



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum Report ABP-301195-18

Development

Alterations and additions to an existing materials Recovery Facility (register references 13/1350 and 16/412 to accept increased tonnage of waste from previously permitted limit of 22,000 tonnes per annum to 50,000 tonnes per annum. The development will also include the introduction of liquid waste treatment onto the site. The development will include the construction of four liquid waste, bunded storage tanks and on-site liquid waste treatment plant. Permission is also sought for all associated works and services. Gross floor space 3033sqm

Location

Deerpark, Oranmore County Galway

Planning Authority

Galway County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

17/1830

Applicant(s)

Walsh Waste Ltd.

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Walsh Waste Ltd.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11/07/2018
Inspector	Gillian Kane

- 1.1. **This report should be read in conjunction with the Inspectors Report ABP-301195-18 dated 29/11/2018**
- 1.2. **Introduction**
- 1.2.1. The applicant was advised by way of letter from the Board (15/01/2019) that the subject development is of a class specified under article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, as requiring the submission of an EIAR.
- 1.2.2. The applicant was advised that for the purposes of the EIA Directive the term 'waste disposal' is interpreted to include 'recovery' (*Interpretation of definitions of project categories of Annex I and II of the EIA Directive*). The subject proposal therefore must be assessed against Class 11(b) of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, which sets the threshold for installations for the disposal of waste at "an annual intake greater than 25,000 tonnes". As the proposed development consists of an extension to an existing authorised development, Class 13(a) is also relevant. Class 13 refers to any change or extension of development already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed (not being a change or extension referred to in Part 1) which would: (i) result in the development being of a class listed in Part 1 or paragraphs 1 to 12 of Part 2 of this Schedule, and (ii) result in an increase in size greater than 25%, or an amount equal to 50% of the appropriate threshold, whichever is the greater.
- 1.2.3. The subject facility has permission to accept 22,000 tonnes pa (Planning Authority reg. ref. 16/412 refers). The proposed increase of 28,000 (from 22,000 to 50,000 tonnes) exceeds the 25,000 tonne threshold of class 11(b) but also falls under class 13(a), being an extension of an authorised development which would result in the development being of a class listed in Part 2 *and* would result in an increase in size greater than 50% of the appropriate threshold -namely, the proposed increase of 28,000 tonnes is greater than 50% of the 25,000 threshold (12,500).
- 1.2.4. The applicant responded to the above on the 8th April 2019 with an Environmental Impact Assessment Report.

2.0 Submissions

2.1.1. Following the Applicants response to the Boards s132 request, a submission on the EIAR was received from An Taisce. The submission can be summarised as follows:

- Although the source of the liquid waste is not stated, it is assumed that it will be the contents of commercial and domestic septic tanks. The subject operators Walsh Waste have been operating a septic tank cleaning and emptying service since 1979.
- An Taisce recognises the need for waste infrastructure in the area as it would avoid the transportation of liquid waste to other facilities.
- In relation to section 7.5.4.1 of the EIAR, it is submitted that such is the proximity of the site to the Galway Bay SAC that the entire site should be bunded with ramps to enter or exit the site and that all surface water drains from the site should be routed into the existing sewer drains. This will ensure no failure or leak reaching the SAC.
- With regard to section 5.4.3.7 of the EIAR, it is submitted that if there is a southerly wind there are significant unpleasant odours emanating from the facility. The building housing the proposed liquid waste facility must be ventilated. Odours from the facility have the potential to impact the nearby hotel and cinema which are important for tourism. The odour suppression system adds pleasant odours to unpleasant ones. A BAT solution should be included which would capture unpleasant odours and use the gases to fuel a generator.

3.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

3.1.1. As required by Schedule 6 the EIAR submitted to the Board contains a non-technical summary, a reference list detailing the sources for the assessments within the EIAR, and a list of the experts who contributed to the preparation of the report. As is required under Article 3(1) of the amending Directive, the EIAR describes and assesses the direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the following factors: (a) population and human health; (b) biodiversity with particular attention to the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC; (c) land, soil, water, air and climate; (d) material assets, cultural

heritage and the landscape. It also considers the interaction between the factors referred to in points (a) to (d).

