



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting
ABP- 315809-23
5th meeting

Case Reference / Description	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 / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	5 th		
Date	23 rd January 2024	Start Time	10:00am
Location	1 st Floor Meeting Room & Microsoft Teams	End Time	11:50am

Representing An Bord Pleanála
Stephen Kay, Assistant Director of Planning
Deirdre MacGabhann, Senior Planning Inspector (Remote)
Marcella Doyle, Senior Administrative Officer
Nichola Meehan, Senior Executive Officer (Remote)
Ashling Doherty, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant
Lis Royal, CWP
Jerry Barnes, CWP
Callum Draper, CWP
Sybil Berne, MDB
Fiona Campbell, CWP
Sean Leake, CWP
Alan Roberts, A&L Goodbody
Richard Hamilton, MDB

The meeting commenced at 10:00am

Introduction

The Boards representatives referred to the previous meeting with the prospective applicant on 19th December 2023 and confirmed the record of this meeting will be issued to them in the coming days.

Discussion:

The Boards representatives began the meeting by addressing the procedures involved in submitting a planning application for the proposed development to the Board under section 291 of the Planning and Development Act 2021, as amended.

The Boards representatives stated that an application can only be lodged following consultation with An Bord Pleanála under section 287/287A of the Planning and Development Act 2000, (as amended).

The Board's representatives advised the prospective applicant of the following procedures:

- An application form must be submitted with the application.
- Public notices must contain the full development description. If an Environmental Impact Assessment Report or Natura Impact Statement is required, this must be included in the public notices. Reference to Transboundary, Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations

(COMAH) and any EPA licence for dumping at sea (if relevant) must also be included.

- The application must be advertised in two newspapers, which includes one national newspaper.
- Sample public notices have been provided to the applicant.
- Advised that any site notice should be placed close to the landing point of the proposed development if feasible.
- The Board can check dates of the public notices, if necessary, prior to publication.
- Two hardcopies of the application and eight soft copies of the application must be submitted to the Board. The Board would also like the flexibility to request further copies of the application if necessary.
- Five hardcopies and two softcopies of the application must be submitted to the coastal planning authorities. The documentation must be available for inspection at their offices.
- A standalone website must be provided with all of the application documentation and stay live for the duration of the time with the Board and after for the Judicial Review period. The website should be a replica of the documentation submitted in hard copy format and must not be updated unless requested by the Board to do so.
- The prospective applicant must ensure the application is submitted to the Board and the coastal planning authorities shortly after the publication of the notices.
- A period of eight weeks from the date the documents become available for public inspection must be provided in the notices to allow the public to make submissions on the application.
- Prescribed bodies must be given the same timeline of 8 weeks for the making of submissions. A sample notice was provided to the prospective applicant for this also.
- A list of any other public notice given or other public consultations conducted by the applicant and an indication of the date or dates of such additional notice or consultations. All letters notifying the coastal

planning authority and prescribed bodies must be included in the application.

- A copy of the opinion provided by the Board under section 287B(2) of the Act.
- The application must be consistent with the opinion issued by the Board under section 287B of the Act.
- The fee for lodging an application has yet to be confirmed. The Boards representatives noted that once a decision is made by the department on the fee then there will need to be an 8 week public consultation period before it is confirmed however the lack of clarity on a fee does not act to prevent the submission of an application.

The prospective applicant asked as to whether site notices would be required to which the Boards representative confirmed that there is no requirement in the legislation for site notices but that in the event that site notices are proposed to be erected the site notices should be located where the offshore meets the onshore elements, if possible. The Board's representatives clarified that there is no requirement for public display, apart from via the development website.

The Boards representatives confirmed that as part of the notification of the closure of the pre application consultation under section 287 the Board will provide a list of coastal planning authorities that should be notified of the application. It was also stated that while Fingal County Council may not be a coastal planning authority, they may be listed as a Prescribed Body.

The Boards representatives confirmed that a list of the Transboundary States along with contact details will also be provided as part of the notification of closure of the pre application consultation.

The prospective applicant discussed form number 22 and asked if it would be acceptable to append the s287 table or would the information be required to be entered into the form under section 7. The Boards representative stated that the form should be used if feasible. The Boards representatives stated the Inspectors report will cover the 287A request and the reasons for their decision will be clarified in the

direction. The prospective applicant highlighted the volume of documentation and the requirement to issue coastal planning authorities 5 copies of the application. The Board's representatives stated that contact can be made with the coastal planning authorities to seek clarification if 5 copies are required or if some soft copies would suffice.

The Boards representative confirmed that it requires a list of landowners who have consented to the proposed development, but the Board would not require individual letters to be submitted. It is noted that a grant of permission does not mean the development can proceed without the consent of the landowners.

The Boards representatives noted that for complete transparency there should be no confidential or redacted information and all documents submitted will be made available for public inspection.

A discussion was held regarding the drawings to be submitted by the prospective applicant where the Board advised to use the standardized drawing scales and to indicate the MAC boundary, where possible. The prospective applicant stated there may be some practical difficulties in standardizing the maps, but it will be something they will take note of. The Boards representatives also suggested to applying a different colour to indicate the MAC boundary and recommended submitting a comparative document showing what the 2 design layout options will look like. The prospective applicant raised concerns that to show the two layouts on one drawing may be misleading.

The Board's representatives advised that detailed drawings should be provided for details of turbine options sought, consistent with the section 287A request.

The prospective applicant stated that cable protection will vary in location and depth depending on the turbine location.

The prospective applicant indicated that some minor details of the offshore substations would be omitted e.g. external staircase. The Boards representatives stated that any absence of detail needs to be clearly justified. It was also stated that

contextual drawings should be provided for onshore and offshore elements, so that the relative scale of the development can be clearly understood.

The Board representatives highlighted how it would be useful to have a drawing which set out the options for the cable and the approach to the landfall point. The Board's representatives also stated that limits of deviation need to be reflected in submitted drawings.

A discussion was held around the application and how the Board would approach any uncertainty in the application. The prospective applicant stated they would be in favour of oral hearings or a FI request if it meant resolving any issues that may be presented in the application. **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.

The meeting concluded at 11:50am



Stephen Kay

Assistant Director of Planning