

Case	27.PC0202	
Reference/		
Description	Arklow Sewerage Scheme Wastewater Treatment Plant at Ferrybank, Arklow, County Wicklow.	
Case Type:	Pre-app consultation	
Meeting:	4 <sup>th</sup>	
Date:	6 <sup>th</sup> May, 2016	11.15a.m.
Location:	Board's offices	
Chairperson:	Anne Marie O'Connor	

Attendees:
Representing An Bord Pleanála
Anne Marie O'Connor – Assistant Director of Planning
Mairead Kenny – Senior Planning Inspector
Marcella Doyle - Senior Executive Officer
Kieran Somers – Executive Officer
Representing Prospective Applicant
John Joyce, Irish Water, Project Manager
Olwyn James, Irish Water, Spatial Planning Specialist
Kevin Scanlon, Wicklow County Council, Local Authority Project Manager
Eddie Feeley, Arup, Consultant EIS Lead
Eamonn Sweetman, ByrneLooby, Consultant Project Manager



The meeting commenced at 11.15a.m.

### **Prospective Applicant's Presentation:**

The prospective applicant gave an outline of the emerging preferred scheme and emerging preferred site for the proposed development. The proposed development comprises:

- demolition of existing buildings and site clearance.
- a new 36,000 p.e. wastewater treatment plant (possibly over two phases).
- Interceptor sewers including combined sewer overflow and storm water storage tank new combined sewer outflow and a storm water storage tank. The southside interceptor sewer will be circa 1.1 kilometres in length, with a diameter range of between 300 to 1,200 millimetres; of this approximately 300 metres will be constructed in the Avoca River with associated road widening. The proposed tunnelling crossing of the Avoca River will be circa 120 metres in length. The prospective applicant advised that relevant foreshore consents and an EPA discharge licence will be required in respect of some of the proposed works.
- Sea outfall of c.0.9 kilometres and a short sea outfall for storm water flows.

The preferred site has now been confirmed as the Waterfront (or 'Wallboard') site.

The prospective applicant advised that it has made a submission to Wicklow County Council in respect of the draft County Development Plan. It noted the discussion at previous meeting in relation to the existing planning policy framework. The prospective applicant said that it has raised this matter with the local authority. Having regard to the reference in the Arklow Development Plan to the Seabank site, the Board advised that it would be useful for the development plan to provide a policy context for the WWTP at a possible alternative location particularly given its importance in relation to the Core Strategy.

With respect to the preparation of an EIS, the prospective applicant advised the Board that it will be carrying out informal scoping. The EIS scoping report will then be circulated to the relevant statutory and non-statutory bodies for comment. The prospective applicant said that the key potential impacts which will be identified in the EIS scoping report are as follows:



- Noise and vibration
- Air quality
- Odour
- Biodiversity
- Archaeology and cultural heritage
- Construction traffic impacts
- Socio-economic and amenity impacts
- Visual impacts

An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report will be submitted as a standalone document.

The prospective applicant advised that baseline surveys are ongoing in respect of the proposed development. Such surveys relate to traffic, baseline noise monitoring, archaeology, biodiversity, geotechnical investigations and dispersion modelling to inform outfall design.

Lastly, the prospective set out the expected timeline in respect of the lodgement of the formal planning application. It is expected that the design review report will be completed in May or June 2016. The ongoing surveys and baseline studies are expected to be completed during the summer of 2016. The current target date for the lodgement of the formal planning application is either late 2016 or early 2017.

### **Board queries:**

The Board enquired as to whether the compulsory acquisition of land would be required in relation to the preferred site. The prospective applicant replied that the site is currently in receivership. It added that the site might be purchased by it, or else acquisition of the required portions of land would be carried out by CPO. Notwithstanding the current ownership of the land, the prospective applicant confirmed to the Board that geotechnical investigations are ongoing. The Board also said that it would expect any CPO application, if required, to be made to it at the same time as the SID application.

With respect to the marine outfall, the prospective applicant stated that it intends to submit an application for consent to carry out various investigations on the foreshore shortly. This application is expected to take a few months to process. All surveys and investigations will be completed by the time of a formal planning application to the Board. It is intended to submit the SID application and foreshore licence application at the same time.



The Board also reminded the prospective applicant that the application would need to fully demonstrate that the proposed development could comply with the surface water regulations and the water framework directive.

The Board also reiterated that a high design quality would be required in respect of the proposed development given that it would be located in an urban area. The prospective applicant noted this.

As regards consultations generally, the prospective applicant said that a media update/circular issued at the beginning of April 2016 in relation to the emerging preferred site, and that discussions were held with near neighbours. The main issues raised related to noise and odour. It also confirmed to the Board that the matter of community gain would be further discussed with the local authority. The amenity uses on adjacent lands were noted.

In terms of consultations, the Board also reminded the prospective applicant to include water-users and fisheries in its consultations.

#### Other matters:

The prospective applicant informed the Board that the preliminary design for a proposed flood relief scheme has recently been agreed with the Office of Public Works. The prospective applicant said it is expected that this will go out to public consultations shortly, followed by the preparation of an EIS. The prospective applicant said that the proposed scheme would be relatively small-scale, but enquired of the Board as to what level of interaction should occur between this scheme and the proposed development. The Board asked how the proposed flood relief scheme might impinge upon or affect the current proposal. The prospective applicant pointed to the construction of quay walls and the redesign of the bed level under the Arklow Bridge. The area concerned would be mostly on the southside of the river. The Board advised the prospective applicant that any EIS would need to address cumulative impacts in this regard. The Board said that various scenarios should be considered for both the construction and operational phases (e.g if construction works for both projects were to coincide) and the potential impacts of all such scenarios addressed in the EIS.



The Board enquired as to whether there has been any flooding on the subject site. The prospective applicant replied that there has been no such major event in recent times. The Board also enquired as to whether there is any issue of coastal erosion. The prospective applicant responded by saying that rock armour was installed in the area in the late 1980s, so coastal erosion does not affect the subject site. The Board advised that these issues should also be dealt with in any application/EIS.

#### Conclusion:

It was agreed that it will be a matter for the prospective applicant to revert to the Board when it wishes to hold a further meeting. The prospective applicant indicated such a further meeting would be likely in late summer or September 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_Anne Marie O'Connor

The meeting concluded at 12.15 p.m.

**Assistant Director of Planning**