

Record of Meeting ABP-314612-22 1st meeting

Case Reference / Description	Integrated Waste facility with a waste acceptance of up to 250,000 tonnes per annum. 1 & 2 Kylemore Business Park, Kylemore Way, Dublin 8.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3 rd Meeting	1st		
Date	27/10/22	Start Time	11.00 a.m.
Location	N/A	End Time	11.55 a.m.

Representing An Bord Pleanála			
Stephen Kay, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)			
Kevin Moore, Senior Planning Inspector			
Niamh Thornton, Executive Officer			
Representing the Prospective Applicant			
Shaun Thorpe, Marlet Property Group			
Cian O'Hora, Integrated Material Solutions			

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant requesting pre-application consultations and advised the prospective applicant that the instant meeting essentially constituted an information-gathering exercise for the Board; it also invited the prospective applicant to outline the nature of the proposed development and to highlight any matters it wished to receive advice on from the Board. The Board mentioned general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process as follows:

- 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 Board will serve notice at the conclusion of the process as to the strategic infrastructure status of the proposed development. It may form a preliminary view at an early stage in the process on the matter.
- A further meeting or meetings may be held in respect of the proposed development.
- Further information may be requested by the Board and public consultations may also be directed by the Board.
- The Board may hold consultations in respect of the proposed development with other bodies.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Board in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or any legal proceedings.

ABP-314612-22 An Bord Pleanála Page 2 of 6

Presentation by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant opened its presentation by giving an overview of the current status of activities on the site. The prospective applicant referred to two buildings. Building one, the smaller of the buildings received planning permission recently from Dublin City Council, under reference 3289/21 for a waste facility of up to 50,000 tonnes per annum. It is proposed that this building will handle packaging waste and some construction and demolition waste.

Building two is currently in use as an industrial building/warehouse, operated by Jamestown Metals, producers of rolled lead and hard metals. The prospective applicant stated that Jamestown Metals will be leaving this building.

The proposed development consists of an integrated waste management facility, accepting up to 250,000 tonnes per annum. The prospective applicant stated that the capacity will be set in accordance with the capacity of local infrastructure, primarily the local roads infrastructure.

It was stated that the types of waste to be accepted to the proposed facility has not been finalised and that there are several waste streams within the Greater Dublin Area requiring extra capacity. It was also stated that some facilities currently in operation are on lands which have been re-zoned, reducing the possibility of capacity increases at these facilities.

The prospective applicant stated that, for these reasons, the proposed development is of strategic and economic importance to the State and Greater Dublin Area. The prospective applicant stated that it considers the proposed development is SID.

Discussion:

The prospective applicant confirmed, when asked by the Board's representatives, that the smaller building referred to in the presentation is No. 2 Kylemore Business Park.

In response to a query by the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant confirmed that it does not yet have a definitive breakdown of the wastes or volumes

of various wastes to be processed on site. The prospective applicant stated that it could prepare a document providing further detail on this.

A discussion was had on the kinds of waste it is envisaged will be handled in the proposed facility, including hazardous waste, municipal solid waste and liquid wastes.

Regarding hazardous waste, the prospective applicant clarified that it is envisaged that this will include packaging waste with hazardous residue, contaminated soil, and asbestos containing cement. Regarding hazardous waste, it was stated that this processing will take place in the smaller building and will not be a majority of waste processed on site. It was clarified that hazardous waste will make up between 30,000 - 50,000 tonnes per annum.

Regarding municipal solid waste, it was stated that this kind of waste could come to the proposed facility for separation prior to incineration.

The prospective applicant explained the process that will be involved in the separation of hazardous liquids on site, involving separation tanks. It was clarified that after the separation process, non-hazardous water will be discharged into the sewer system and the remaining contaminated water will be transferred offsite for further treatment. Irish Water has confirmed feasibility to discharge from the site, however some upgrades will be required to the wastewater network, at the prospective applicant's expense. Details of required upgrades will be confirmed at connection offer stage, however, the prospective applicant has been informed that the works will not be significant. A maximum cost of €100,000 was referenced.

The prospective applicant stated that the site lends itself to a number of different waste types and the mix of wastes to be accepted will be based on national requirements and will include a mix of technologies.

The prospective applicant confirmed that building works are near completion at the smaller building and it is intended that waste will begin to be processed here by the end of the year.

Regarding proposed construction works/modifications to buildings it was stated that these will be relatively minor with the installation of picking lines and separation tanks and changes to doors.

ABP-314612-22 An Bord Pleanála Page 4 of 6

In relation to traffic, the prospective applicant stated that this assessment would be a scaling up process relative to the existing permitted waste facility development on the site. It is envisaged that the proposed facility will increase the current projected volumes of traffic to the site by approximately a factor of five, however a detailed Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) regarding the proposed development has not yet been undertaken. Regarding the haul route, it was clarified that the facility will be accessed by using the M50 and existing road network. Some trucks coming from Dublin City will not use the M50. The Board's representatives advised that a traffic impact assessment will be required with junction capacities examined.

The prospective applicant stated that relevant information from the TIA, undertaken in 2021, showing routes and junction capacity can be supplied to the Board for information. It was stated that another TIA would be undertaken for this project.

The Board's representatives raised the issue of zoning. The site in question is zoned objective Z6 under the provisions of the existing 2016-2022 Dublin City Development Plan and that this zoning is not proposed to change under the 2022-2028 Draft Plan. However, the Board representatives noted that currently a waste facility is not identified as either a Normally Permissible or Open for Consideration use on lands zoned Objective Z6 and that this would remain the position under the Draft Plan. The Board's representatives further noted that the 2022-2028 Draft Development Plan proposes a change such that uses not identified as Normally Permissible or Open for Consideration will be deemed Not Permitted on lands zoned Objective Z6. The Board's representatives advised that this issue will have to be addressed in any application.

Regarding the question of whether the proposed development is SID, the Board's representatives stated that the proposed tonnage of 250,000 per annum is above the 7th schedule threshold. It was noted that the prospective applicant had stated in the documentation already submitted to the Board that the proposed development meets two of the criteria for SID, strategic economic/social importance to the state/region and that it would have a significant effect on more than one panning authority.

The Board's representatives advised the prospective applicant to provide the Board with a comment on the third test, whether the proposed development would contribute substantially to the fulfilment of any of the objectives of the National

Planning Framework or in any regional spatial and economic strategy in respect of the area or areas in which the development would be situated.

The prospective applicant stated that it intends to make an application in Q1 of 2023.

The Board's representatives gave their preliminary opinion that the proposed development is SID. The final decision, however, is for the Board to make.

It was agreed that the prospective applicant would provide the Board with further information in relation to a number of items discussed at the instant meeting including waste types and tonnage breakdown, further information on traffic and haul routes, commentary on zoning and commentary on the third SID test.

Conclusion:

The record of the instant meeting will issue in due course and the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting. The onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process.

The meeting concluded at 11.55 p.m.

Stephen Kay

Assistant Director of Planning

Stephen Lay.