



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-319699-24

Case Reference / Description	ABP-319699-24 - Proposed development of 110kV ESB supply, 110kV underground cable network and 110kV substation. Lands at the Guinness Brewery, bounded by James's Street, Watling Street, Victoria Quay and Steeven's Lane, Dublin 8		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Date	20 th June 2024	Start Time	11:00am
Location	MS Teams	End Time	11:25am

Representing An Bord Pleanála
Paul Caprani (Assistant Planning Director) Chair
Rachel Gleave O'Connor (Senior Planning Inspector)
Ellen Moss (Executive Officer)

Representing the Prospective Applicant
Brian Coughlan (John Spain Associates)
Shannon Green (Diageo)
Vicky Landy (RKD)
Aislinn Tate (JAE Engineering)
Michael O'Brien (ARUP)
Kevin O'Regan (Molone O'Regan)

Introduction

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant on the 9th May 2024, requesting pre-application consultations under section 182A of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, 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 that it wished to receive advice on from the Board. The Board's representatives mentioned the following general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process:

- 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 in any legal proceedings.

Presentation made by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant began their presentation by briefly introducing the proposed development. The proposed site is located south of James's Street and west of Stephens Lane.

The proposed development would transform energy and water use at the 264-year-old Guinness brewery at St James Gate. The prospective applicant aims for this site to be one of the most efficient breweries in the world. The proposed development would target an improvement in water use efficiency and would reduce the water used to brew Guinness by 30% by using a water treatment plant onsite. The prospective applicant's aim is to achieve a net zero carbon footprint by 2030.

The prospective applicant provided information regarding the specific proposal. The proposed development would include a new 110-kilovolt ESB meter and isolation room to accept the 110-kilovolt power supply, a new 110-kilovolt underground supply from the ESB meter room to a new 110-kilovolt—10-kilovolt substation to the east, and an onsite 110 kilovolt—10-kilovolt substation transformer unit.

The prospective applicant advised that they consider the proposed development not to be a strategic infrastructure development. The metre and isolation room and the 110-kilovolt—10-kilovolt transformer units are intended to distribute the electrical load to an end user (Diageo) and will not function as part of the national grid or act as a new node to the system.

Discussion:

The prospective applicant's submission, made reference to a Board's decision in case of a similar development at St Vincents Hospital (Register Reference ABP 316225-23) where the inspector concluded that the proposal would form part of the electricity distribution network rather than the transmission network, and therefore did not fall within the provisions of 182A. In this instance the Board, in its decision, confirmed that the proposal did not constitute SID. On this basis, the prospective applicant contended that the proposal which is the subject of the current pre-application consultation, did not constitute SID. The Board's representatives, while acknowledging this decision, made reference to other cases where the Board determined that projects of this nature did fall under the provisions of 182A and therefore did constitute SID. In this regard reference was made to the Board's determination of Reg Ref. ABP 313680-22. The prospective applicant was requested to note that the inspectors report in the case of Reg Ref. ABP- 313680-22 referenced numerous precedents where the Board came to the conclusion that projects, such as that currently before the Board, did fall within the scope of S.182A and therefore did constitute SID. The Boards representatives therefore advised that this is not a straightforward case and that the Board's representatives may not be able to provide a definitive preliminary opinion as to whether or not the proposal falls within the provisions of 182A of the Act at this meeting. However, they reminded the prospective applicant that the Board will make the final decision in relation to the question before it.

The Boards representatives queried if the electrical infrastructure would be visible from the public thoroughfares surrounding the site?. The prospective applicant advised that they have survey drawings from Stephens Lane. The height of the wall is seven meters, and the structure would be four and a half metres, so it would be completely concealed.

The Boards representatives mentioned that the red line boundary must be pinned down. If any buildings are required to be demolished as part of the application, these structures should be included within the red-boundary line. The application should also include the current use of any building being demolished.

When asked, by the prospective applicant, as whether or not it would be possible to find out what the initial view of the inspector might be with regard to the SID status of the case, prior to the recommendation being sent to the Board, the prospective applicant was informed that this would not be possible.

Conclusion:

The Board's representatives advised that the onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Board's representatives advised that the record of the instant meeting will be issued in the meantime and that 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 Meeting concluded at 11:25.



Paul Caprani

Assistant Director of Planning