

## Record of Meeting ABP-315809-23 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting

Case Reference / Description	ABP-315809-23 - Proposed development of Codling Wind Park, an offshore wind farm in the Irish Sea, located in the Codling Bank, approximately 13-22 kilometres off the coast of County Wicklow, between Greystones and Wicklow Town.		
Case Type	Marine pre-application consultation under Section 287		
1st / 2 <sup>nd</sup> / 3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting	2 <sup>nd</sup>		
Date	22 <sup>nd</sup> August 2023	Start Time	11:00am
Location	Offices of An Bord Pleanála	End Time	12:00pm

Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Ciara Kellett, Director of Planning (Chair)		
Stephen Kay, Assistant Director of Planning		
Deirdre MacGabhann, Planning Inspector		
Eugene Nixon, Consultant		
Marcella Doyle, Senior Administrative Officer		
Cora Cunningham, Senior Executive Officer		
Barbara White, Administrative Assistant		

Re	epresenting the Prospective Applicant
Lis	s Royle, CWP
Se	ean Leake, CWP

Fiona Campbell, CWP	
Callum Draper, CWP	
Jerry Barnes, MacCabe, Durney, Barnes	
Brendan Curran, A&L Goodbody	

The meeting commenced at 11:00am.

The Board's representatives began the meeting by referring to its previous meeting with the prospective applicant on the 6<sup>th</sup> June 2023 and moved on to discuss the presentation submitted for this meeting.

## Presentation by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant began their presentation by giving the Board's representatives an update on the project since the last meeting.

This is the largest Phase 1 marine project which will have a capacity of up to 1450MW. The proposed development is to be located between Greystones and Wicklow with the grid connection at Poolbeg which Eirgrid has confirmed.

Wind Turbine Generators (WTG) layout options: there are currently 2 proposed design options. Option  $A - 75 \times 250 m$  Rotor Diameter (RD) WTG or Option  $B - 60 \times 276 m$  RD WTG with 3 offshore substations. Since 2005, when the wind farm on the northern part of the site was consented with c.220 turbines, the design of the proposed development has been refined allowing for a decrease in the numbers of WTG required. This decrease has been made possible mainly due to developments in technology.

In a 2019 project review it was proposed to construct 140 turbines which was reduced to 100 in January 2023 and further reduced to 75 in June 2023.

Two public consultations where held and feedback has been received from local stakeholders, which has assisted in guiding the design process also.

The prospective applicant enquired if the documentation submitted so far was acceptable (size of drawings submitted). The Board's representatives advised that the drawings submitted thus far were acceptable.

Onshore development boundary: The prospective applicant aims to align their planning application with the Dublin Port Company's (DPC) 3FM planning application, as the onshore element of the project is adjacent to the 3FM project. Engagements with DPC are ongoing.

As per slide 5 of the presentation it was noted that it is not proposed to develop the area outside the main construction compound, however there is a requirement for approximately 1.5ha for a laydown area. The prospective applicant is liaising with DPC to obtain agreement regarding the additional 1.5ha likely to be located in the area hatched red, slide 5.

The prospective applicant is currently considering whether there may be a need to update the Maritime Area Consent (MAC), but noted work is ongoing in this regard.

NPWS: The prospective applicant contacted the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS), but no meetings have been organised so far. The prospective applicant also noted that Wind Energy Ireland (WEI) had met recently with the NPWS and has provided them with documents from each of the Phase 1 projects. The last update from NPWS stated they will respond to the prospective applicant regarding the methodology related to Ornithology assessments within six weeks and any comments from the NPWS would be welcomed.

Consultation and cumulative impact assessment: The Board's representatives enquired if there were any updates in relation to the fisheries and community benefit funds. The prospective applicant responded that there has been engagement with local fishers, which is ongoing along with the Terms of Reference for a fisheries fund. They further noted the community benefit fund will be guided by the Offshore Renewable Energy Support Scheme (ORESS) community benefit fund guidelines and its development is ongoing also.

