE)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:**Recommendation No. 4** (re. Infrastructure and Utilities in the Land Use Zoning Matrix)

Amend the land use zoning matrix in each of the following Settlement Plans - Ballaghaderreen, Castlerea, Elphin and Strokestown to identify the development type of 'Infrastructure and Utilities' as 'Open to Consideration' and on land zoned for 'Agriculture' instead of the current 'Not Normally Permitted', (signified by a change in the intersecting matrix box from red to yellow).

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 4.

Submission No. 39 – HSE (West) c/o MKO

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation in respect of land use zoning:

No land use zoning changes are recommended.

Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 5

Include the following Policy Objective (PO) at the end of the section entitled 'Education, Social and Community Infrastructure' and renumber all POs accordingly.

EDUCATION, SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

It is a policy objective of Roscommon County Council to:

RN XX

Support, facilitate and promote the sustainable provision, expansion and enhancement of healthcare, education, social, community and wellbeing infrastructure within Roscommon Town and work collaboratively with the Health Service Executive, education providers, community organisations and all relevant stakeholders to ensure that the needs of a growing population are appropriately accommodated.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fallon

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** that no land use zoning changes would be made and to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 5.

Submission No. 41 – ESB

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. McDermott

SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

GENERAL SUBMISSIONS

Members agreed that Notices of Motions relating to submissions would be considered during discussion of the relevant submission.

Submission No. 1 – Abbeyville Residents Association – c/o Chairperson Siobhan McLoughlin (pertains to lands adjacent to Abbeyville, Roscommon Town)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change recommended. The proposed 'New Residential' zoning shall remain unchanged.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S5:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. McDermott

Opposes the rezoning of subject lands adjacent to Abbeyville Estate

I am writing to formally express my deep concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of land adjoining our estate.

While I understand the need for strategic development, the current proposal poses significant risks to the safety, infrastructure, and quality of life within Abbeyville Estate on the Galway Road.

My primary objections centre on the following critical issues:

1. **Severe Traffic Congestion:** There are currently 129 residential houses in Abbeyville. The estate's internal roads are already operating at capacity. Directing additional development traffic through the narrow residential roads will cause significant congestion, increase noise pollution, and pose an immediate safety hazard to local children, pedestrians, and other road users.
2. **Inadequate Access to Galway Road:** There is currently only one entrance/exit serving Abbeyville onto the N63 (Galway Road). Requiring all additional traffic from a new development to use this single junction will create an unsustainable bottleneck. In the event of an emergency, reliance on a single, heavily congested entrance/exit could severely delay emergency services, including ambulances and fire appliances, from accessing both Abbeyville and any newly developed lands. I note that a previous planning application for development on this site included a second entrance/exit onto the Galway Road. Any new development should therefore be strictly conditional on the construction of a dedicated secondary entrance/exit onto the Galway Road to ensure safe traffic management, emergency access and the long-term sustainability of any future development.
3. **Water and Wastewater Infrastructure:** I'm also concerned about the capacity of the existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure to accommodate a substantial new development. The residents have voiced concerns around the presence of vermin in the sewer network. Uisce Éireann has also expressed concerns about the wastewater infrastructure within the estate.
4. **Construction Traffic:** The construction phase will inevitably involve a significant volume of heavy goods vehicles and construction machinery. Routing these vehicles through Abbeyville would create serious road safety concerns, increase noise and dust and risk damage to estate roads that were not designed to accommodate such traffic. A comprehensive construction traffic management plan should be required to minimise disruption and ensure the safety of residents.

I therefore object to this rezoning application in its current form. I request that any future development in this area be strictly conditional upon the provision of a completely independent secondary access directly onto the Galway Road, together with confirmation that adequate water, wastewater and sewage systems are in place and that appropriate measures are implemented to safely manage construction traffic.

I respectfully ask Roscommon County Council to give full consideration to these concerns and to protect the safety, wellbeing, and quality of life of the existing residents of Abbeyville.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 1).”

Cllr. McDermott noted that significant concerns had been raised by residents of the estate regarding the proposed ‘New Residential’ zoning. In particular, concerns were expressed that a single access point would be insufficient to accommodate any additional development.

Members acknowledged a number of issues, including sightline and visibility concerns, traffic volumes during peak periods, unfinished elements of the estate, and pedestrian safety. However, it was also noted that the site represents a strategically located parcel of land which could make a valuable contribution to housing delivery if rezoned. Members further noted that any issues arising could be addressed through the planning process should a planning application be submitted. It was also suggested that the provision of a second access point could address many of the concerns identified.

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, advised that all of the issues raised had been referenced in the Chief Executive’s Report. He noted that any future planning application would be required to demonstrate compliance with relevant safety and traffic management requirements, the adequacy of existing infrastructure, and appropriate servicing arrangements. He further advised that the unfinished elements of the existing development would need to be resolved before any new connections could be facilitated. Mr. Keaveney added that the Planning Authority could not predetermine the specific elements that may be included in any subsequent planning application.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Crosby
SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made. The proposed ‘New Residential’ zoning shall remain unchanged.

**Submission No. 3 – Noel and Raymond Egan
(pertains to lands at Rampark, Knockroe, Castlerea)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive’s Report on the submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The land should remain unzoned and outside the Castlerea Settlement Plan boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Connolly
SECONDED by Cllr. Kelly

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made. The land should remain unzoned and outside the Castlerea Settlement Plan boundary.

Submission No. 4 – Lt Eran Farrell

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes are recommended.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Fallon

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made.

**Submission No. 6 – Davitt Plan & Design
(pertains to lands at Curlew View, Boyle)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:**Recommendation No. 6:**

Make the following changes to the Proposed Boyle Settlement Plan (Amendment No. 60):

- (i) Change the zoning of the subject lands from the proposed 'Greenbelt' zoning to 'Existing Residential' on Maps 1, 1a, 1b and 3;
- (ii) Amend Table BOY 1: Land Use Zoning Extents to reflect the changes (identified below).

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Moylan

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 6.

**Submission No. 7 – Farnbeg Punt Ltd
(pertains to lands at Farnbeg, Strokestown)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes are recommended. The land should remain unzoned and outside the Strokestown Settlement Plan boundary.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S2:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Crosby

Include the former GAA grounds at Farnbeg in settlement boundary and zone the site for a Retirement village / Age centre

That Roscommon County Council extend the Strokestown settlement boundary to include the former GAA grounds at Farnbeg and zone the approximately 3.03-hectare site for a retirement village and age-Centre in each of these friendly housing. The lands are vacant and already benefit from water, electricity, footpaths and public lighting, with wastewater services nearby. This development would meet the housing needs of older people, provide opportunities to downsize, free up family homes, support local businesses and services, and contribute positively to the continued regeneration and growth of Strokestown.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No’s 7, 29 & 33).”

Cllr. Crosby outlined that the rezoning of this land would be of huge benefit to people in Strokestown and the wider areas, due to the lack of available housing, the fact the N5 will bypass the town in the near future and the suitability of the location for a retirement village type development. He added that this brownfield site has no other future potential and the landowner is keen to develop it. He clarified he wished to make a slight amendment to his motion to specify that it is rezoned as ‘New Residential’.

Members supported Cllr. Crosby’s motion.

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, advised that the Proposed Variation had already provided for the maximum additional zoning allowance of 50% and that the inclusion of the proposed lands would exceed this threshold. Notwithstanding this, he emphasised that the Members were fully empowered to make their own determination on the matter.

