



Case Reference / Description	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.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	Meeting with Local Authority		
Date	09/02/17	Start Time	11.20 a.m.
Location	Meeting Room 3	End Time	12.15 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		
Patricia Calleary, Senior Planning Inspector		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107
Representing Meath County Council		

Caroline Corrigan – Environment		
Larry Whelan – Environment		
Paul McNulty – Transportation and Roads		
Padraig Maguire – Planning		

The meeting commenced at 11.20 a.m.

The Board said that the instant meeting with the local authority was an information-gathering exercise from its point of view pursuant to section 37C(4) of the Act whereby the Board can consult with any person it considers may have information relevant to the purposes of the consultation under section 37B. A record of the meeting would be taken and which would be made public at the closure of the pre application consultation process.

The Board set out the nature of the proposed development and the progress of pre-application consultations to date. It advised the local authority that three meetings have been held with the prospective applicant and that there is a pending meeting with representatives from the Eastern-Midlands Regional Waste Office.

The Board's representatives mentioned that, as part of the pre-application consultation process, it can impart advice to the prospective applicant on issues that might inform the Board's decision-making process. The local authority was also informed that the Board's preliminary opinion, as relayed to the prospective applicant, is that the proposed development would constitute strategic infrastructure development.

The Council's representatives were informed that the holding of such meetings shall not prejudice the Board in relation to any of its functions under the Act and cannot be relied on in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.

The constituent elements of the proposed development, which is the subject of the pre-application case, were set out to the local authority. With reference to the proposed maximum 600,000 tonne figure, the Board commented that the prospective applicant had stated that this would comprise a mix of non-hazardous and hazardous waste. With respect to the classification of strategic infrastructure development generally, the Board referred to the criteria set out under section 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

With reference to the instant meeting, the Board said that it would wish to elicit general views from the local authority, particularly having regard to the planning application that was made to it, which is currently in abeyance. The local authority said that it had no objection in principle to the proposed development, but considered that the figure of 600,000 tonnes was substantial. It added that it considered the planning application lodged with it did not provide sufficient justification for this

proposed tonnage. The local authority also mentioned that a further information request had been made by it to the prospective applicant during the application process.

With regard to the 600,000 figure, the local authority acknowledged that such throughput might never be realised at the facility, but nevertheless said it would have concerns with such issues as security of supply and how it would fit with national policy in respect of waste. During the planning application process, it said it received third party objections to the proposed development. One of the issues raised was the potential of cumulative effects having regard to the proximity of the Indaver waste-to-energy facility and the Knockharley landfill.

The Board enquired as to the matters raised by the local authority in its further information request from the prospective applicant. The local authority replied that the key issues raised were as follows:

- Policy context
- Breakdown of alternative fuels and details of annual tonnage
- Types of wastes and quantities
- Traffic impacts
- Water
- Wastewater
- Drainage infrastructure
- Tourism (Brú na Bóinne and Newgrange)
- Other matters raised in third party submissions

With regard to traffic, the local authority said that it would have concerns regarding traffic movements and where materials required for the proposed development would be coming from. The local authority added that it understood such an element will be driven by market conditions and is difficult to exactly predict, but felt that a preliminary programme in this regard would be of benefit.

The Board enquired as to whether there were any other local issues with regard to the existing facility. The local authority replied that there are none at present.

Responding to the Board's query, the local authority said that it would forward to the Board a list of prescribed bodies with whom it has consulted with in relation to the planning application.

The local authority referred to the main issues which have been raised in third party submissions with respect to the proposed development. These include concerns such as traffic impacts, possible effects on human health and possible effects on significant national heritage sites such as Newgrange.

The Board asked if there had been any issues with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which was lodged with the planning application. The local authority replied that there had been no outstanding issues in this regard. It undertook to advise the Board as to whether a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) was lodged as part of the planning application.

Conclusion:

The Board asked the local authority if it had any questions with regard to the pre-application or subsequent application process. The local authority enquired as to the likelihood of an oral hearing being held on the proposed development. The Board's representatives replied that the holding of an oral hearing on any case is at the discretion of the Board although there was a presumption in favour of holding oral hearings on all strategic infrastructure cases. It added that such a decision is often premised on the number of third party submissions received and the complexity of issues raised with respect to a proposed development.

With regard to the production process proposed generally at the facility, the local authority commented that it would be useful – particularly from a public perception point of view – if this could be explained clearly in any formal planning application.

The record of this meeting will be forwarded to the local authority.

The meeting concluded at 12.15 p.m.

Philip Green**Assistant Director of Planning**