



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Recording of Meeting 17.PC0223 1<sup>st</sup> meeting

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	17.PC0223  Increased acceptance of non-hazardous waste for recovery and disposal, Co. Meath.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Pre-application consultation		
<b>1<sup>st</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> / 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>		
<b>Date</b>	04/08/16	<b>Start Time</b>	11a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Conference Room	<b>End Time</b>	12.05p.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		
Pauline Fitzpatrick, Senior Planning Inspector		
Diarmuid Collins, Senior Administrative Officer		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

<b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b>		
Derek Milton, Fehily Timoney and Company		
Tim Hodnett, Knockharley Landfill Ltd		
John O'Malley, Kiaran O'Malley and Co Ltd		

The meeting commenced at 11a.m.

**Introduction:**

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant dated the 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 formally requesting pre-application consultations with the Board.

The Board advised the prospective applicant that the instant meeting essentially constituted an information-gathering exercise for the Board; it also invited the prospective applicant to outline the nature of the proposed development and to highlight any matters it wished to receive advice on from the Board.

The Board mentioned general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process as follows:

- The Board will keep a record of this meeting and any other meetings, if held. Such records will form part of the file which will be made available publicly at the conclusion of the process.
- The Board will serve formal notice at the conclusion of the process as to whether or not the proposed development is SID. It may form a preliminary view at an early stage in the process as to whether the proposed development would likely constitute strategic infrastructure.
- A further meeting or meetings may be held in respect of the proposed development.
- Further information may be requested by the Board and public consultations may also be directed by the Board.
- The Board may hold consultations in respect of the proposed development with other bodies.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Board in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or any legal proceedings.

### **Presentation by the prospective applicant:**

The prospective applicant began by outlining the main issues it intended to address by way of the instant meeting. These were as follows:

- Development proposal
- Site location
- Existing development
- Elements of the proposed development
- Need for the proposed development
- Why the proposed development is considered to be strategic
- Intended submission programme

### **Development Proposal:**

The prospective applicant stated that the proposed development is intended to facilitate the increased need for landfilling of non-hazardous municipal solid waste (MSW); the recovery, through long-term storage, of non-hazardous incinerator bottom ash (IBA); and the development of a leachate treatment/conditioning plant. The prospective applicant noted that this is a smaller scale development in the context of its previous proposal which was the subject of a pre-application consultation process under case reference number 17.PC0210.

### **Site Location:**

With respect to the location of the subject site, the prospective applicant said that it is strategically located off the N2, has direct access to the Greater Dublin Area, and is the closest landfill facility to Carranstown and Poolbeg Waste to Energy Facilities. In terms of road access, there is a dedicated junction on the N2 leading to the facility, as well as a private access road.

### **Existing Development:**

The prospective applicant said that the current facility, and operations as they exist are covered by an EPA Industrial Emissions Licence. This licence permits the acceptance of up to 200,000 tonnes per annum (which is constituted of 175,000 tonnes of MSW and the recovery of 25,000 tonnes of construction and demolition material). The prospective applicant referred to planning permission received from the Board under appeal case reference number PL 17.220331 which restricted disposal at the facility to 132,000 tonnes per annum until the end of 2010, and 88,000 tonnes per annum thereafter.

### **Elements of the Proposed Development:**

The prospective applicant gave an indicative layout of the proposed development and outlined the constituent elements of this. The proposed development would have proposed inputted tonnages of up to 290,000 tonnes per annum of non-hazardous MSW and non-hazardous soils for disposal, and up to 150,000 tonnes for the recovery of incinerator bottom ash.

As regards the first element of this (non-hazardous MSW and non-hazardous soils for disposal), the proposed development would provide for:

- Additional capacity to be incorporated within the existing permitted landfill facility footprint.
- A proposal to increase the existing height profile of the landfill body.
- Additional annual capacity to provide replacement MSW capacity for closed and closing landfills, as well as contingency capacity.
- An increase in demand for non-hazardous soils capacity.

As regards the second element (recovery of incinerator bottom ash), the prospective applicant said that the proposed development would provide for:

- The recovery of IBA which is currently accepted at Knockharley from the Indaver Carranstown facility.
- The construction of a dedicated IBA storage area to facilitate the future reclamation of such material should markets be developed for this.
- The sourcing of IBA material at the existing Carranstown and Poolbeg facilities and other similar facilities should they be developed.

In response to the Board's query, the prospective applicant said that the IBA material proposed to be stored in a dedicated area on site would be kept separate from MSW. This will enable the IBA material to be re-used in the future if a market for it develops.

As regards the third element (development of a leachate conditioning plant), the prospective applicant said that this would result in a reduction of the quantity of leachate for treatment at an off-site wastewater treatment plant, and could also entail processes such as reverse osmosis, sequential batch reactors and membrane bioreactors.