- 3.1.2. I have carried out an examination of the information presented by the applicant, including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the EIAR has been prepared by competent experts to ensure its completeness and quality, and that the information contained in the EIAR and supplementary information provided by the developer is up to date, adequately identifies and describes the direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment, and complies with article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2000, as amended.
- 3.1.3. Article 3(2) includes a requirement that the expected effects derived from the vulnerability of the project to major accidents and / or disasters that are relevant to the project concerned are considered. The EIAR addresses this issue within chapter 5.
- 3.1.4. **Chapter 1** refers to EIA screening and the obligation to prepare the EIAR with reference to the direction from the Board. It provides information in relation to the EU Directive 2014/52/EU which is an amendment of Directive 2011/92/EU. It provides details on the project team, the purpose and scope of the EIAR and a brief description of the development.
- 3.1.5. **Chapter 2** provides details on the background to the proposed development, including the site and its planning history, and the planning policy context and the support for the proposal at national, regional, and county level, submissions and reports on the planning application and a cumulative impact assessment. Chapter 2 also provides details of the **consultation** entered into by the applicant as part of the preparation of the EIAR. No responses were received to the scoping document that was circulated in early 2018. No responses to the public notices advising of significant additional information (April 2019) were received. I am satisfied that the participation of the public has been effective, and the application has been made accessible to the public by electronic and hard copy means with adequate timelines afforded for submissions
- 3.1.6. Chapter 3 refers to **Reasonable Alternatives** as required by article 5(1)(d) of the 2014 Directive. The description of the reasonable alternatives must indicate the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental

effects (Annex IV Information for the EIAR refers). The chapter states that the existing waste operation moved to the current site in 2013 due to its location within an established industrial area and access links to the surrounding road network. The existing site has the capacity to accept and process the increased water quantities but also has a connection to the Irish Water foul sewer. A new location would entail the provision of new infrastructure and the unnecessary duplication of resources and environmental emissions and so was not considered a reasonable alternative. In terms of alternative technologies and processes, for the proposed liquid waste, the report states that notwithstanding the advancement of sludge process, activate sludge remains the most widely used process for biological waste water treatment. The core principle of using aeration to degrade dissolved pollutants remains the same, with four options available: sequential batch reactor process, diffused aeration, surface aeration and membrane-aerated biofilm reactor (MABR). MABR was chosen for the subject development due to the proven high rate / high efficiency treatment – operating costs are reduced by 75% while an oxygen transfer efficiency of 99% can be achieved, compared to 30% for conventional technologies. The Do-Nothing scenario is that waste continues to be transported further from source to be treated.

3.1.7. The consideration of alternatives is an information requirement of Annex IV of the EIA Directive, and the single most effective means of avoiding significant environmental effects. Having regard to this requirement and its purpose (i.e. avoidance of significant environmental effect), I am satisfied that the consideration of alternatives is adequate.

3.1.8. **Chapter 4** provides a description of the existing site including surrounding land uses, available infrastructures, the nature and extent of waste recovery currently ongoing and how emissions from the existing operation are monitored and mitigated against. The proposed development is described in detail.

3.2. **Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects**

The likely significant indirect effects of the development are considered under the following headings, after those set out in Article 3 of the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU:

- population and human health;

- biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC;
- land, soil, water, air and climate;
- material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape;
- the interaction between the factors referred to in points above

3.2.1. **Chapter 5 – 13:** Chapter 5 addresses Population and Human Health, Chapter 6 considers Biodiversity, Chapter 7 considers Land, Soils, and Geology, Chapter 8 Water, Chapter 9 Air and Climate, Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration, Chapter 11 Landscape and Visual, Chapter 12 Cultural Heritage, Chapter 13 Material Assets, and Chapter 13 Interaction of the Foregoing. The board will note that the final two chapters are both titled Chapter 13. Each of the chapters are considered in detail below, with respect to the relevant heading of the Directive.

