



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting 06F.PC0152 4th meeting

Case Reference / Description	06F.PC0152 Greater Dublin Drainage Project comprising a regional waste water treatment plant and associated orbital drainage network and marine outfall, North County Dublin.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	4 th		
Date	26/06/17	Start Time	2.30 p.m.
Location	Meeting Room 3	End Time	3.40 p.m.
Chairperson	Philip Green	Executive Officer	Kieran Somers

Attendees		
Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Staff Member	Email Address	Phone
Philip Green, Assistant Director of Planning		
Paul Caprani, Senior Planning Inspector		
Diarmuid Collins, Senior Administrative Officer		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

Muiriosa Cassells, Executive Officer		
Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Geoff O’Sullivan – Irish Water, Major Projects		
Ciaran O’Keeffe – Jacobs Tobin		
Olwyn James – Irish Water, Asset Delivery - Engineering		
Noeleen McHenry – Irish Water, Legal		
Jane Chambers – Irish Water, Major Projects		
Frieda Ryan – Irish Water, Major Projects		

The meeting commenced at 2.30 p.m.

Noting that this was the fourth meeting so far in this particular pre-application consultation process, the Board referred to its previous meeting with the prospective applicant held on the 9th July, 2015 and the record of same. The Board asked the prospective applicant if it had any comments it wished to make on this. The prospective applicant replied that it had no comments to make.

Presentation by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant said that the instant meeting was effectively an update on the project and referred to the proposed agenda it had forwarded to the Board. The prospective applicant recapped on the need for the proposed development generally having regard to Greater Dublin Strategic Drainage Study (GDSDS) Final Report 2005, the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the GDSDS 2008 and Irish Water’s National Wastewater Sludge Management Plan. The prospective applicant reiterated its opinion that the proposed development would constitute strategic infrastructure development having regard to its scale and significance, its strategic, social and economic importance to the Greater Dublin Area, and the significant effect it would have on the area of more than one planning authority.

The prospective applicant referred to the Project Road Map and said that this is currently at the stage of preparation of environmental studies. It addressed the various elements of the project with respect to the proposed wastewater treatment plant, pumping stations, orbital sewer, outfall pipeline, regional biosolids storage facility and the proposed tunnelling near the Portmarnock golf course. An indicative layout of the proposed wastewater treatment plant at Clonshaugh was provided and it confirmed to the Board that this particular element is part of Phase 1 of the development. The proposed pumping station is to be located at Abbotstown and the marine outfall will discharge into Dublin Bay. In relation to this element, the prospective applicant said that a lot of studies have been conducted in the area in order to prove that the proposed development would not have adverse effects on the integrity of the qualifying interests of the Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC. It is cognisant also of the Dublin Bay UNESCO Bio-sphere site and other water quality issues in the vicinity. The prospective applicant reported that surveys are also being conducted with regard to the Reef Habitats at Ireland's Eye. In response to the Board's query on the matter, it said that much discussion has taken place between it and the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS).

With respect to sludge treatment, the prospective applicant said that this would be treated on site and that the method of treatment will be advanced anaerobic digestion. It referred to the proposed regional biosolids storage facility and said that, in accordance with studies which are currently being conducted, five sites are currently under consideration for its location. The prospective applicant confirmed that this facility will also form part of the planning application in relation to the proposed expansion and upgrading of the Ringsend Waste Water Treatment Plant (which is also currently the subject of a pre-application consultation request under case reference number 29S.PC0203). Noting this, the Board advised the prospective applicant that any application for the regional biosolids facility should also make reference to associated nutrient management plans for land-spreading.

The various investigative surveys which have been completed and are on-going were set out by the prospective applicant. These are in respect of marine and terrestrial effects and include a fisheries survey, underwater noise, ecology and air quality. The prospective applicant confirmed to the Board that no reef habitats or harbour porpoise (which are qualifying interests associated with Natura 2000 sites in the area) will be affected by the proposed development and the prospective applicant also noted that there will be no major water temperature fluctuations caused by the marine outfall discharge. It also advised that modelling for potential cumulative impacts associated with the Ringsend proposal is being carried out. With respect to all surveys, the prospective applicant said that it has had a number of meetings with representatives from the NPWS. Noting this, the Board's representatives advised the prospective applicant to tease out all issues with the NPWS as best as possible. The Board noted that there are many environmental designations in the area, including designated shellfish waters.

Responding to the Board's query, the prospective applicant said that the NPWS had not raised the possibility of IROPI with regard to the proposed development. The prospective applicant also advised that there are no priority habitats in any of the Natura 2000 sites which could be potentially affected.

With regard to construction phasing for the overall project, the prospective applicant said that this would consist of two phases, phase 1 to cater for loads up to 2045 and phase 2 to cater for loads post 2045. It added that the EIS to be lodged with the planning application would examine the entirety of the project. It also stated that the site would be sized for the overall project with the outfall sized to facilitate Phase 2. Responding to the Board's question, the prospective applicant said that the various constituent elements of the project were included in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which was carried out in 2008. The Board, for its part, said that it would be important that it be clear that the proposed Phase 2 would be the subject of a separate planning application and any required environmental assessments and that any possible issues in relation to project splitting be addressed.

The prospective applicant referred to other consents which will be required for the project; these include a wastewater discharge authorisation, a foreshore licence and a compulsory purchase order (for lands and wayleaves). The prospective applicant stated that no closure of any public right-of-way was proposed. With regard to the wastewater discharge authorisation licence, which is required from the EPA, the prospective applicant noted that it would need to have this in place prior to going to tender as any tendering documentation would need to take cognisance of conditions attached to the licence. With regard to the CPO, the prospective applicant said that it is engaging with relevant landowners who number five in total. It said that consultations with the public will continue up to the time of the planning application. In response to a question from the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant said there had been a considerable response from the public with over 30,000 submissions being originally received. At the present moment it said its intention is to lodge the formal planning application circa Quarter 2, 2018. The other consent applications will also be made at approximately this time. The prospective applicant said that it would make the planning application having regard to the provisions of the 2014 EIA Directive. Noting this, the Board's representatives said that the relevant transposing Regulations would likely be in place by that time.

Lastly, the prospective applicant presented the Board with its proposed format for the EIS which will accompany the planning application. It said that its intention is to reference cumulative impacts with Ringsend in each section of the EIS.

Conclusion:

Prior to lodging the formal planning application, the prospective applicant indicated its preference to have at least one more pre-application consultation meeting with the Board. It was agreed that this might take place later in 2017 and the prospective applicant will contact the Board in this regard.

The meeting concluded at 3.40 p.m.

Philip Green

Assistant Director of Planning