Mr. Keaveney further noted that the site is not currently serviced and that the necessary infrastructure would need to be extended to the lands at the developer’s expense. He also highlighted the site’s distance from the town centre as a planning consideration. In addition, he advised that, should the lands be rezoned, the zoning could not be restricted solely to the provision of accommodation for older persons, and any future development proposal would be assessed in accordance with the relevant planning policies and objectives.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Crosby

SECONDED by Cllr. Moylan

It was **AGREED** that Roscommon County Council extend the Strokestown settlement boundary to include the former GAA grounds at Farnbeg and zone the approximately 3.03-hectare site as ‘New Residential’.

Clarification was sought regarding the provision of wastewater services and the associated costs to the developer. It was also noted that lands zoned for ‘New Residential’ development would be subject to the Residential Zoned Land Tax (RZLT).

Cllr. Crosby noted that the developer was aware of the obligations and requirements that would arise should the lands be rezoned.

In conjunction with Members resolution to zone the lands, Mr. Keaveney requested that a proposal be outlined indicating how the development boundary would be extended to incorporate the lands in question.

Cllr. Crosby identified the proposed extension of the development boundary on the map presented to the meeting.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, noted that the Chief Executive’s recommendation was not being accepted and invited Senior Planner, Ms. Mary Grier, to outline the process that would apply in progressing the Proposed Variation.

Ms. Grier advised that the proposed rezoning of additional lands and the extension of the development boundary constituted a significant modification to the Proposed Variation and,

therefore, a material alteration. As a result, the resolution to make the Variation could not be adopted at the meeting.

She explained that the Planning Department would be required to engage with its environmental consultants to undertake the necessary screening and assessment processes, including Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) screenings, to determine whether the proposed amendment, or any other amendments arising during the meeting, would necessitate further environmental assessment. Should a full SEA and AA be required, the statutory process may have to be paused pending completion of the necessary work, with the Chief Executive required to determine the duration of such a pause.

Ms. Grier further advised that the process would subsequently resume with a four-week period of public consultation on the proposed material alterations. A further Chief Executive's Report would then be prepared and circulated to Members for consideration at a future meeting. She noted that, if the statutory timeline did not need to be paused, the process was likely to take approximately 12 weeks to complete. However, if additional environmental assessment was required, the timeframe for completion was dependent on environmental consultants and completion of the Plan Variation process could extend into the following year.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, added that the environmental assessments undertaken to date supported the recommendations contained within the report. He cautioned that any additional proposals arising during the meeting had not yet been assessed and would require further evaluation, resulting in additional time and cost. He further noted that the outcome of such assessments could determine that the lands proposed for rezoning were not suitable for development.

**Submission No. 8 – William Walsh
(pertains to lands adjacent to Walsh's filling station, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The 'Greenbelt' zoning should be maintained.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Rezone the 15m strip of land adjoining Walsh's Service Station (identified in Sub no. 08) as Outer Core instead of Greenbelt.

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 8 – William Walsh.

In considering Submission No. 8, this Council resolves to amend the Proposed Variation by changing the zoning of the identified 15-metre strip of land adjoining the existing filling station at Castle Street and the N60/N61, Roscommon Town, from "Greenbelt" to "Outer Core".

Reasons:

- The Variation should provide a co-ordinated spatial framework for the proper and sustainable development of Roscommon Town. In considering the future development of the town, it is appropriate that necessary transport infrastructure is considered alongside residential growth.
- The provision of additional EV charging infrastructure is an increasingly important element of

modern transport infrastructure. These lands are particularly well located at the junction of the N60 and N61 and immediately adjoining an established filling station and commercial premises.

- There is insufficient space within the existing filling station site to adequately accommodate additional EV charging infrastructure. The proposed zoning change relates only to an identified 15 metre strip adjoining the existing premises and therefore represents a limited extension of the Outer Core.
- Any future development of the lands would be subject to the normal development management process, including a site-specific flood risk assessment where required. The proposed EV charging use represents a less vulnerable land use, and all matters relating to flooding, drainage, access and detailed site design can be appropriately assessed at planning application stage.
- The proposed rezoning would not itself constitute permission for development.
- Any future proposal would also be required to appropriately address the setting and protected views of Roscommon Castle. Appropriate management of existing vegetation could potentially improve visual connections towards the Castle.
- The absence of a submission from the landowner during a previous Local Area Plan process should not determine the planning merits of the proposal currently before the Council.
- Having regard to the limited extent of the lands involved, their strategic location adjoining an established filling station at the N60/N61 junction, the increasing requirement for EV charging infrastructure and the ability to comprehensively assess site-specific planning matters through the development management process, I consider that the identified lands should be rezoned from Greenbelt to Outer Core.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 8).”

Cllr. Dineen advised that the proposal was a straightforward request to rezone a 15-metre section of land from ‘Greenbelt’ to ‘Outercore’ to facilitate the provision of additional EV charging infrastructure. The proposal was seconded by Cllr. Ward.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, reminded Members that the primary objective of the Variation was to facilitate the delivery of additional housing. He advised that consideration of other zoning amendments could be undertaken as part of the review of the next County Development Plan. Mr. Tiernan further cautioned that lands designated as ‘Greenbelt’ had generally been identified as areas subject to flood risk and urged Members to give careful consideration to this matter.

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, added that the rezoning of lands identified as being at flood risk, based on national flood risk mapping, was likely to trigger the requirement for a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Members discussed the following:

- It was noted that the area proposed for rezoning was relatively small in scale.
- Members highlighted the need for additional EV charging infrastructure in Roscommon Town.
- Clarification was sought regarding the potential timeframe associated with undertaking a Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- Clarification was sought as to whether the identification of a material alteration in one element of the Variation could result in increased scrutiny of the overall plan by the relevant regulatory bodies.

Mr. Keaveney advised that national planning policies and Ministerial Guidelines must be taken into account and noted that Roscommon County Council has no discretion in relation to the designation of flood risk areas. He further advised that, should a full SEA be required for any proposed material alterations, it would involve a substantial body of work and could significantly extend the timeframe for completion of the process. He noted that submissions received from the Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR) and the Office of Public Works (OPW) had already raised concerns regarding the zoning of lands identified as being at risk of flooding.

Senior Planner, Ms. Mary Grier, explained that prescribed bodies engage with the OPR in relation to planning matters and that concerns raised by those bodies are reflected in OPR submissions. She advised that proposals to apply zoning objectives other than 'Greenbelt' to lands at risk of flooding would be likely to attract particular scrutiny.

Ms. Grier further advised that any material alterations arising from the meeting would be subject to public consultation, during which the OPR, OPW and other prescribed bodies would have an opportunity to make submissions. A further assessment of each proposed alteration would then be undertaken. She noted that, should a full SEA be required, the timeframe would be dependent on the availability of environmental consultants and would result in additional costs to the process.

It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Keogh, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Conboy, that the CE recommendation be adopted.

Cllr. Dineen entered a counter proposal. It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Dineen, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Ward to rezone the 15-metre section of land from 'Greenbelt' to 'Outercore'.

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly stated the following: A vote will be taken on the counter proposal and if it passes it will defeat the original proposal. If the counter proposal is defeated, it will be deemed that the original proposal is passed.

The Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, stated the following:

The counter proposal is to amend the Proposed Variation by changing the zoning of the identified 15-metre strip of land adjoining the existing filling station at Castle Street and the N60/N61, Roscommon Town, from "Greenbelt" to "Outer Core".

I will now conduct a vote by member in alphabetical order by surname. Please clearly state whether you are FOR or AGAINST the counter proposal. You are reminded to put on your microphone to ensure your vote is clearly recorded.