3.3. **Population and Human Health**

3.3.1. The likely significant effects of the proposed development on the population and human health are addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIAR. The main areas examined are population, human health, employment and economic activity, land-use, tourism, noise and health and safety. The subject site and the immediate area is industrial in nature with the nearest residential property 150m away. During the construction phase temporary negative impacts could arise from the presence and operation of heavy machinery and traffic. These will be mitigated against by a health & safety plan and other measures such that there will be a temporary imperceptible negative impact and no significant effect. Best practice mitigation measures are proposed to address residual impacts from odour, noise, dust and air quality and traffic with the result that no significant effects are predicted. During the operation phase no significant effects are predicted. The proposed development is not considered to be vulnerable to a natural disaster other than flooding which is addressed separately. In terms of cumulative impacts, the potential for same is deemed to be negligible.

3.3.2. With regard to the submission of An Taisce that the existing facility creates unpleasant odours, section 5.4.3.7 of the report provides details of the existing odour suppression system. It states that two rotary atomisers form a droplet mist to prevent odour nuisance with the additional benefit of controlling dust emissions. Given the

wider industrial nature of the subject site and the scale of the proposed liquid waste proposed to be treated, I am satisfied that this measure is acceptable and that there will not be any significant odour impact from the increase in solid waste recovery or proposed liquid waste treatment.

- 3.3.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on population and human health.

3.4. **Biodiversity**

- 3.4.1. As the subject proposal seeks to increase and intensify an existing established operation, the construction phase of the development is stated to be small in scale and nature. No decommissioning is proposed but potential effects are assessed on a precautionary basis. The zone of influence was set at 15km with no ecological receptors identified in the 9 no. NHA's and pNHA's due to distance or the nature of the site. In terms of European sites, as the subject site is a brown-field site in an industrial zone, no habitats of conservation importance were recorded. There is no potential for any significant effect on natural habitats or on fauna. While there are no watercourses on site, during the construction phase the possibility of pollution from mobilised suspended solids and / or the spillage of fuels, lubricants, hydraulic fluids and cement will be mitigated against through best practice environmental monitoring. No significant effect on ground or surface water is predicted. No cumulative effects are predicted.

- 3.4.2. I have considered all information submitted in relation to biodiversity and I am satisfied that it has been appropriately addressed in terms of the application and the information submitted by the applicant and that no significant adverse effect is likely to arise.

3.5. **Land, Soils and Geology**

- 3.5.1. According to chapter 7 the subject site has no known areas of soil contamination. Potential construction phase impacts are stated to be the contamination of soils through fuel leaks. A series of detailed mitigation measures are proposed that will

result in no significant effects on soils and bedrock. During the operation phase the design of the proposed development will result in no significant effects on soil and bedrock. The report identifies an interaction between human health and soils & bedrock in dust contact with contaminated soil. This is stated to be unlikely due to the small scale and best practice mitigation measures. The industrial nature of the wider area means there will be no cumulative impacts.

- 3.5.2. With regard to the submission of An Taisce that to avoid impact on soils and bedrock, that the entire site be bunded with ramps to enter or exit the site, it is considered that this is not necessary. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on land, soils and geology.

3.6. **Water**

- 3.6.1. Chapter 8 of the EIAR assesses the environmental impact of the proposed development on water. A Drainage report is included in Appendix 4-2. Regarding the submission of An Taisce that all surface water drains should drain to the existing system, the report states that the existing operation sends surface water to the public water storm sewer adjacent to the entrance of the site and a network of drainage channels on site bring foul water to a pumping station and on to the public network, in accordance with the system installed under Planning Authority reg. ref. 13/1350. The existing development involves the processing of only dry waste with the result that leachate generation is minimal. Water waste in the leachate tank to tankered to a waste water treatment plant. For the proposed development a trade effluent discharge to sewer licence has been obtained from Irish Water. A Flood Risk Assessment (appendix 8-1) carried out for the proposed development has found no significant potential for flooding. The FRA notes that there is no increase in impermeable surface area and that the proposed works will not affect the current storm water drainage system operating on site. The FRA notes that some ponding has occurred due to blocked gullies at the front of the site but that the severe weather event of November 2008 resulted in no flooding on site.