The prospective applicant also noted that there is ongoing collaboration and data sharing with other Phase 1 marine projects in terms of cumulative effects, mitigation and data regarding marine mammals. The prospective applicant is confident that Codling Wind Park remains acceptable and retains European site integrity. The principal focus is on ornithological sites currently.

The prospective applicant stated that they were extending the 3 months cut-off for cumulative effects to 6 months, to ensure there is enough time to collate the datasets. This was noted by the Board's representatives, in the context that the Board, if necessary, could seek further information.

Transboundary issues: the prospective applicant stated Northern Ireland, the United Kingdom and the Isle of Man were contacted in relation to the project. It was noted Northern Ireland had responded and are satisfied with the plans. The prospective applicant has contacted approximately 12 other transboundary stakeholders including UK vessels, shipping navigation firms and the UK Defence Organisation. The Board's representatives requested the prospective applicant provide the Board with the names and contact details of the transboundary stakeholders they had contacted. The prospective applicant indicated they would provide these details.

Planning authorities: Fingal County Council (FCC) has been formally contacted by the prospective applicant however FCC has had only minimal engagement with the project team so far. The prospective applicant also contacted Dublin City Council, Wicklow County Council and Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, who they believe are the main coastal planning authorities affected by this project. The Board's representatives stated they will inform the prospective applicant, if any additional bodies need to be notified.

Dumping at sea: The Board's representatives asked for an update in relation to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regarding the dumping at sea requirements. The prospective applicant advised they had contacted the EPA on this issue and were advised following their application to the Board, they would need to then submit an application to the EPA in relation to this item. It was noted that any requirement for dumping at sea licence may need to be included in the public notice.

Timeline: The prospective applicant is proposing to submit the application as soon as possible, however there may be a requirement for a further meeting towards the end of September in order to clarify some details. Ideally, they wish to submit the entire proposed development in just one application. It was pointed out that the provisions of the Historic and Archaeological Heritage Bill provides for only one application for the entire project to be made under section 291 of the Act. However,

the prospective applicant was reminded to review the progress of the Bill in terms of the timing of the making the application.

Special Protection Areas (SPA): The Board's representatives referred to the most recent candidate SPA and stated that any environmental effects on this should be addressed. It was noted that designation of the SPA is underpinned by a characterised dataset, but data currently gathered indicates there would be limited implications for the proposed development. The candidate SPA is to be included in NIS.

Ecological Sensitivity Analysis of the western Irish Sea: The prospective applicant stated that the sensitive areas (identified in the Department's publication) which overlaps with the project site, are the areas with the lowest sensitivity, but it was noted this will be addressed in the application.

National Marine Planning Framework (NMPF): The Board's representatives stated that there are 92 policies contained within this framework and it would be optimal for the prospective applicant to systematically assess the application on the basis of each of these policies. The prospective applicant enquired if they would be required to review the application against all 92 policies and the Board's representatives noted that this would be advisable, for example in a grouped or table format with references to appendices or reports, and to use the best available data and science in the assessment. This is to ensure a thorough and robust application is submitted. The prospective applicant noted that a comprehensive Statement of Consistency will be prepared.

Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA): The Board's representatives enquired what approach was being taken with regard to alternatives, including site selection. The prospective applicant stated that alternatives would be addressed in a standalone chapter, supported by appendices. The overall aim in site selection/alternatives is to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

Seveso sites: The Board's representatives referred to the COMAH Regulations 2015, and advised that if applicable, this needs to be included in the public notices. The prospective applicant noted there were some Seveso sites identified and that they would be liaising with the Health and Safety Authority (HSA) regarding this. The

Board's representatives in turn stated they would also consult with the HSA in relation to this matter once the application was submitted.

Other matters: The Board's representatives asked the prospective applicant if they had any other matters they wished to discuss. The prospective applicant noted they had one item they wished to clarify from the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting record. It was noted the prospective applicant agreed to sharing and aligning assessment methods and some data sets, but as they are still engaged in a competitive process, there would be limited sharing data with other Phase 1 marine projects.

## 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 Board will revert to the prospective applicant in relation to scheduling a further meeting.

The meeting concluded at 12:00pm.

Ciara Kellett

**Director of Planning**