



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Recording of Meeting 17.PC0221 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	17.PC0221  Proposed development to allow further replacement of fossil fuels with alternative fuels and use of alternative raw materials at existing cement works at Platin, Duleek, Co. Meath.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Pre-application consultation		
<b>1<sup>st</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> / 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup>		
<b>Date</b>	15/11/16	<b>Start Time</b>	11.30 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Conference Room	<b>End Time</b>	12.35 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Philip Green	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Kieran Somers

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

<b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b>		
Seamus Breen, Head of Sustainability and Quality, Irish Cement Limited		
Brian Gilmore, Marketing and Communications Manager, Irish Cement Limited		
Thomas Burns, Planning Consultant, Brady Shipman Martin		
Deborah Spence, Arthur Cox Solicitors		

The meeting commenced at 11.30 a.m.

**Introduction:**

The Board referred to its previous meeting with the prospective applicant of the 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 and the record of this meeting. The Board asked the prospective applicant if it had any comments to make on this record. The prospective applicant replied that it had made comments as part of its further written submission which was received by the Board on the 8<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

The Board referred to this further written submission and outlined to the prospective applicant the process it had adopted following its receipt. An interim report had been prepared by the Senior Planning Inspector and this was forwarded to the SID division of the Board for its consideration. All other submissions on file from the prospective applicant were also considered. The prospective applicant was advised that the SID division of the Board had come to a preliminary opinion that the proposed development would constitute strategic infrastructure development.

The Board's representatives summarised the key points and conclusions as contained in the interim report. These were as follows:

- The proposed development would appear to relate to development as identified under the third category of development listed in the Seventh Schedule of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended (namely, an installation for the disposal, treatment or recovery of waste with a capacity for an annual intake greater than 100,000 tonnes).
- Noting that there are no definitions around waste in the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the reporting Inspector had regard to the definitions of waste as set out under various legislation, including the Waste Management Act 1996, as amended, and the EPA Act 1992, as amended.
- The reporting Inspector had regard to the properties of material proposed to be used as alternative raw materials in the cement production process which would include contaminated soil, meat and bone meal and solvents and considered that the activity would sit on the 'other recovery' tier of the waste hierarchy as set out in the Eastern Regional Waste Management Plan.
- The existing cement production plant would appear to constitute an installation for the disposal, treatment or recovery of waste with a capacity for an annual intake greater than 100,000 tonnes, notwithstanding its primary purpose for the production of cement.
- Having regard to the provisions of 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, it is considered that the proposed development would fall under the criteria listed in (a), (b) and (c).

The Board's representatives noted that the SID division of the Board accepted the Inspector's recommendation that the proposed development would fall within the provisions of Part 3 of the Seventh Schedule of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and would also satisfy the conditions set down under Section 37A(2). The Board's representatives then allowed the prospective applicant some time to consider this preliminary assessment of the case and in order for it to consider how it might wish to proceed in the pre-application process.

The prospective applicant noted in response that the significance of this. The prospective applicant queried the process by which the SID division of the Board had reached its preliminary opinion on the status of the proposed development. This process, involving the interim report of the Inspector, was clarified by the Board's representatives.

Going forward, the Board's representatives stated that there would likely be a need for further meeting(s) with the prospective applicant prior to the conclusion of consultations to outline issues that may have a bearing on the Board's decision should an application be lodged and procedures in making and considering such an application. As part of the pre-application process generally, it also signalled that, in such a case, meetings with both the local authority in question and the relevant regional waste management body were likely.

The Board's representatives said that, from its perspective, it would be useful if the prospective applicant could write to the Board providing a summary of the status of the current planning application lodged with the planning authority and also key planning issues that may have been identified to date as a result. It was confirmed that it would not be appropriate for the applicants to submit the full EIS for the Board's consideration at this stage.

In noting the current circumstances that the prospective applicants found themselves in the Board's representatives indicated that they would seek to move the pre-application process along as expeditiously as possible.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that the prospective applicant will await the Board's written record of the instant meeting. Following this the prospective applicant may respond to the summary of the reasoning given as to why the proposed development is considered to be SID and to submit to the Board the aforementioned information.

The meeting concluded at 12.35 p.m.

---

**Philip Green**

**Assistant Director of Planning**