- 3.6.2. In terms of surface water quality, surface water monitoring was carried out in March 2019 at the point of discharge to the surface water sewer. All results were found to be within limits set by the current waste permit. For ground water, the identified risk is that of hydrocarbon spillage and leakage. This is deemed to be unlikely during the construction and the operational phases as there is no source-pathway-receptor route due to the built-up nature of the subject site and the wider area. The chapter notes that a trade effluent discharge to sewer licence was granted by Irish Water in August 2017 to treat the proposed liquid waste. No significant cumulative impacts are predicted.
- 3.6.3. I note the submission of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Gaeltacht that key concerns would be potential effects of the development on ground water quality with the associated negative implications for nearby areas of alkaline fen and habitats. I am satisfied that the potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on water.

3.7. Air and Climate

- 3.7.1. The assessment on air and climate notes that due to the general character of the surrounding environment air quality sampling with the exception of dust monitoring was deemed necessary. Details of the existing air quality for Galway City is provided with the statement that air quality at the subject site is expected to be similar. Dust deposition limit values at the site are limited by the sites current Waste Permit to 350 mg/m²/day. It is concluded that future waste permits will have similar limits. Table 9.9 of chapter 9 presents details of dust monitoring undertaken during 2018. Results above the 350mg limit were explained by the construction work being undertaken at the subject site. As the proposed construction phase is not intrusive or prolonged no significant effects are predicted once best practice mitigation measures to control dust are implemented. During the operational phase dust is not considered to be a significant effect. No cumulative impacts are likely. Greenhouse gas emissions during the construction and the operational phase are not considered significant.

3.7.2. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the existing and the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on air and climate.

3.8. **Noise and Vibration**

3.8.1. Chapter 10 of the EIAR refers to noise and vibration. The existing waste operation's waste permit sets daytime (06.00 – 20.00) noise limits at 55dB(A)LA_{eq} and night time limits at 45dB(A)LA_{eq}. Future permits are expected to have similar limits. The existing operation has three noise monitoring locations. Details of the 2018 survey are presented. During the construction phase the chief source of noise emissions will be plant - details of the noise levels of the proposed plant is presented in table 10.6. The conclusion is that noise levels will rise above the specified limits during the construction phase but this will be temporary and reflective of the wider industrial area. The impact is therefore not considered significant.

3.8.2. I note that section 10.4.2 states that noise impacts during the operational phase are not expected to be significant as the proposed development does not involve any new waste processing plant or technology. This is not correct as the introduction of liquid waste is a new process that will require new plant and a new technology. Nonetheless the scale of same is such that I concur with the chapters finding that given the background noise environment and the waste permits for the site, that no significant effects are likely. Mitigation measures are proposed.

3.8.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on noise and vibration.

3.9. **Landscape and Visual**

3.9.1. The assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development refers to the policies of the Galway County Development Plan 2015-2021 and to the existing character of the industrial area within which the subject site is located. In

terms of a visual landscape baseline, the LVIA notes the industrial nature of the wider area and that there are no residences or recreational uses nearby. Landscape and visual effects are deemed to be not significant. I concur with this finding.

3.9.2. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on landscape and visual.

3.10. Cultural Heritage

3.10.1. Chapter 12 of the EIAR assesses the impacts of the proposed development on cultural heritage. There are no RMP, archaeological monuments or NIAH sites within the subject site. Given the industrial nature of the site and the wider area, the report states that there will be no impact on cultural heritage from the proposed development.