			FOR COUNTER PROPOSAL	THE AGAINST THE COUNTER PROPOSAL
Cllr.	Larry	Brennan		✓
Cllr.	Valerie	Byrne	Absent	
Cllr.	Liam	Callaghan		✓
Cllr.	Ruth	Conboy		✓
Cllr.	Domnick	Connolly		✓
Cllr.	Tom	Crosby		✓
Cllr.	Leah	Cull	✓	
Cllr.	Nigel	Dineen	✓	
Cllr.	Valerie	Duffy		✓
Cllr.	Laurence	Fallon		✓
Cllr.	Paschal	Fitzmaurice		✓

Cllr.	Michéal	Frain	Abstain	
Cllr.	Michael	Holland	Abstain	
Cllr.	Emer	Kelly		✓
Cllr.	John	Keogh		✓
Cllr.	Marty	McDermott		✓
Cllr.	Sean	Moylan	Absent	
Cllr.	Tony	Ward	✓	
TOTAL			3	11

The Meetings Administrator stated the following:

The result of the vote is:

3 votes FOR the counter proposal

11 votes AGAINST the counter proposal

2 abstentions

2 marked as absent

The Cathaoirleach then stated: The counter proposal is defeated, and the original proposal is deemed as passed.

**Submission No. 11 – Terry Leyden - C/O AOL Design Ltd.
(pertains to lands in Cloonybeirne, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes are recommended. The subject lands should remain as 'Greenbelt.'

Members referred to the earlier discussion on flooding and to Cllr. Keogh's Notice of Motion, which had been deferred to the September Plenary Meeting. It was noted that the deferral would provide an opportunity for updated flood risk assessments to be considered in the preparation of the next County Development Plan.

Clarification was sought in relation to the final line of the Chief Executive's response, which referred to the rezoning of the lands from 'Greenbelt' to 'Agriculture'. Mr. Keaveney advised that this reference was a typo error.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Brennan

SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made. The subject lands should remain as 'Greenbelt.'

**Submission No. 12 – The Higgins Family - C/O AOL Design Ltd.
(pertains to lands adjacent to Quarry View at Ballybride, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change. The Settlement Plan boundary should remain unchanged and the subject lands should not be zoned.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following two Notice of Motions.

S4:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Larry Brennan

Zone the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 12) adjoining Quarry View estate, Ballybride, as New Residential

As this land is serviced and is essentially development ready and constitutes sequential residential development, I propose this land be zoned Residential Development.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 12).”

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Include the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 12) adjoining Quarry View Estate, Ballybride in settlement boundary and zone as New Residential

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 12 – The Higgins Family c/o AOL Design Ltd., Ballybride, Roscommon Town.

In considering Submission No. 12, this Council resolves to amend the Proposed Variation by including the identified c.4.93 hectares of lands at Ballybride, Roscommon Town, within the Roscommon Town Settlement Plan boundary and zoning the lands as “New Residential”.

Reasons:

- Roscommon Town must have a sufficient supply of appropriately located and deliverable residential land to accommodate its planned population and housing growth over the lifetime of the Plan.
- The subject lands at Ballybride comprise approximately 4.93 hectares and represent a logical extension of the existing residential area, immediately adjoining the established Quarry View residential development.
- The location of these lands is particularly suitable for residential development. They are within convenient walking and cycling distance of a range of existing services and facilities, including schools, church, library and Roscommon railway station, together with the proposed iRos campus.
- The lands also benefit from existing infrastructure in the immediate area, including footpaths and public lighting extending to the site entrance. Part of the property containing an existing dwelling and the site entrance is already within residential zoning. In considering additional residential zoning for Roscommon Town, appropriate weight should be given to lands which can integrate naturally with the existing built-up area and make effective use of established infrastructure and services. – The location of future housing close to schools, public transport, community facilities and other established services also supports sustainable travel patterns and reduces dependence on private car journeys.
- It is important that the Development Plan provides not only a sufficient quantity of residentially zoned land, but also an appropriate choice of suitably located and deliverable sites. This is particularly relevant where some other lands identified for residential development require additional infrastructure works before significant housing development can be delivered.
- The Ballybride lands provide an opportunity to accommodate additional housing immediately adjoining an established residential area and close to the existing services and facilities of Roscommon Town.
- Having regard to the location of the lands, their relationship with existing residential development, proximity to established services and facilities, availability of infrastructure and the need to ensure an adequate supply and choice of deliverable residential lands in Roscommon Town, I consider that the identified c.4.93 hectares at Ballybride should be

included within the Roscommon Town Settlement Plan boundary and zoned “New Residential”.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 12).”

Members noted that, on previous occasions, lands had been rezoned with those portions identified as being at risk of flooding excluded from the residential rezoning proposal and instead zoned as ‘Greenbelt’. Concern was expressed that maps identifying flood risk areas within Roscommon were not included in the Chief Executive’s Report.

Mr. Keaveney advised that the relevant maps had been included as part of the published documentation for the Proposed Variation and noted that the flood risk area was confined to the northern portion of the site.

Cllr. Brennan, with the agreement of Cllr. Dineen, proposed an amendment to the motion to provide for the consideration of the lands for ‘New Residential’ zoning, excluding the area identified as being at risk of flooding.

A map was displayed to Members outlining the site and indicating the areas under consideration.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Dineen

SECONDED by Cllr. Brennan

It was **AGREED** to zone the subject lands identified in submission No. 12 adjoining Quarry View Estate Ballybride as ‘New Residential’ excluding the portion that is subject to flooding but shall be zoned ‘Greenbelt’.

**Submission No. 13 – Image Furnishings Ltd. and John Crean – c/o AOL Design Ltd.
(pertains to lands at Killarney Townland, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive’s Report on the submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the proposed *Roscommon Settlement Plan* boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made.

**Submission No. 14 – Orla Leyden
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive’s Report on the submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

No change recommended - maintain the zoning of Edenville House as ‘Outer Core’ as proposed in Amendment No. 59 (i) relating to the *Roscommon Settlement Plan*.

Cllr. Brennan noted that he had submitted a Notice of Motion relating to a number of submissions concerning the subject lands. He stated that the building is an important community asset with significant heritage and cultural value and that there was strong support for its restoration and

continued community use rather than residential development. Cllr. Brennan advised that, in light of these considerations, he wished to withdraw his motion and support the Chief Executive's recommendation.

Cllr. McDermott similarly indicated his intention to withdraw his motion in respect of the subject lands.

Members expressed their support for the Chief Executive's recommendation, noting that the volume and content of submissions received demonstrated a clear community preference for the site to be retained for community purposes rather than housing. It was further noted that the proposed 'Outer Core' zoning represented the most appropriate approach and that any future development proposals would be subject to the Part 8 process, affording Members an opportunity to consider and determine the use of the site.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Brennan
SECONDED by Cllr. Conboy
It was **AGREED** that no change would be made.

**Submission No. 17 – Roscommon Town Team
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 18 – Bianca Fachel Sarda
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

Submission No. 19 – Langan Fruit Company (Boyle) Ltd.

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The zoning of the subject lands should be maintained as 'Existing Residential' as proposed in the *Boyle Settlement Plan*.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Connolly
SECONDED by Cllr. Fallon

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made. The zoning of the subject lands should be maintained as 'Existing Residential' as proposed in the *Boyle Settlement Plan*.

**Submission No. 20 – Collins Boyd - Engineers & Architects
(pertains to lands at Lisnacroggy / Gallowstown, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes are recommended. The land should remain unzoned and outside the Settlement Plan boundary.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S4:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Larry Brennan

Retain current zoning for a portion of the subject lands (identified in Sub No. 20) at Lisnacrogghy / Gallowstown, and zone the remainder of the site as Outer Core

As this land already has existing residential zoning towards the front of the site, I propose that portion of the site retains that current zoning and I further propose that the remainder of the site be zoned "Outer Core" as this land directly adjoins existing both residential and industrial / commercial developments.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

"This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive's Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 20)."

