



An
Bord
Pleanála

Recording of Meeting 15.PC0226 1st meeting

Case Reference / Description	15.PC0226 Refurbishment of Berth No. 2 in Greenore Port, Greenore, Co. Louth.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	1 st		
Date	27/09/16	Start Time	11 a.m.
Location	Meeting Room 1	End Time	11.35 a.m.
Chairperson	Anne Marie O'Connor	Executive Officer	Sinead McInerney

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

Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Niall McCarthy, General Manager, Greenore Port		
Diarmuid O'Neill, Director, Doyle Shipping Group		
Adam Cronin, Marine Director, Byrne Looby Consulting Engineers		
Tom Halley, Director, McCutcheon Halley Walsh		
Conor Frehill, Senior Planning Consultant, McCutcheon Halley Walsh		

The meeting commenced at 11a.m.

Introduction:

The Board referred to the prospective applicant's letter dated the 2nd September, 2016 seeking pre-application consultations and 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.

With respect to the instant proposal, the Board noted the prospective applicant's preliminary opinion, as expressed in its letter dated the 2nd September, 2016 that the proposed development would not constitute strategic infrastructure development.

Presentation by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant outlined the background to the proposed development and the operational need for the proposed extension to Berth 2. It said that the existing Berth 1 is 120 linear metres, and that Berth 2 – the subject of the current proposal – is approximately 137 linear metres. The prospective applicant said that both berths are operational. Works were carried out to Berth 1 in 2000/2001 as per a 1996 planning permission obtained from Louth County Council. As a consequence, although the two berths are abutting and consecutive, the quay wall is staggered as Berth 2 is set back circa five metres from the quay wall of Berth No.1.

The prospective applicant remarked that vessels have got longer over the course of time. Vessels docking at the quays are in the region of 180 to 200 metres in length, significantly longer than berths 1 or 2. The staggered layout of the two berths means that one berth cannot be used to accommodate this overhang, resulting in operational and safety difficulties.

The prospective applicant said that the primary purpose of the proposed development is to align the old quay wall of Berth 2 with that of Berth 1. The prospective applicant referred to the Seventh Schedule of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and said that its argument that the proposed development would not constitute strategic infrastructure development is premised on the fact that the 137-metre berth already exists, and is merely staggered back from Berth 1. The prospective applicant emphasised that the proposed works are not to construct a new quay, but rather to realign and refurbish an existing facility. The prospective applicant also referred to the criteria set out under section 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and argued that the proposed development would not meet any of the three criteria. The prospective applicant said that the proposed works are primarily for safety and operational reasons and that this would have no major effect on throughput at the port. The prospective applicant also noted the port's Tier 3 status and said that the proposed development would not change this status.

Board comments/queries:

The Board enquired as to what width is intended to be added on to Berth 2 as part of the proposed works. The prospective applicant responded that this would be approximately five metres. It confirmed again that the length of Berth 2 is 137 linear metres approximately. The prospective applicant added that Berth 2 will essentially remain the same, but will be extended out in order to align with Berth 1. In visual terms it said that it will appear as if the overall quay has been extended. The Board suggested that some further images might be useful; the prospective applicant undertook to furnish these in due course.

The prospective applicant confirmed to the Board that there would be no change to the size of vessels which are currently facilitated as a result of the proposed development. It stated that the port can currently handle vessels up to 55,500 tonnes.

The Board stated that it would consider the information presented, and that a site visit would be undertaken by the planning inspector. The prospective applicant suggested that conducting such a site visit on a day when a vessel is docked would be desirable.

The Board stated that if it comes to a preliminary view that the proposed development does not fall within any of the classes of development set out in the Seventh Schedule of the Act, and is not therefore SID, then a formal determination to this effect can be expedited in due course. If, however, the Board's preliminary opinion is that the proposed development may fall within a class of development, a subsequent meeting may be required to further discuss matters such as the criteria set out under section 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The Board also reminded the prospective applicant that if the proposed development is deemed by it to be SID, then an EIS would be required as the proposed development would be under the Seventh Schedule of the Act.

Conclusion:

Responding to the prospective applicant's query on the likely timeline for a formal SID determination, the Board said it would seek to come to a preliminary opinion as soon as practicable. In the meantime, a site visit by the reporting Inspector will be conducted and the prospective applicant will seek to furnish the Board with further images relating to the proposed works.

The meeting concluded at 11.35 a.m.

Anne Marie O'Connor**Assistant Director of Planning**