

Case Reference/	04.PC0216		
Description	Alterations to previously permitted redevelopment of existing port facilities at Ringaskiddy Port and Ferry Terminal. Loughbeg, Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork.		
Case Type:	Pre-app consultation		
Date:	5 th May 2016	Start Time:	11.00 a.m.
Location:	Meeting Room 3	End Time:	12.30 p.m.
Chairperson:	Brendan Wyse	Executive Officer:	Kieran Doherty

Attendees:	
Representing An Bord Pleanála	
Brendan Wyse – Assistant Director of Planning	
Pauline Fitzpatrick – Senior Planning Inspector	
Marcella Doyle – Senior Executive Officer	
Kieran Doherty – Executive Officer	
Representing Prospective Applicant	
Denis Healy – Project Director, Port of Cork	
Henry Kingston – Port of Cork	
Brian McCutcheon – McCutcheon Halley Walsh	
Ray Holbeach – RPS Group	



Introduction

The Board's representatives welcomed the representatives of the prospective applicant and introductions were made.

The prospective applicant was informed of the following regarding the pre-application consultation process:

- The purpose of the consultations is to establish whether or not the proposed alterations are considered to be strategic infrastructure development having regard to the provisions as set out in the legislation.
- The Board will consider whether a request under section 146B would be the appropriate mechanism for the proposed development.
- The Board will keep a record of the pre-application consultations. A copy of the record will become public when consultations are completed. The record will be placed with the application documents once the application has been submitted for approval. The prospective applicant may put in writing any comment on the written record.
- The consultation process may require further meetings if an application under section 37E is appropriate.
- If it is appropriate to make an application under section 146B then no further meetings will take place as there is no consultation process under section 146B.
- At the end of the pre-application consultation process the Board will serve notice of its decision on the issue of strategic infrastructure development. The Board may also give written advice on matters requested by the prospective applicant, such as significant issues, prescribed bodies and application procedures.
- The Board may require the prospective applicant to submit additional information during the pre-application process (or at any stage) if deemed necessary.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Board in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.



Presentation

The prospective applicant submitted a document, Ringaskiddy Port, Redevelopment Alterations, Presentation to An Bord Pleanála. The document includes drawings and photomontages of the proposed alterations. The following is a summary of the main points covered in the presentation.

Introduction

The prospective applicant is advancing the detailed design of the permitted redevelopment of the port facilities; however, it is experiencing increasing container growth and an accelerated trend to larger vessels (greater draught). As a result the prospective applicant is investing in Tivoli, including a new gate system, pending the coming into operation of the permitted development at Ringaskiddy. Ringaskiddy is not expected to be operational until the 4th quarter of 2018.

Proposed Changes

The prospective applicant wants to alter its operational regime to optimise the berth and cargo handling operation to provide maximum efficiency.

Operations

The existing permission allows for container boxes to be stacked 5 high with rubbertyred gantry cranes and moved within the port by tractor trailers before removal from port on heavy goods vehicles. It is now proposed to use straddle type carriers to move the containers within the port; however, these only operate where container boxes are stacked 3 high. As the containers will not be stacked as high, a more extensive stacking area will be required to store the same number of containers.

The straddle carriers will allow the port to transition across from the current facilities and then expand in line with demand, and also provide a more flexible system with regard to management of truck movements; however, they require an enlarged and relocated maintenance building (effectively a garage). This revised operation would allow for more effective traffic management in accordance with the mobility management plan for the port.

The prospective applicant is of the opinion that the visual impact of the maintenance building will be mitigated by the reduction of the container stacks from 5 to 3 and will not have a significant impact having regard to the industrial context of the site. The maintenance building will now be situated outside of the red line boundary of the existing permission but within the port operational area and on lands owned by the prospective applicant.



Main Berth and Mooring Dolphins

- A reconfigured layout in the vicinity of the new Ro-Ro freight berth and revised mooring arrangements at the existing ferry berth.
- The adjustment of the foreshore boundary has been discussed with the DoECLG.
- Moorings dolphins will be relocated to allow efficient and safe berthing.
- Removal of two existing mooring bollards and landside storm bollard to be replaced with three new mooring bollards for ferry berth.
- 25-30 piles to be installed in front of the new quay line.
- Additional dredging of approx. 15,000m³ in an extended dredge pocket of 982m².
- The berth length will be increased from 514m to 560m.

Other changes

- Increased separation at the interchange area.
- Entrance and exit areas moved and realigned.
- New customs building, including border control and agriculture inspection facility.
- Double stacked port-a-cabin offices no longer required.
- Reduction to a single kiosk at each gate.

Environmental Issues

- Minimal change to the visual impact.
- No effect on the quantum of trade through the port.
- No effect on construction, operations, or indirect economic activity assessed within the 2014 EIS.
- All of the proposed alterations fall within the landholding of the Port of Cork within lands used for port operations.
- Unlikely to be any impact on cultural heritage.
- There will be no increase in traffic generated by the port and no impact on the surrounding road network.
- Traffic generated by employees will be less as fewer staff are required.
- There will be no significant noise impact.
- Air quality will not change from that predicted in the 2014 EIS.
- There will be no impact on soils and geology.
- There will be a 3.4% increase in dredging; however, this will not result in the release of contaminated sediments into the water column.



- Following dredging, a benthic community, largely the same as the one currently present and as described in the 2014 EIS, is likely to recolonize the area affected.
- No additional impacts on terrestrial ecology and ornithology.

Procedural Queries

The prospective applicant wishes to seek advice from the Board in relation to the mechanism for the making of the application to the Board. In this context, reference was made to the following options:

- A request to the Board for alterations under section 146B of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.
- A new application to the Board under section 37E of the Act.
- If the proposed development is not deemed to be strategic infrastructure development, an application under section 34 of the Act made direct to the planning authority.

A discussion took place regarding the provisions of section 146B in this regard and the implications of some of the alterations being located outside the red line of the permission granted by the Board under reference number PA0035. However, the applicant stated that section 146B would be its preferred option and alerted the Board to previous cases submitted under section 146B by Shannon LNG (Ref. PL08.PM0002) and Indaver (Ref. PL17.PM0004) which may have similar issues. The applicant also stated that it has sought legal advice in relation to this matter. The prospective applicant queried whether the Board would require public consultation or a revised EIA or AA for the alteration request.

Conclusion

The prospective applicant is of the opinion that an application for the proposed alterations should be made under section 146B, having regard to the limited nature and impact of the changes. The Board's representatives will report to the Board and will revert to the prospective applicant in due course.

Brendan Wyse Assistant Director of Planning May 2016