3.10.2. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on cultural heritage.

3.11. Material Assets

3.11.1. The Material assets chapter of the EIAR addresses traffic and transport. It states that the assessment is based on the Traffic and Transport Assessment produced in 2018 for the proposed development. According to the chapter the proposed development will see traffic movements derived from the solid waste processing at the site increase by a factor of 2.7 over the existing turning movements. The existing turning movements generated by the current operation are not presented as a clearly identifiable figure however – being broken down into am & pm peaks, different junction movements, movements of cars v HGVs v office staff across a range of tables. Analysis of the various tables between the NTS, chapter 12 and the TTA provides no greater clarity. This contrasts with the easily understood information presented for traffic that will be generated by the proposed introduction of liquid

waste: 1,000 additional movements over a year which corresponds to 20 per week / 4-5 per day. That the EIAR is not more specific about the possible impact of this is regrettable. Nonetheless, I note that the TTA indicates that all junctions will operate within capacity at the operational year.

- 3.11.2. Chapter 12 concludes that there will be no significant effects during the construction or the operational phase. The cumulative impact of the development of the adjoining site which has permission for a used car sales operation and the M17 / M18 Gort to Tuam scheme is presented, showing that the junctions will continue to operate within capacity.
- 3.11.3. No significant effects are predicted for other services assessed: electricity, gas, water, sewage and telecommunications networks.
- 3.11.4. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on material assets.

3.12. Interactions

- 3.12.1. Chapter 13 of the EIAR states that the potential for significant interactions was addressed in the baseline and impact assessment chapter for each of the relevant topics in the chapters 5- 13. The chapter notes that there is also the potential for the interaction of significant effects and table 13.1 of the EIAR identifies the main interactions between environmental effects: positive, neutral, negative and no effect. Table 13 shows no potential positive or neutral effects between topics and 13 incidences where a potential negative effect exists. These can be summarised as population / human health and water, air and climate, noise and vibration and health and landscape, biodiversity, flora and fauna and water. Land, soils & geology and water and the last: air & climate and material assets. The report states that where potential negative effects have been identified during the assessment process, these impacts have been avoided by design or reduced by proposed mitigation measures as presented in the relevant chapters of the EIAR.

3.13. Reasoned Conclusion on the Significant Effects

3.13.1. Having regard to the examination of environmental information contained above, all submission received and in particular to the EIAR and the submission from the prescribed body, it is considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are, and will be mitigated as follows:

- Potential effect on human health which will be mitigated by the use of a Health & Safety plan, appropriate signage and barriers on site and use of trained personnel only,
- Potential effects arising from noise and vibration during construction which will be mitigated by appropriate management measures.
- Potential effects on human health and air during which will be mitigated against by the existing odour suppression system, and compliance with the dust control measures of the existing Waste Permit,
- Potential direct effects on surface and ground waters which will be mitigated by the existing system for surface water management and attenuation with respect to stormwater runoff and the drainage of foul effluent to the public foul sewerage system, compliance with the existing Trade Effluent Discharge Licence, implementation of a discharge monitoring inspection programme and standard good construction practices,

The proposed development is not likely to have significant adverse effects on population, land, soils & geology, noise, landscape and visual and cultural heritage.

The likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have therefore been satisfactorily identified, described and assessed. They would not require or justify refusing permission for the proposed development or requiring substantial amendments to it.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1.1. As stated in the previous Inspectors report, I am satisfied that the principle of a material recovery facility on the subject site has been established by previous Board decisions and has been accepted by the Planning Authority in subsequent decisions. Given the existing industrial operation on site and the corresponding programme of

environmental monitoring including the existing Waste Permit and Trade Effluent Discharge Licence, the industrial nature of the wider area, the information provided in the Environmental Impact assessment Report, and the planning history of the site, it is considered that the proposed increase in solid waste to 50,000 tonnes and introduction of 20,000 tonnes of liquid waste is acceptable.