Cllr. Brennan advised that he wished to withdraw this motion.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh
SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan

It was **AGREED** that no change would be made. The land should remain unzoned and outside the Settlement Plan boundary.

Submission No. 21 – John Bannon - C/O Collins Boyd
(pertains to lands in Monksland / Bellanamullia, Athlone)

Cllr. Dineen advised that he wished to withdraw his Notice of Motion in relation to this land.

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No further action required.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh
SECONDED by Cllr. Dineen

It was **AGREED** that there was no further action required.

Submission No. 22 - Collins Boyd
(pertains to Scramogue)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No recommendation arising.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S2:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Crosby

Include Scramogue as a designated village within the County's Settlement hierarchy and prepare a plan to formally recognise and support its development as a village

That Roscommon County Council, in reviewing Variation No. 1 of the County Development Plan, recognise Scramogue as a village and prepare a Village Plan for the area. Scramogue has public sewerage, suitable serviced lands and many of the facilities needed to support additional housing and future growth. A number of villages already included in the Development Plan do not have the same level of wastewater infrastructure. Recognising Scramogue as a village would support the local community, encourage appropriate housing development and help sustain rural Roscommon. Scramogue should therefore be included as a designated village within the County's settlement hierarchy.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No’s 22 & 38). The preparation of a Village Plan for Scramoge and the promotion of the growth of this area is not considered appropriate at this time, having regard in particular to existing infrastructural constraints.”

Cllr. Crosby advised that the area benefits from a range of amenities and services, including two large residential estates. He stated that designation as a village would create additional opportunities for development, including public realm improvements, enhanced public lighting, and the provision of footpaths. Cllr. Crosby further noted that the proposed €450 million Ballaghaderreen to Scramogue Bypass project would increase the strategic importance and visibility of the area. He expressed the view that the proposal fell within the scope of the Variation and could support additional housing development and help attract further population growth to the area.

Mr. Keaveney advised that it would not be appropriate to consider the proposal as part of the current Variation and indicated that it would be more appropriately examined through the review of the County Development Plan scheduled for the end of the following year. He noted that there were existing infrastructure issues affecting the two residential estates in the area, however, he confirmed that the Council was actively engaging with Uisce Éireann to address these matters and that the issue had been prioritised.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Dineen

SECONDED by Cllr. Ward

It was **AGREED** that there was no recommendation arising.

**Submission No. 23 - Aidan Kelly - C/O Collins Boyd
(pertains to lands at Hodson Bay / Barrymore)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive’s Report on the submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned, within the Hodson Bay / Barrymore Plan boundary.

Cllr. Keogh proposed that the lands would be rezoned as ‘New Residential’. Cllr. Kelly seconded this proposal.

Members discussed the following:

- Disappointment was expressed with the response contained in the Chief Executive’s Report.
- It was noted that the landowner wished to develop executive-style housing on the site.
- Members highlighted the significant level of investment being directed towards the area.
- It was noted that the area benefits from a range of existing facilities and services.
- Reference was made to the growing demand for housing arising from the expansion of employment opportunities in the greater Athlone area.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, advised that the primary purpose of the Variation was to facilitate additional zoning in identified growth centres. He confirmed that Roscommon County Council remained willing to engage with any developer interested in delivering housing in Barrymore. Mr. Tiernan stated that the proposal was not considered appropriate for inclusion in the

current Variation. He acknowledged, however, the strategic importance of the area as a flagship tourism destination in the south of the county.

Senior Planner, Ms. Mary Grier, explained that the area benefits from an established development boundary and that the existing 'Whitelands' / unzoned lands zoning has facilitated, and continues to facilitate, low-density, high-quality residential development. She further advised that Hodson Bay is not a serviced settlement in the traditional sense, as it does not have facilities such as schools, church, retail etc. and entails travel out of the Plan area to all of those. She noted that, should the lands be rezoned for 'New Residential' development, any future proposals would be required to comply with the density standards set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Growth Guidelines. Ms. Grier noted that this would likely result in development patterns and densities that differ from those currently permitted in the area.

Members sought further clarification regarding the implications of rezoning the lands, particularly in relation to the type, scale and density of housing that could be permitted under a 'New Residential' zoning objective.

It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Keogh, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Fallon, that the CE recommendation be adopted.

Cllr. Ward entered a counter proposal. It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Ward, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Dineen that the land is rezoned as 'New Residential'.

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly stated the following: A vote will be taken on the counter proposal and if it passes it will defeat the original proposal. If the counter proposal is defeated, it will be deemed that the original proposal is passed.

The Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, stated the following:

The counter proposal is that the subject lands are rezoned as 'New Residential'.

I will now conduct a vote by member in alphabetical order by surname. Please clearly state whether you are FOR or AGAINST the counter proposal. You are reminded to put on your microphone to ensure your vote is clearly recorded.

			FOR COUNTER PROPOSAL	THE AGAINST THE COUNTER PROPOSAL
Cllr.	Larry	Brennan		✓
Cllr.	Valerie	Byrne		✓
Cllr.	Liam	Callaghan		✓
Cllr.	Ruth	Conboy		✓
Cllr.	Domnick	Connolly		✓
Cllr.	Tom	Crosby		✓
Cllr.	Leah	Cull	✓	
Cllr.	Nigel	Dineen	✓	
Cllr.	Valerie	Duffy		✓
Cllr.	Laurence	Fallon		✓
Cllr.	Paschal	Fitzmaurice		✓
Cllr.	Michéal	Frain		✓
Cllr.	Michael	Holland		✓
Cllr.	Emer	Kelly		✓
Cllr.	John	Keogh		✓
Cllr.	Marty	McDermott		✓

Cllr.	Sean	Moylan	Absent	
Cllr.	Tony	Ward	✓	
TOTAL			3	14

The Meetings Administrator stated the following:

The result of the vote is:

3 votes FOR the counter proposal

14 votes AGAINST the counter proposal

0 abstentions

1 marked as absent

The Cathaoirleach then stated: The counter proposal is defeated, and the original proposal is deemed as passed.

Submission No. 24 – Collins Boyd

(pertains to lands bounded by The Walk and the N63, Roscommon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Settlement Plan boundary.

Cllr. Brennan noted that due to a possible, perceived conflict of interest in respect of this submission, he wished to withdraw his Notice of Motion. Cllr. Brennan then withdrew from the meeting.

Cllr. Holland proposed that the lands be rezoned on the following grounds:

- The site occupies a strategic and accessible location.
- The area benefits from existing public infrastructure.
- The lands have an established planning suitability for development.
- The proposal would support the balanced development of the town.
- The rezoning would assist in the delivery of additional housing opportunities.

There was no proposer for the CE recommendation.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Holland

SECONDED by Cllr. Frain

It was **AGREED** to rezone the subject lands as 'New Residential'.

Cllr. Brennan returned to the meeting.

Submission No. 25 – Collins Boyd

(pertains to lands at The Walk, Roscommon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Settlement Plan boundary.

Mr. Keaveney advised Members that, during the course of the meeting, in excess of 7 hectares of additional land in Roscommon Town had already been proposed for rezoning.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Zone the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 25) with frontage along The Walk for Residential use

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 25 – Denis Smith, concerning lands at The Walk, northeast of Roscommon Town.

In considering Submission No. 25, this Council resolves to zone the subject lands for Residential purposes.

Reasons:

- In determining where Roscommon Town should accommodate future residential development, significant consideration should be given to lands which have already demonstrated their suitability for residential development.
- These lands have previously received planning permission for multi-unit residential development similar in character to the adjoining Sliabh Bawn estate. The fact that the development did not proceed during the national economic downturn should not, in itself, diminish the suitability of the lands for residential development today.
- The lands are partially serviced, are situated adjoining established residential development and have the potential to be fully serviced.
- It makes sound planning sense to maximise existing infrastructure and established patterns of development before requiring unnecessary expansion into locations where equivalent infrastructure may not be readily available.
- Having regard to the previous residential planning history, adjoining residential development, availability of services and the need to provide suitable lands for the continued growth of Roscommon Town, I consider that these lands should be zoned for Residential purposes.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 25).”

