



An
Bord
Pleanála

Recording of Meeting 29S.PC0203 4th meeting

Case Reference / Description	29S.PC0203 Expansion and upgrading of the existing Ringsend Waste Water Treatment Plant, Dublin.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	4 th		
Date	22/07/16	Start Time	11a.m.
Location	Conference Room	End Time	12.10p.m.
Chairperson	Anne Marie O'Connor	Executive Officer	Kieran Somers

Attendees		
Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Staff Member	Email Address	Phone
Anne Marie O'Connor, Assistant Director of Planning		
Paul Caprani, Senior Planning Inspector		
Marcella Doyle, Senior Executive Officer		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

Shaun McGee, Administrative Assistant		
Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Dominic Molony, Irish Water		
Donal O' Connor, Irish Water		
Niall Riordan, Irish Water		
Ken McIntyre, J.B. Barry and Partners		
Gordon Barry, J.B. Barry and Partners		
Stephen Little, Stephen Little and Associates		
Michael Hand		

The meeting commenced at 11a.m.

Presentation by the prospective applicant:

As regards non-statutory consultations, the prospective applicant advised the Board that an 8-week public consultation was held from the 14th March to the 17th May, 2016. Open day events in relation to the proposed development were held on the 21st April, the 26th April and the 6th May. There was also a press release and engagement with the media. The prospective applicant said it contacted elected members from all five relevant local authorities and that an event was held for these at Wood Quay on the 21st March, 2016.

As regards scoping, the prospective applicant advised that 28 prescribed bodies and the Sandymount and Merrion Residents Association were written to and forwarded a copy of the scoping document. Written responses were received from a number of prescribed bodies including Dublin City Council, the ESB, the Health Service Executive and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The prospective applicant said that a submissions report on these is being prepared and that issues raised will be addressed by the time of the lodgement of the formal planning application.

The prospective applicant alluded to some of the issues raised in submissions received. In respect of the Sandymount and Merrion Residents Association, the prospective applicant said its chief concerns relate to the principle of the proposed development, the proposed expansion in capacity and visual impact. It did comment that the said association had positive remarks to make on the AGS process. The prospective applicant said another third party submission raised concerns with respect to micro-pollutants.

Issues raised by the Health Service Executive related to construction and mitigation measures. The prospective applicant advised that, since the time of its previous meeting with the Board, it has continued to engage with the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) and the National Monuments Service. Noting this, the Board advised the prospective applicant to maintain such contact with the NPWS so as to tease out as best as possible any issues/concerns that might be arising. The prospective applicant noted that one of the NPWS's chief concerns relates to potential effects on bird life in the Tolka Estuary. Also, the NPWS has raised a concern with respect to an area which is being proposed to be taken temporarily for access where Brent Geese are present. The prospective applicant said that it is seeking to allay such concerns by either taking a smaller area than previously proposed or not at all. If it is a case that the area in question is required, it would seek to provide compensatory measures in this regard. The prospective applicant noted that the NPWS's main concern with regard to any formal planning application is likely to relate to potential effects on the SPA. Again, the Board's representatives encouraged the prospective applicant to liaise with the NPWS as fully as possible.

The prospective applicant confirmed to the Board that representatives of the EPA visited a similar facility in the Netherlands earlier this year. It said that the Agency was broadly satisfied with this and the technology employed at this facility.

In a general context with regard to on-going testing of the proposed technology to be employed, the prospective applicant said that it is pleased with the quality of effluent; its chief concern it said would be with respect to nitrogen levels.

With respect to the proposed SDZ in the Ringsend vicinity, the Board advised the prospective applicant to operate on a worse-case scenario and to ensure that all figures are firmed up as best as possible.

The prospective applicant drew the Board's attention to the fact that the 2014 EU Directive requires it to present a robust planning application. This entails and includes analysis of the following:

- 'physical characteristics of the whole project including...land-use requirements during the construction and operational phases.'
- 'the use of natural resources.'
- 'the emission of pollutants...the creation of nuisances, and the disposal and recovery of waste.'
- 'the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects.'

The prospective applicant said that the EIS for the proposed development will describe off-site ancillary works and activities arising from the storage and subsequent recovery in agriculture of treated biosolids (and associated impacts). The prospective applicant also stated that, for the purposes of clarity, the cumulative (and in-combination) impacts of the entire project at Ringsend will generally be presented under each topic in the EIS. Where relevant, the cumulative and in-combination impacts of other projects in the vicinity of the proposed development (such as Alexandra Basin) will be addressed separately, and as appropriately, in the EIS and NIS.

The prospective applicant advised the Board that it now intends to include a proposed Biosolids Storage Facility as part of its formal planning application. The primary purpose of this proposed facility will be to service the Ringsend agglomeration (site development works and use). Responding to the Board's query with respect to this, the prospective applicant said that this material is essentially sludge. It elaborated on this point by saying that this material cannot be spread on land over the course of the winter months and so it must be stored. Currently, the material in question is transported to an existing facility in Thornhill, County Carlow. From this storage facility, the material is then taken away to be spread on farms. The prospective applicant said that the development of such a new facility as part of the planning application would be consistent with the National Sludge Management Plan which is currently being prepared at present.

The prospective applicant said that this proposed facility could potentially serve as a long-term strategic facility with capacity to serve both Ringsend and the Greater Dublin Area. It added, however, that it has yet to make a decision on this aspect of the proposed facility. This matter will be finalised prior to the lodgement of the formal planning application.

Noting this, the Board said that this new element being introduced at the instant meeting should be further discussed with the prospective applicant at a future meeting in the pre-application process. The prospective applicant informed the Board that the site selection process for the proposed facility is on-going. A preferred location is emerging in this regard. The Board said it would wish to know when the subject site for the proposed facility is finalised; it also added that all pertinent information relating to the facility should be presented to it in due course. The Board's representatives suggested that a separate meeting in the pre-app process might be in order regarding the proposed facility. It also reminded the prospective applicant that this aspect and all other aspects of the planning application should be as robust and holistic as possible.

In relation to the overall project programme, the prospective applicant said that discussions with relevant landowners will continue; it added that to date such discussions have been progressing quite well. Baseline environmental surveys are also being advanced. The prospective applicant expects that the non-statutory public consultations on the scoping of EIS and NIS issues in connection with the proposed Biosolids Storage Facility will take place circa August/September 2016.

The prospective applicant indicated that its present target is to lodge the formal planning application circa October/November 2016.

With regard to the proposed Biosolids Storage Facility, the Board suggested that options open to the prospective applicant would be to either include the facility as part of the planning application for the instant project, or else not include it in the application, but carry out EIA assessment on it nonetheless in the EIS. The prospective applicant indicated its preference would be to include the proposed facility in the instant project.

The prospective applicant queried the scale of drawings to be produced for the planning application. Its main concern related to the scale to be produced for the site location map. The Board said that site location maps are often produced in two halves if the site is of a large size. It said that it is not necessary for the prospective applicant to show the entire site on one map in this regard, but that, in the final analysis, this is a matter for the prospective applicant to decide upon. The prospective applicant said that all other proposed structures and buildings would be to normal scale in terms of drawings. The Board suggested that an A3 booklet would be of assistance as regards plans and drawings.

Conclusion:

There will be at least one further meeting in the pre-app process and it was agreed that the onus is on the prospective applicant to request this. The prospective applicant indicated that it is likely to request such a meeting in due course. Such a further meeting is likely to address in more substance the proposed Biosolids Storage Facility

The meeting concluded at 12.10p.m.

Anne Marie O'Connor

Assistant Director of Planning