- 4.1.2. Noting that the Planning Authority have determined that the proposed development materially contravenes the objectives of the Oranmore LAP, I am satisfied that the Board may grant permission for the proposed development in accordance with section 37(2)(b)(ii) as objectives regarding material recovery facilities are not clearly stated and also under section 37(2)(b)(iv) having regard to the pattern of development in the area and permissions granted since the making of the development plan.

5.0 Recommendation

- 5.1. I recommend permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

6.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 6.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal and to the industrial zoning objectives for the area as set out in the Connaught Ulster Waste Management Plan 2015-2021, the Galway County Development Plan 2009-2015 and the Oranmore Local Area Plan 2012-2022, the pattern of development in the area, to the proximity of the site to the regional and local road network and to the Galway metropolitan area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development, taking into account:

- (a) the nature, scale and extent of the proposed development;

- (b) the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted in support of the application;
- (c) the submissions from the planning authority and the prescribed bodies in the course of the application, and
- (d) the Inspector's report.

The Board considered that the environmental impact assessment report, supported by the documentation submitted by the applicant, identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

The Board agreed with the examination, set out in the Inspector's report, of the information contained in the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted by the applicant and submissions made in the course of the application.

The Board considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are, and will be mitigated as follows:

- Potential effect on human health which will be mitigated by the use of a Health & Safety plan, appropriate signage and barriers on site and use of trained personnel only,
- Potential effects arising from noise and vibration during construction which will be mitigated by appropriate management measures.
- Potential effects on human health and air during which will be mitigated against by the existing odour suppression system, and compliance with the dust control measures of the existing Waste Permit,
- Potential direct effects on surface and ground waters which will be mitigated by the existing system for surface water management and attenuation with respect to stormwater runoff and the drainage of foul effluent to the public foul sewerage system, compliance with the existing Trade Effluent Discharge Licence, implementation of a discharge monitoring inspection programme and standard good construction practices,

The proposed development is not likely to have significant adverse effects on population, land, soils & geology, noise, landscape and visual and cultural heritage.

The likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have therefore been satisfactorily identified, described and assessed.

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment in relation to the proposed development and concluded that subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed as set out in the environmental impact assessment report and subject to compliance with the conditions set out herein, the effects on the environment of the proposed development by itself and in combination with other development in the vicinity would be acceptable. In doing so, the Board adopted the report and conclusions of the Inspector.

7.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The mitigation and monitoring measures set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report submitted with this application shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.

Reason: To protect the environment.

3. The volume of materials to be handled at the facility shall be restricted to a maximum of 30,000 tonnes per annum of construction and demolition (C&D) waste and dry commercial/municipal waste and 20,000 non-hazardous liquid

waste only and shall not be used for any other purposes save with a prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To regulate and control the development and to safeguard the amenities of the area.

- 4 Specific materials under the European Waste Codes (EWCs) as set out under Council Decision 2003/33/EC to be accepted at the facility shall be agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and in order to safeguard the amenities of the area.

5. All storage, inspection and processing of dry waste material shall take place indoors. Outdoor storage or processing of dry waste materials including temporary and/or occasional storage is prohibited.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and in order to safeguard the amenities of the area.

6. (a) Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.
(b) Wastewater shall be connected to the public foul sewer.

Reason: To ensure adequate servicing of the development, and to prevent pollution.

7. Leachate generated by the development within the confines of the building shall be stored in a separation retention tank underneath the building and shall be disposed of off-site by a suitably licensed waste contractor and shall be disposed of in a licensed waste facility.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. The site and building works required to implement the development shall be carried out only between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and between 09.00 to 17.00 on Saturdays unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority. No construction activity shall take place on site on Sundays or Bank Holidays without the prior agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

9. No signage, advertising structures/advertisements, security shutters or other projecting elements including flagpoles shall be erected within the site unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area

10. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to the commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to the Board to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission

Gillian Kane
Senior Planning Inspector
17th May 2019