There was no proposer for the CE recommendation.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Dineen

SECONDED by Cllr. Conboy

It was **AGREED** to rezone the subject lands.

Submission No. 26 – Collins Boyd

(pertains to lands at Racecourse Road, Roscommon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive’s Report on the submission and the Chief Executive’s Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive’s Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should retain their ‘Strategic Industrial / Enterprise’ zoning.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Zone the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 26) at Racecourse road as Existing Residential

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 26.

In considering Submission No. 26, this Council resolves to zone the subject lands as Existing Residential.

Reasons:

- The lands have already been partially developed for residential purposes, with foundations in situ, on foot of Planning Permission Ref. 05/1635.
- The Council has previously determined that it was in the interests of proper planning to override the Industrial/Enterprise zoning applying to these lands by way of a material contravention. This previous decision of the Council is an important consideration when determining the appropriate zoning of the lands now.
- The purpose of the Variation should not only be to identify additional lands to accommodate future residential growth, but should also appropriately recognise lands where residential development has already been permitted and commenced.
- In my view, where residential development has previously been permitted, commenced and partially constructed, it is appropriate that this established planning history is reflected in the zoning of the lands.
- Having regard to the planning history, the commencement of residential development and the previous decision of the Council in relation to the lands, I consider that the appropriate zoning is Existing Residential.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

"This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive's Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 26)."

Director of Services, Mr. Mark Keaveney, clarified with Cllr. Dineen, that a 'New Residential' zoning objective would be more appropriate for the lands in question than 'Existing Residential'.

There was no proposer for the CE recommendation.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Dineen

SECONDED by Cllr. Ward

It was **AGREED** to rezone the subject lands as 'New Residential'.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, reminded Members that this represented the third parcel of land proposed for rezoning during the course of the meeting. He noted that the effect of these proposals would result in the Proposed Variation exceeding the 50% zoning allocation threshold

**Submission No. 27 – Declan Jones, Westward Holdings Ltd
(pertains to lands at a residential property in Strokestown)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Recommendation No. 7:

- (i) Amend the zoning on the subject land from 'Strategic Industrial / Enterprise' to 'Existing Residential' on Map 1, 1a, 1b and 3; and
- (ii) Update the land extents in Table ST1 – Land Use Zoning Extents to reflect the changes to the two

land use zones

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Callaghan

SECONDED by Cllr. Byrne

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 7.

Submission No. 28 – Vincent O'Dowd

(pertains to lands at Knockadalteen, Carrick-on-Shannon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Cortober Land Use Zoning Framework boundary.

Members noted that the lands should be rezoned as 'New Residential' for the following reasons:

- The location of the site.
- The significant development potential of the lands.
- The limited availability of lands suitable for housing development in the Cortober area, having regard to flood risk constraints and the proposed nearby bypass.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, emphasised that the principles of proper and sustainable development must remain central to the consideration of all housing-related proposals.

Mr. Keaveney advised that the site comprises approximately 5.5 hectares and is located at a distance from existing services. He further noted that the nearby road network needs improvement and cautioned that these factors could give rise to development and infrastructure challenges in the future.

There was no proposer for the CE recommendation.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Cull

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** to extend the Plan boundary and zone the subject lands as 'New Residential'.

Submission No. 29 – Strokestown Town Team

(pertains to lands known as the Canon's Field in Strokestown)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Recommendation No. 8

- (i) Remove the specific 'Residential Opportunity Site' designation from the Canon's Field and retain the existing 'Town Core' land use zoning on the subject lands.
- (ii) Amend Maps 1, 1a, 1b and 3 in the Strokestown Settlement Plan (Amendment No. 95) to reflect (i) above.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Callaghan

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 8.

Recommendation No. 9

- (i) Amend Maps 1, 1a, 1b and 3 in the Strokestown Settlement Plan (Amendment No. 95) to identify the lands adjacent to the Primary Care Centre as a 'Residential Opportunity' site.
- (ii) Amendment Table ST2 (New Residential Lands) in the Strokestown Settlement Plan to reflect the site area of the newly identified 'Residential Opportunity Site'.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Crosby

SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan

It was **AGREED** to approve the Chief Executive's Recommendation No. 9.

Submission No. 30 – Niamh Molloy

(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

Submission No. 32 – Peter Forkan

(pertains to lands at Ballyoughter, Ballaghaderreen)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Ballaghaderreen Settlement Plan boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Callaghan

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 33 – Rory Doyle

(pertains to lands at Farnbeg, Strokestown and the Canon's Field, Strokestown)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

- (i) Double the Proposed 'New Residential' Zoning in Strokestown

Not supported and no change recommended.

- (ii) Expand Settlement Boundary to include and zone Lands at Farnbeg

No change recommended (refer also to content in Submission 7).

- (iii) 'Canon's Field' as a Public Park

Refer to Chief Executive's Recommendation No's. 8 and 9 in response to Submission No. 29 (Strokestown Town Team)

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Callaghan

SECONDED by Cllr. Crosby

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made in relation to (i) and (ii), and (iii) was previously dealt with.

Submission No. 34 – Roscommon Tidy Towns Committee

(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

Submission No. 36 – Collins Boyd**(pertains to lands at Racecourse Road and Gallowstown, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Roscommon Settlement Plan boundary.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen**Zone the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 36) at Racecourse Road and Gallowstown for Residential use**

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 36 – Noel Beatty, concerning lands at Racecourse Road and Gallowstown, Roscommon.

In considering Submission No. 36, this Council resolves to zone the subject lands for Residential purposes.

Reasons:

- There is a strong established planning basis for considering these lands suitable for residential development.
- The lands previously received planning permission for a multi-unit residential development, including fully designed roads and services. This is an important consideration when determining which lands are most appropriate to accommodate the future residential growth of Roscommon Town.
- In my view, appropriate weight should be given to lands which have already been subjected to the planning process and have previously been considered suitable in principle for residential development.
- The planning of Roscommon Town should also provide an appropriate distribution of residential development. Suitable lands should not be excluded simply because they fall beyond a proposed settlement boundary where their planning history, location and ability to accommodate development demonstrate a reasonable case for their inclusion.
- Rather than overlooking lands with an established residential planning history, the Variation provides an opportunity to recognise their potential contribution to the future growth of the town.
- Having regard to the established residential planning history of the lands and the previous design of the associated roads and services, I consider it appropriate that the subject lands be zoned for Residential purposes.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

"This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive's Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 36)."

Cllr. Dineen proposed that the land be zoned 'New Residential'. This was seconded by Cllr. Ward.

Mr. Keaveney informed Members that, up to that point in the meeting, in addition to lands already put forward in Proposed Variation No. 1, approximately 11 hectares of additional land in

Roscommon Town had been approved for rezoning. He noted that the inclusion of the lands currently under consideration would result in a further approximately 6.5 hectares being added to the total area proposed for rezoning.

It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Conboy, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Brennan that the CE recommendation be approved.

Cllr. Dineen entered a counter proposal. It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Dineen, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Ward, that the land be zoned 'New Residential'.

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly stated the following: A vote will be taken on the counter proposal and if it passes it will defeat the original proposal. If the counter proposal is defeated, it will be deemed that the original proposal is passed.

Cllr. Fallon noted that he would abstain from the vote, due to a conflict of interest.

The Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, stated the following:

The counter proposal is that the subject lands are rezoned as 'New Residential'.

I will now conduct a vote by member in alphabetical order by surname. Please clearly state whether you are FOR or AGAINST the counter proposal. You are reminded to put on your microphone to ensure your vote is clearly recorded.

			FOR THE COUNTER PROPOSAL	AGAINST THE COUNTER PROPOSAL
Cllr.	Larry	Brennan		✓
Cllr.	Valerie	Byrne		✓
Cllr.	Liam	Callaghan		✓
Cllr.	Ruth	Conboy		✓
Cllr.	Domnick	Connolly		✓
Cllr.	Tom	Crosby	Absent	
Cllr.	Leah	Cull	✓	
Cllr.	Nigel	Dineen	✓	
Cllr.	Valerie	Duffy		✓
Cllr.	Laurence	Fallon	Abstained	
Cllr.	Paschal	Fitzmaurice		✓
Cllr.	Michéal	Frain	Absent	
Cllr.	Michael	Holland		✓
Cllr.	Emer	Kelly		✓
Cllr.	John	Keogh		✓
Cllr.	Marty	McDermott		✓
Cllr.	Sean	Moylan	Absent	
Cllr.	Tony	Ward	✓	
TOTAL			3	11

The Meetings Administrator stated the following:

The result of the vote is:

3 votes FOR the counter proposal

11 votes AGAINST the counter proposal

1 abstention

3 marked as absent

The Cathaoirleach then stated: The counter proposal is defeated, and the original proposal is deemed as passed.

Submission No. 37 – Eilish Feeley

(pertains to (i) Edenville House, Roscommon and (ii) Residential Opportunity Site No. 3, Roscommon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

Edenville House Site

As per the Chief Executive's recommendation in response to Submission No. 14 – No change from the proposed 'Outer Core' zoning is recommended.

Residential Opportunity Site No. 3 – The Spinney

No change recommended – Continue to maintain the designation of this land as a 'Residential Opportunity Site' in the *Roscommon Town Settlement Plan*, consistent with its status in the adopted *Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030*.

As the Edenville House Site was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this element of the submission.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Brennan

SECONDED by Cllr. Callaghan

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 38 – Cllr Tom Crosby

(Pertains to Scramoge)

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

Submission No. 40 – Collins Boyd

(pertains to lands to the NE of Roscommon Town in the area of Killarney Townland)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the proposed Roscommon Settlement Plan boundary.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Zone Northern portion of the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 40) at The Walk, Roscommon Town as Industrial / Enterprise and Southern portion for Residential use

In considering Submission No. 40, this Council resolves to zone the subject lands for Industrial/Enterprise and Residential purposes in accordance with the lands identified in Submission No. 40.

Reasons:

- The future development of Roscommon Town requires an appropriate balance between the provision of housing and the provision of lands capable of supporting employment and

enterprise.

- These lands are located in an area where there is already a significant concentration of established enterprise development. The lands also benefit from public sewer infrastructure and form part of an existing pattern of development on this side of Roscommon Town.
- Where infrastructure and established development already exist, it is reasonable that these factors should carry significant weight when deciding where future Industrial/Enterprise and Residential development should be accommodated.
- The Development Plan should seek to consolidate development around existing infrastructure and established employment and residential areas rather than unnecessarily directing development towards lands which may be more difficult or costly to service.
- It is also important that Roscommon Town has an adequate supply and appropriate geographical distribution of lands for both employment and residential development so that the town can continue to grow in a balanced and sustainable manner.
- Having regard to the existing infrastructure, established enterprise activity and overall pattern of development in this area, I consider it appropriate that the lands identified in Submission No. 40 be zoned for Industrial/Enterprise and Residential purposes as appropriate to the respective land parcels identified in the submission.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 40).”

Cllr. Dineen proposed that the land be zoned ‘Industrial/Enterprise’ and ‘Residential’. This was seconded by Cllr. Ward.

Members sought clarification regarding the flood risk status of the lands and queried whether, if flooding was identified as a constraint, the proposed ‘Residential’ element could be omitted from the zoning proposal.

Ms. Grier advised that there was evidence indicating that portions of the lands are subject to flood risk.

Chief Executive, Mr. Shane Tiernan, reminded Members that the cumulative rezoning proposals approved during the meeting had already significantly exceeded the maximum 50% additional zoning allocation provided for under the Variation. He further noted that the lands proposed for ‘Residential’ zoning were located within a floodplain. Mr. Tiernan also advised that, approximately 18 months previously, a direction had been received from the Office of the Planning Regulator indicating that the lands should not be zoned for ‘Industrial’ use.

It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Callaghan, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Duffy that the CE recommendation be approved.

Cllr. Dineen entered a counter proposal. It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Dineen, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Ward, that the ‘Residential’ element be removed from his proposal and the land be zoned as ‘Industrial/Enterprise’.

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly stated the following: A vote will be taken on the counter proposal and if it passes it will defeat the original proposal. If the counter proposal is defeated, it will be deemed that the original proposal is passed.

The Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, stated the following:

The counter proposal is that the subject lands are rezoned as ‘Industrial/Enterprise’. I will now

conduct a vote by member in alphabetical order by surname. Please clearly state whether you are FOR or AGAINST the counter proposal. You are reminded to put on your microphone to ensure your vote is clearly recorded.

			FOR THE COUNTER PROPOSAL	AGAINST THE COUNTER PROPOSAL
Cllr.	Larry	Brennan		✓
Cllr.	Valerie	Byrne	✓	
Cllr.	Liam	Callaghan		✓
Cllr.	Ruth	Conboy		✓
Cllr.	Domnick	Connolly		✓
Cllr.	Tom	Crosby	Absent	
Cllr.	Leah	Cull	✓	
Cllr.	Nigel	Dineen	✓	
Cllr.	Valerie	Duffy		✓
Cllr.	Laurence	Fallon		✓
Cllr.	Paschal	Fitzmaurice		✓
Cllr.	Michéal	Frain	Absent	
Cllr.	Michael	Holland		✓
Cllr.	Emer	Kelly		✓
Cllr.	John	Keogh		✓
Cllr.	Marty	McDermott		✓
Cllr.	Sean	Moylan	Absent	
Cllr.	Tony	Ward	✓	
TOTAL			4	11

The Meetings Administrator stated the following:

The result of the vote is:

4 votes FOR the counter proposal

11 votes AGAINST the counter proposal

0 abstentions

3 marked as absent

The Cathaoirleach then stated: The counter proposal is defeated, and the original proposal is deemed as passed.

**Submission No. 42 – Mary Hennigan
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 43 – Rosemarie Hanley – (Sub 1 of 3) – c/o Foundation Management Consultants
(pertains to lands in Athleague)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No changes are recommended.

Members expressed the view that, if the proposed development were to proceed, that zoning should not act as a barrier to its future development.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fallon

SECONDED by Cllr. Kelly

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 44 – Rosemarie Hanley – (Sub 2 of 3) – c/o Foundation Management Consultants

(pertains to lands in Athleague)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Athleague Village Plan boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Duffy

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made.

Submission No. 45 – Killcorry Holdings c/o Rosemarie Hanley – (Sub 3 of 3)

c/o Foundation Management Consultants

(pertains to lands adjacent to Centre Point Retail Park, Roscommon)

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain zoned as Greenbelt.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion.

S6:26 Notice of Motion from Cllr. Dineen

Rezone the subject lands (identified in Sub no. 45) adjacent to Centre Point retail park, as Outer Core instead of Greenbelt

Please record the following proposed amendment in respect of Submission No. 45 – lands adjoining Centrepont Retail Park, Roscommon Town.

