

An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-321066-24 1st meeting

Description	ABP-318886-24 – Proposed development of a washing plant at Kilsaran's material recovery facility		
Case Type	Pre-application Consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	1 st Meeting		
Venue	Virtually by Microsoft Teams		
Date	19/12/24	Time	11:00am - 11:35am

Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Stephen Kay, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)		
Philip Davis, Senior Planning Inspector		
Lauren Griffin, Executive Officer	lauren.griffin@pleanala.ie	01-8737244
Kevin McGettigan	k.mcgettigan@pleanala.ie	01-8737263
Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Valerie Brennan - Valerie.Brennan@rps.tetrattech.com		
Carlos Laragonzalez - Carlos.Laragonzalez@rps.tetrattech.com		
Liam Murphy - Liam.Murphy@Kilsaran.ie		
Eftim Ivanoff - Eftim.Ivanoff@Kilsaran.ie		
Shane Dolan - Kilsaran Concrete Unlimited Company		

Introduction:

The Board welcomed the prospective applicant to the meeting and introduced those attending from the Board.

The Board 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

The prospective applicant introduced those attending the meeting and began the presentation. The following matters were presented:

The prospective applicant stated the reason for the consultation meeting was to seek a determination on whether the proposed development came under a class of development included within the Seventh Schedule and whether the development could be considered strategic infrastructure with respect to Section 37(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The prospective applicant continued with further description of the proposed development, detailing that Kilsaran Concrete were operating a materials recovery facility located within the former Tullykane quarry as part of the permitted works to restore the inactive quarry. The prospective applicant noted the overall site was 51.44 hectares, the proposed soil washing plant would occupy 0.53 hectares or 1% of the total site.

The prospective applicant noted that the permitted development on the site was for the restoration of the existing excavated quarry granted permission under ABP ref. PL17.119097 which permitted the infilling of the quarry by the importation of 5.6 million tonnes of inert soil and stone material over a 14 year period and the construction of a community park and playing pitch and other associated works.

The prospective applicant detailed the proposed development comprised of a new soil-washing plant facility with a processing capacity of 200,000 tonnes per annum. The prospective applicant noted the proposed development would not cause an increase to the volume of materials coming to the site, or the number of vehicle movements to and from the site, and the materials are inert. The prospective applicant stated recovered products would be sent back out from the site in backloads. The prospective applicant noted the proposed development would take 6-12 months to construct and would not need an NIS.

The prospective applicant stated the proposed development was needed to meet the increasing demand for waste recovery and to meet national waste reuse and recycling targets.

The prospective applicants stated that the existing facility on site is licenced by the EPA as a soil recovery facility.

The prospective applicant stated that it was their opinion that the proposed development may come within the scope of development set out in the Seventh Schedule to the Planning and Development Act being a soil washing facility for both non waste and waste with a capacity of greater than 100,000 tonnes per annum and therefore such that it might come within the following class:

‘An installation for the disposal, treatment or recovery of waste with a capacity for an annual intake greater than 100,000 tonnes’.

The prospective applicant stated that it was their opinion that the proposed development would not fall under the categories of a development included within Section 37(A)(2) of the Act. The following points were raised in this regard:

Criteria 1 – The development is deemed not to be of strategic economic or social importance to the state or region. The proposed development is not required in order to implement the existing permission for infilling of the site and the washing plant is not considered to be of such a scale that it would be of strategic economic importance to the state or region.

Criteria 2 – There were no specific aims/objectives set out in the National Planning Framework to facilitate the planning and development of a soil waste recovery facility. While the proposed development could be seen to be consistent with NPO56 of the RSES it is submitted that the scale and nature of the proposed development is not such that it would contribute significantly to the fulfillment of this objective.

Criteria 3 – The proposed development would be located entirely in Meath County Council and would not therefore have a significant effect on the area of more than one planning authority. ~~8~~

In conclusion the prospective applicant considered that the subject proposal did not qualify as SID as it did not meet any of the criteria set out in Section 37(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Discussion:


The Board's representatives asked the following questions:

- The Board's representatives sought clarification that the total volume or nature of the material being brought to the site would not change on foot of the proposed development. In response, the prospective applicant stated that the total volume of material to be brought to the site would not exceed 400,000 tonnes per annum and that the nature and source of this material would be the same as is currently accepted at the site.
- The prospective applicant stated that of the proposed 200,000 tonnes of material to be accepted at the soil washing plant it is estimated that c.150,000 tonnes could be recovered. In response to a question from the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant stated that this could mean that the quarry void may not be filled within the 14 year lifespan of the existing permission.
- The prospective applicant stated that the recovered material would be transported off site in backloads and that this material would be moved to the Kilsaran base at Piercetown, c.20km from the site. The prospective applicants also stated that there was a washing facility for cleaning vehicles prior to reloading with material from the wash plant.
- The prospective applicants stated that the input to the washing plant is going to comprise material that can be categorised as both 'waste' and 'non waste'. No estimate for the breakdown between waste and non waste was provided by the prospective applicants.
- The Board's representatives noted that the site was the subject of an existing EPA licence and asked if a new licence would be required. The prospective applicant stated that a new licence would not be required.
- In response to a question from the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant stated that there is an existing water source on the site and that the wash plant would be able to recycle c.95 percent of the water used in the washing process. It was therefore stated that the water usage for the proposed development would be low.
- The Board's representatives asked if the prospective applicant had been in consultations with the local authority. In response, the prospective applicant stated that they had and that the local authority had advised them to enter into pre-application consultation with the Board.

- The prospective applicant stated an appropriate assessment is being prepared.
- In response to a question as to whether there would there be an increase of material coming through the facility in the event of the proposed development being undertaken, the prospective applicant noted that the proposed development would not cause an increase to the volume of materials coming to the site beyond that already permitted.
-
- With regard to the volume of material proposed to be accepted by the wash plant relative to the recovery of such material at national or regional scale, the prospective applicant stated that the national figure for recycling of C&D waste is c.9 million tonnes per annum.
- The prospective applicant stated that they have a target of submitting a planning application by the end of February. The Board's representative stated based on the criteria set out in Section 37(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, its preliminary opinion was that the proposed development does not constitute SID, however the final determination of this issue is a matter for the Board. In response to a question from the Board's representatives the prospective applicant indicated that it will not require another pre-application consultation meeting.

Conclusion:

The record of the meeting will issue to the prospective applicant, and it will then be a matter for the prospective applicant to submit any comments on this if it wishes to do so. It will be a matter for the prospective applicant to revert to the Board if it requires a further meeting or if it wishes to close the pre-application consultation process.

 7.1.2025

Stephen Kay

Assistant Director of Planning