Responding to the Board's query, the prospective applicant said that a dedicated lagoon would be installed for the capture of leachate arising from IBA. It added that the amount of leachate arising from this material would not be particularly high. In a general context, the prospective applicant noted that there are very limited outlets for leachate at the present time and this informs its decision to include a leachate conditioning plant as part of the overall proposal.

### **Need for the Proposed Development:**

The prospective applicant said there is a clear need for the proposed development having regard to the following considerations:

- Providing a facility for an increased level of MSW and soils acceptance having regard to reducing national landfill capacity generally, as well as the need to manage MSW and soils disposal in the most effective possible way.
- Providing IBA management capacity having regard to the significant waste stream requiring management and to ensure the potential for future sustainable re-use opportunity, if such an opportunity arises.
- Providing for leachate treatment having regard to the need for a reduction in cost and volume, and a requirement in the reduction of loading on wastewater treatment plants.

### **Why the Proposed Development is considered to be Strategic:**

The prospective applicant said that the proposed development clearly comes under the remit of the Seventh Schedule of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, under the following category:

- An installation for the disposal, treatment or recovery of waste with a capacity for an annual intake greater than 100,000 tonnes.

Having regard also to the criteria as set out under 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the prospective applicant said that the proposed development would constitute strategic infrastructure in that it would have both regional and national importance, would have significance pertaining to the regional spatial and economic strategy, and would have significant effects on the functional area of more than one planning authority.

**Intended Submission Programme:**

The prospective applicant indicated to the Board that its intention is to lodge a formal application for the proposed development some time in the fourth quarter of 2016.

**Board comments/queries:**

Having regard to the previous pre-application case which was before it (case reference number 17.PC0210), the Board enquired as to why there are material changes between this and the instant pre-application case. Noting that elements such as the proposed biological waste treatment facility and the development of a hazardous waste landfill have been omitted, the prospective applicant said that these decisions were based primarily on commercial considerations.

The prospective applicant advised the Board that the Indaver Carranstown facility primarily accounts for the IBA material currently being accepted at the existing facility equating to approximately 45,000 tonnes per annum. Responding to the Board's query, the prospective applicant said that the Poolbeg facility, once operational, would likely generate 120,000 to 130,000 tonnes per annum. Taking this figure in conjunction with the amount currently being accepted from Indaver Carranstown, the prospective applicant said that there would be provision for 90% acceptance of tonnage from these two facilities. It added that this overall figure would be subject to commercial arrangements.

The prospective applicant said that there are no current proposals for the acceptance of IBA material from other jurisdictions.

With respect to the proposed intake of up to 290,000 tonnes per annum figure in relation to non-hazardous MSW and non-hazardous soils, the Board enquired as to how that figure was arrived at.. The prospective applicant replied that the figure in question is premised on striking a balance between operational and engineering capacity at the facility and what is reasonably to be expected in terms of throughput, as well as contingency factors. If the throughput of 290,000 tonnes was reached on a per annum basis, the prospective applicant said that the lifespan of the facility would likely end circa 2025-2026. The prospective applicant added that in recent times local authorities have had to invoke the provisions of section 56 of the Waste Management Act 1996 in response to capacity issues in waste disposal.

In respect of the proposal to increase the existing height profile of the landfill body, the prospective applicant advised the Board that this would be in the order of between seven to twelve metres in terms of additional height.

The Board enquired as to whether IBA material changes in any way when it is placed in storage over time, as is proposed as part of the subject development. The prospective applicant replied that there is no chemical change, but that a certain degree of solidification occurs. In respect of this material generally, the prospective applicant reiterated that it remains to be seen if a market demand for it emerges.

Responding to the Board's query, the prospective applicant said that there would be low levels of contamination in respect of soils accepted for disposal at the facility. It added that these would not be hazardous. It also noted that there has been a general increase in the demand for the disposal of soils.

In response to the Board's query, the prospective applicant confirmed that the facility is currently operating under the permission obtained under appeal case reference number PL 17.220331. There have been no further permissions.

The Board enquired as to whether there have been any discussions yet between the prospective applicant and the relevant regional authorities and local authority. The prospective applicant advised that there have not been but that there will be soon. It also said that a public consultation event is planned within the next four to six weeks. Noting this, the Board said that it may seek meetings with relevant prescribed bodies as part of the pre-application consultation process.

### **Conclusion:**

It was agreed that, following its initial round of consultations, the prospective applicant will then revert to the Board seeking a further meeting. This request will likely be made circa mid-September, 2016. At that point the prospective applicant will give the Board feedback on its consultations and also expects to have a design for the proposed development finalised. The Board's representatives indicated to the prospective applicant that, in the meantime, they may seek a meeting with the relevant waste management body.

The meeting concluded at 12.05p.m.

---

**Philip Green**  
**Assistant Director of Planning**