In considering Submission No. 45, this Council resolves to amend the Proposed Variation by changing the zoning of the subject lands adjoining Centrepont Retail Park from "Greenbelt" to "Outer Core".

Reasons:

- The subject lands occupy a logical and strategic location immediately adjoining the established Centrepont Retail Park, with Lidl directly to the north and existing commercial development forming the established character of this area.
- Roscommon Town is identified as a Key Town and is being planned for significant additional population and housing growth. Increased residential development must be accompanied by the appropriate provision of retail, commercial and other services necessary to serve both the existing and future population of the town.
- The proposed rezoning represents a modest extension of an established retail and commercial

area rather than the creation of a new or isolated commercial destination.

- The lands have the significant advantage of being directly accessible from the existing internal road network serving Centrepont Retail Park and are immediately adjoining existing developed and serviced lands.
- The proposed Outer Core zoning would not itself constitute permission for development. Any future development proposal would remain subject to the full planning application process, where matters including flood risk, finished floor levels, drainage, access, servicing, design and environmental considerations would be required to be comprehensively addressed.
- Retail and commercial development represents a less vulnerable land use in the context of flood risk assessment. Detailed site-specific assessment can therefore determine the nature, scale and design of development which may appropriately be accommodated on these lands.
- The existing Greenbelt designation should also be considered in the context of the established development pattern surrounding the site, with significant retail and commercial development already located immediately to the north and west.
- Having regard to the site's location immediately adjoining an established retail destination, existing access and infrastructure, the planned population growth of Roscommon Town and the ability to comprehensively assess any future development through the development management process, I consider that the appropriate zoning of the subject lands is Outer Core.

The Meetings Administrator read the following reply:

“This matter has been comprehensively addressed in the Chief Executive’s Report on the Submissions Received on Proposed Variation No. 1. (See CE response to submission No. 45).”

It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Conboy, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Callaghan that the CE recommendation be approved.

Cllr. Dineen entered a counter proposal. It was **PROPOSED** by Cllr. Dineen, **SECONDED** by Cllr. Ward, that the subject land be rezoned as ‘Outercore’.

The Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly stated the following: A vote will be taken on the counter proposal and if it passes it will defeat the original proposal. If the counter proposal is defeated, it will be deemed that the original proposal is passed.

The Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, stated the following:

The counter proposal is that the subject lands are rezoned as ‘Outercore’.

I will now conduct a vote by member in alphabetical order by surname. Please clearly state whether you are FOR or AGAINST the counter proposal. You are reminded to put on your microphone to ensure your vote is clearly recorded.

			FOR COUNTER PROPOSAL	THE AGAINST THE COUNTER PROPOSAL
Cllr.	Larry	Brennan		✓
Cllr.	Valerie	Byrne		✓
Cllr.	Liam	Callaghan		✓
Cllr.	Ruth	Conboy		✓
Cllr.	Domnick	Connolly		✓
Cllr.	Tom	Crosby	Absent	
Cllr.	Leah	Cull	✓	

Cllr.	Nigel	Dineen	✓	
Cllr.	Valerie	Duffy		✓
Cllr.	Laurence	Fallon		✓
Cllr.	Paschal	Fitzmaurice		✓
Cllr.	Michéal	Frain	Absent	
Cllr.	Michael	Holland	✓	
Cllr.	Emer	Kelly		✓
Cllr.	John	Keogh		✓
Cllr.	Marty	McDermott		✓
Cllr.	Sean	Moylan	Absent	
Cllr.	Tony	Ward	✓	
TOTAL			4	11

The Meetings Administrator stated the following:

The result of the vote is:

4 votes FOR the counter proposal

11 votes AGAINST the counter proposal

0 abstentions

3 marked as absent

The Cathaoirleach then stated: The counter proposal is defeated, and the original proposal is deemed as passed.

**Submission No. 47 – Windows and Rooflights Ltd. – c/o Brehony Sustainable Design
(pertains to lands at Circular Road, Ballaghaderreen)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Ballaghaderreen Settlement Plan boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. Brennan

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made. The subject lands should remain unzoned and outside the Ballaghaderreen Settlement Plan boundary.

**Submission No. 48 – Comhaltas Ceoltóirí Eireann – c/o Padhraicin Ui Mhuiris (Runai)
(Patricia Morris)
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 49 – Lisnamult Residents and Tenants Association – c/o Patricia Morris
(pertains to lands at Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 50 – Mulryan Construction Ltd. – c/o Brehony Sustainable Design
(pertains to lands adjacent to Abbey Haven Care Centre and Nursing Home, Boyle)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should remain as 'Community Infrastructure' as proposed in the Boyle Settlement Plan.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Byrne

SECONDED by Cllr. Holland

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made. The subject lands should remain as 'Community Infrastructure' as proposed in the *Boyle Settlement Plan*.

**Submission No. 51 – Goldcross Developments Ltd – c/o Foundation Management Consultants
(pertains to lands at Ardsallagh, Roscommon)**

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

No change is recommended. The subject lands should be zoned as proposed in the Roscommon Town Settlement Plan i.e. Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development.

Members noted that funding had been secured through the Housing Infrastructure Investment Fund (HIIF) to support the provision of infrastructure required to unlock the development potential of lands in this area. It was further noted that the zoning and development objectives for the area could be reviewed as part of the forthcoming County Development Plan process. Clarification was sought regarding the other settlements included in the Council's application under the HIIF scheme.

Mr. Keaveney advised that applications for funding under the HIIF had been submitted in respect of Roscommon Town and Monksland.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Conboy

SECONDED by Cllr. Fitzmaurice

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made. The subject lands should be zoned as proposed in the *Roscommon Town Settlement Plan* i.e. Long Term Strategic and Sustainable Development.

Submission No. 52 – Vincent O'Dowd c/o Cllr Leah Cull

The Director of Service provided a summary of the Chief Executive's Report on the submission and the Chief Executive's Recommendation as follows:

Chief Executive's Recommendation:

As per the Chief Executive's Recommendation in Submission No. 28 – No changes are recommended. The lands should remain unzoned and outside the Cortober Land Use Zoning Framework boundary.

The first portion of land mentioned in this submission was dealt with previously; there was no discussion on this submission.

Members noted that the matter could be reviewed further as part of the preparation of the next County Development Plan.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Keogh

SECONDED by Cllr. McDermott

It was **AGREED** that no changes would be made. The lands should remain unzoned and outside the Cortober Land Use Zoning Framework boundary.

**Submission No. 53 – Roscommon Men’s Shed – c/o Pádraig Nally
(pertains to Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 54 – Roscommon Heritage Group c/o Theresa Murray (Sub 1 of 2)
(pertains to Edenville House, Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

**Submission No. 55 – Roscommon Heritage Group c/o Theresa Murray (Sub 2 of 2)
(pertains to Residential Opportunity Site No. 3 in Roscommon)**

As this was dealt with previously, there was no discussion on this submission.

Cathaoirleach Cllr. Connolly advised that he had received a request from a Member and, in the interests of fair procedures, was prepared to allow the matter to be raised.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice, speaking on behalf of Cllr. Moylan, explained that a constituent in Boyle had sought to make a submission in relation to the Proposed Variation of the County Development Plan through a representative. However, the submission was not made in accordance with the prescribed submission process and, consequently, was not received by the Planning Department for consideration.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice requested that the matter be considered by the Members. Referring to the subject lands adjacent to Foxwood Manor in Boyle, he identified on the map presented to the meeting the request that the parcel of land marked “A” be zoned ‘Agriculture’ instead of the proposed ‘New Residential’ zoning and that the parcel marked “B” be zoned ‘New Residential’ instead of the proposed ‘Agriculture’ zoning.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Keogh

It was **AGREED** to accept this proposal.

