



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting 06F.PC0234 1<sup>st</sup> meeting

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	06F.PC0234  Howth Middle Pier Upgrade, Howth, Co. Dublin.		
<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>	06/04/17	<b>Start Time</b>	12 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	Meeting Room 3	<b>End Time</b>	12.15 p.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Anne Marie O'Connor	<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>
Anne Marie O'Connor, Assistant Director of Planning		
Stephen Kay, Senior Planning Inspector		
Marcella Doyle, Senior Executive Officer		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

<b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b>		
John McHale, Assistant Chief Engineer, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine		
John Farragher, Engineer, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine		
Noel Clancy, Chief Engineer, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine		
Pat Parle, Malachy Walsh and Partners		
Raymond Burke, Raymond Burke Consulting		
Noel O'Murchu, Engineer, Marine Engineering Division, Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine		

The meeting commenced at 11a.m.

### **Introduction:**

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant dated the 24<sup>th</sup> October, 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 provided a brief overview of the proposed development. It stated that the proposed development provides for a 130-metre long quay wall on the western side of the existing middle pier and includes ancillary elements such as associated deck area, road access, hard standing and parking. There will be dredging along the front of the new quay wall which will involve the dredging of approximately 5,000 cubic metres of underlying seabed material. Land reclamation is proposed comprising approximately 0.16 hectares on the eastern side of the middle pier.

The prospective applicant said that the proposed development formed part of a plan for the overall development of Howth Harbour which was drawn up in the early 1980s. The middle pier section of this development was not advanced at the time owing to funding issues. A key driver for the proposed development is to allow more efficient operations with respect to fishery activities at the harbour and to facilitate a greater separation between amenity/leisure activities and commercial fishing and fishing related activities. Berthage will be provided on the middle pier for vessels undertaking maintenance and other activities with a consequential freeing-up of area on the west pier that was formerly used for this purpose. The prospective applicant added that the amenity value of the west pier would be improved as a result of this.

It was stated that the proposed development would not result in an increase in fish landings or increased fishing activity in the harbour and was being proposed with the aim of separating commercial and other harbour activities, reducing the need for the rafting up of boats and generally to improve safety.

The prospective applicant outlined the reasons as to why the proposed development is not to be considered strategic infrastructure development as follows:

- With respect to the criteria of section 37A(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, the proposed development is quite small in terms of

nature and extent and would have no national significance with respect to socio-economic activity. Current activities at the harbour account for less than 2% of the national catch and only 6% in a regional context. It was stated that it is not envisaged that the percentage of the national catch landed at Howth would increase over time due to quotas, competition from other ports and other restrictions.

- With regard to the National Ports Policy 2013, the harbour is not listed under Tier 1 or Tier 2 and is quite low down in the hierarchy of fishery harbours. The harbour is not referenced in the National Spatial Strategy 2002 – 2020 or the relevant regional planning guidelines.
- A fundamental impetus for the proposed development is to increase operational facility at the harbour as well as improve health and safety standards.
- There will be no impacts arising on the jurisdiction of any other planning authority.
- The provision of a 130-metre long quay wall would place the proposed development under the Seventh Schedule of the Act under the heading of Transport Infrastructure. The proposed development would not, however, constitute SID as it does not fall under any of the criteria set out under section 37A(2) (a), (b) or (c).

### **Conclusion:**

The Board's representatives said they had no other comments to make on the case except to say that the preliminary opinion is that the proposed development would not constitute SID having regard to section 37A(2).

The Board's representatives said that they would arrange to have an informal meeting with the SID division of the Board in relation to this case and the other related port harbour developments (PC0232, PC0235 and PC0237), and would revert to the prospective applicant if any further issues arose necessitating a further meeting.

The meeting concluded at 12.15 p.m.

---

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