



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of 2nd Meeting ABP-304428-19

Case Reference / Description	ABP-304428-19 Integrated waste management facility at Hollywood Great, Nag's Head, Naul, Co. Dublin.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	2 nd		
Date	14/10/19	Time	2.30 – 3.10 p.m..

Attendees

Representing An Bord Pleanála

Anne Marie O'Connor, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)

Breda Gannon, Senior Planning Inspector

Rob Mac Giollarnáth, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant

Cian O'Hora, IMS

Des Johnson, Planning Consultant

Paul Chadwick, RPS

Introduction:

The Board will keep a record of this meeting and any other meetings, if held. Such records will form part of the file which will be made available publicly at the conclusion of the process. The record of the meeting will not be amended by the Board once finalised, but the prospective applicant may submit comments on the record which will form part of the case file.

The Boards representatives stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the most appropriate mechanism for a new application e.g under section 146(B) of the Act, or, whether a new SID application is required in respect of the proposed development.

Background

Planning permission had previously been granted permission for a landfill facility by the Board in June 2011(06F.PA0018). Subsequently, the duration of the planning permission was extended by Fingal County Council for a further 5 years up until June, 2021.

Issue no. 1

The Board's representatives raised the question of the legal standing of the previous SID application which had no appropriate period specified, and which was extended by Fingal Co. Council under Section 42 Planning and Development Act. The prospective applicant might wish to seek a legal opinion as to the appropriateness of seeking an extension of the duration of the permission from Fingal County Council as opposed to seeking it from An Bord Pleanála. There might be an issue as to whether or not the existing permission was extant, and whether the section 146(B) process is open to the prospective applicants.

Issue no. 2

The Boards representatives also noted the expiry date of the extended permission and queried whether sufficient time remained to implement a permission. It noted that if the section 146(B) route was pursued, and a revised EIA required, the timelines for processing an application under section 146(C) would not be dissimilar from a SID application. If such a situation were to occur the prospective applicant might in

fact prefer to lodge a new application. In response to this issue the prospective applicant noted that in such a scenario it might be preferable, from their point of view, to stay within the confines of S.146(C) as the principle of development would be established

Conclusion:

The prospective applicant indicated that they would consider the issues raised and respond accordingly. The record of the instant meeting will issue in the meantime and the prospective applicant may submit any comments it has on this in writing.



Anne Marie O'Connor

Assistant Director of Planning