113.26 NOTICES OF MOTION

113.26a S1:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. KEOGH

As noted earlier, Cllr. Keogh wished for this Notice of Motion to be adjourned to the September Plenary Meeting.

113.26b S2:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. CROSBY

As these were dealt with previously, there was no discussion on these Notice of Motions.

113.26c S3:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. FITZMAURICE

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion and reply.

Zone the subject lands at Ballindrumlea as New Residential

I wish to propose the following land in the map below with a yellow boundary at Ballindrumlea Castlereagh for new residential zoning. (This Notice of Motion was accompanied by a map identifying the specific portion of land.)

Reply:

As per the Section 28 *NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines for Planning Authorities*, Roscommon County Council has been assigned a specific annual housing growth requirement

of 392 units per annum. In addition, the Guidelines allow for 'additional provision' of up to 50% above this annual growth requirement. The revised Core Strategy and the associated land use zoning strategy as set out in *Proposed Variation No. 1* utilises the full extent of the 50% additional provision allowable, distributed to zoned settlements across the county, with the distribution appropriately maintaining a focus on facilitating a proportionately higher growth opportunity to areas of highest population and greatest housing demand.

The revised Castlerea Settlement Plan, in seeking to align with the above referenced and other applicable statutory Guidelines, has prioritised more centrally located and sequentially positioned lands, thereby ensuring consistency with national and regional planning policy objectives which seek to reduce urban sprawl, maximise the use of existing infrastructure and services, and support the sustainable growth of settlements.

Having regard to the location of the subject lands, their peripheral nature in the context of the settlement of Castlerea and the availability of alternative lands within the Settlement Plan boundary, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to consider zoning the subject lands as part of Variation No. 1. It is considered appropriate that the subject lands remain unzoned and outside the Castlerea Settlement Plan boundary at the present time.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice
SECONDED by Cllr. McDermott.

It was **AGREED** that the land in the map with a yellow boundary at Ballindrumlea Castlerea is zoned as 'New Residential' zoning.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion and reply.

Zone the subject lands at Arm Cashel as New Residential

I wish to propose the lands outlined in yellow in the map below at Arm Cashel for new residential zoning. (This Notice of Motion was accompanied by a map identifying the specific portion of land.)

Reply

As per the Section 28 *NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines for Planning Authorities*, Roscommon County Council has been assigned a specific annual housing growth requirement of 392 units per annum. In addition, the Guidelines allow for 'additional provision' of up to 50% above this annual growth requirement. The revised Core Strategy and the associated land use zoning strategy as set out in *Proposed Variation No. 1* utilises the full extent of the 50% additional provision allowable, distributed to zoned settlements across the county, with the distribution appropriately maintaining a focus on facilitating a proportionately higher growth opportunity to areas of highest population and greatest housing demand.

The revised Castlerea Settlement Plan, in seeking to align with the above referenced guidelines, has prioritised more centrally located and sequentially positioned lands, thereby ensuring consistency with national and regional planning policy objectives which seek to reduce urban sprawl, maximise the use of existing infrastructure and services, and support the sustainable growth of settlements.

A substantial extent of lands in Castlerea have already been identified for new residential growth within the current development plan period. There is no demonstrable evidence that the extent of lands already zoned and proposed to be zoned for 'New Residential' development in Castlerea are insufficient to

facilitate population growth and housing demand in the town over the remaining duration of this County Development Plan. It is also relevant to note that in addition to the 8.2 ha. of 'New Residential' lands identified in Castlerea, other significant opportunities to accommodate residential development continue to remain available in other land use zones (including 'Town Core', 'Outer Core' and 'Existing Residential' zones). Having regard to the location of the subject lands, remote from the Settlement Plan boundary, as well as the availability of alternative lands within the Settlement Plan boundary, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to consider zoning the subject lands as part of Variation No. 1. It is considered appropriate that the subject lands remain unzoned and outside the Castlerea Settlement Plan boundary.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Dineen

It was **AGREED** that the lands outlined in yellow in the map at Arm Cashel, Castlerea be zoned 'New Residential'.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion and reply.

Zone the subject lands at Knockroe for Strategic Residential Use

I wish to propose the lands outlined in yellow in the map below at Knockroe Castlerea for strategic residential reserve. (This Notice of Motion was accompanied by a map identifying the specific portion of land.)

Reply

The *Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2022) provide for the identification of longer-term development areas and strategic development sites for future growth, particularly where additional infrastructure provision may be required. The Guidelines however also emphasise that the zoning of residential land should be aligned with Core Strategy requirements and housing need, with priority afforded to serviced and serviceable lands capable of delivering housing within the plan period.

In addition, having regard to the current *NPF Implementation: Housing Growth Requirements Guidelines for Planning Authorities* wherein reference is made to the potential to identify 'Long-Term Strategic and Sustainable Development Sites/Opportunity Areas' it is explicitly set out that the identification of such lands "should be focused on the five cities and Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan areas, designated Regional Growth Centres, and designated Key Growth Centres." Castlerea does not therefore come within scope for the identification of future strategic residential development areas.

Cllr. Fitzmaurice noted that a number of towns in County Mayo with populations comparable to Castlerea had been allocated Strategic Residential Reserve lands. He expressed the view that a similar approach should be considered for Castlerea in order to support future growth and housing development opportunities.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Conboy

It was **AGREED** that the lands outlined in yellow in the map at Knockroe Castlerea are zoned as 'strategic residential reserve'.

Meetings Administrator, Ms. Karen Hanley, read the following Notice of Motion and reply.

Consider drainage works on River Jiggy and its tributaries while assessing lands identified as flood zones

I also request the planning authority take into consideration recent drainage works on the River Jiggy and its tributaries in their assessment of lands identified as flood zones in Roscommon Town. (This Notice of Motion was accompanied by a map identifying the specific portion of land.)

Reply

Flood Zones are identified nationally by the Office of Public Works under the National Catchment-based Flood Risk Assessment and Management (CFRAM) Programme. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRA) prepared at county / settlement level in the course of plan preparation reflect the nationally identified flood zones and are required to be prepared in accordance with *The Planning System and Flood Risk Management -Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2009) as issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

Cllr. Fitzmaurice advised that he was prepared to withdraw the Notice of Motion, having regard to the earlier decision to defer Cllr. Keogh's Notice of Motion to the September Plenary Meeting, where the matter could be considered further.

Following the conclusion of the discussion on Notice of Motion 3.26 Cllr. Fitzmaurice referred to Amendment 77 (ii) in the Proposed Variation No. 1 proposing to "*Change unzoned land off the R-361 (Trien Road) to 'New Residential' on the portion closest to the road and 'Agriculture' on the remaining portion to the rear*". He proposed instead that it would all remain zoned as 'Agriculture'.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Dineen

It was **AGREED** that it would all remain zoned as 'Agriculture'.

Ms. Grier sought confirmation from Members that there was agreement in respect of the remaining proposals contained within the Proposed Variation No. 1 as published for public consultation.

On the **PROPOSAL** of Cllr. Fitzmaurice

SECONDED by Cllr. Dineen

It was **AGREED** that the remaining proposals in Proposed Variation No. 1 are approved.

113.26d S4:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. BRENNAN

As these were dealt with previously, there was no discussion on these Notice of Motions.

113.26e S5:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. MCDERMOTT

As these were dealt with previously, there was no discussion on these Notice of Motions.

113.26f S6:26 NOTICE OF MOTION FROM CLLR. DINEEN

As these were dealt with previously, there was no discussion on these Notice of Motions.

This concluded the business of the Special Meeting.

The foregoing Minutes are Confirmed and Signed:



Meetings Administrator

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Karen Hanley". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'K'.

Countersigned

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Domhnall Connolly". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'D'.

Cathaoirleach