



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum Report

ABP-318683-23

Development	Demolition of all existing waste processing buildings on site and construction of a new modernised multi-processing facility.
Location	Panda Waste, Ballymount Road Upper, Ballymount, Dublin 24
Planning Authority	South Dublin County Council
Applicant(s)	Starrus Eco Holdings Limited
Type of Application	Section 37E
Observers	TII EPA
Date of Site Inspection	11 th June 2024
Inspector	Alaine Clarke

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This is an addendum report to clarify issues raised within the Board direction dated 6th November 2024. The Board decided to request comments from the applicant regarding the submissions/observations received.
- 1.2. A response from the applicant, prepared by Tom Philips & Ass., was received on 29th November 2024 which addressed the 4 no. observations made during the course of the SID application from Fingal County Council (FCC), Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and South Dublin County Council (SDCC).

2.0 Response to Submissions

- 2.1. The response states that the observations made by FCC and TII were of no comment. With respect to the observations from the EPA and SDCC, the applicant's response is summarised below.

2.2. Environmental Protection Agency

- 2.2.1. The response acknowledges the contents of the EPA submission and states that it has no further submission to make in relation to this observation.

2.3. South Dublin County Council

- 2.3.1. With respect to green-roof policy (Overarching Policy G15, Objective 7 of the South Dublin County Development Plan (SDCDP) 2022-2028 refers) the applicant refers to the current stress on the national electricity grid, and company-wide sustainability commitments and considers the benefits to the environment resulting from the proposed roof mounted solar panels outweigh any associated with a Green Roof, pointing to SDCDP 2022-2028 Energy, objective 1, which support solar energy infrastructure for on-site energy use and re-iterating the detailed grounds made in the Planning Report submitted with the application that roof mounted solar panels be considered in-lieu of a green roof.
- 2.3.2. Regarding comment from the Environmental Health Department, 7 no. conditions are recommended to be attached in the event of a grant of permission, one of which

requires the substation to be temporary in nature. In response, the applicant considers this is overly onerous and has potential to impact on the future operation of the business and request that the condition is not imposed.

- 2.3.3. Regarding landscaping and the requirement for minimum green space factor requirements in accordance with SDCCDP GI5 Objective 4 which seeks to implement the Green Space Factor (GSF) for all qualifying development comprising 2 or more residential units and any development with a floor area in excess of 500 sq m, the applicant states that the proposed development includes a c. 63% increase in the number of trees on site. The applicant considers that the current GSF is appropriate.
- 2.3.4. The applicant has no comment to make in respect of other matters raised by SDCC and concludes by accepting the recommended conditions with the exception of the points raised above.

3.0 Assessment

- 3.1. With the exception of longevity of the substation, the issues given more of a passing consideration in the response to submissions, i.e., green roof policy and green space factor, are considered in detail in my report. Section 6.6 of the report addresses green infrastructure and assesses policies in relation to green space factor and green roofs. The applicant's comments are noted. Nothing new or of substance is presented in the response such that would warrant any change to my report.
- 3.2. With respect to substation longevity, the condition which requires that the substation is for a period of 5 years, is extrapolated from the HSE Environmental Health Officer report and inserted into the SDCC Chief Executive's report. The Board will note that the suggested condition continues then to speak on telecommunications infrastructure and as stated in my report, no telecommunications infrastructure is proposed as part of the development. SDCC note that section 13.6.4.1 of the EIAR states that the proposed facility will be connected to the electricity network and a new electricity substation is proposed to accommodate the increased electricity demand, meaning the proposed substation would be a primary electrical power source to the facility. I note that SDCC do not raise any objection to the substation or its proposed permanency. I note and accept the applicant's concern with respect to the proposition that the substation should be restricted to a temporary period. I do

not consider it necessary or justifiable to restrict the substation to a temporary period. My report reflects the proposed development as applied for and I have not attached any limiting conditions with respect to the proposed substation.

4.0 Conclusion

Having regard to the foregoing, the conclusion of the inspector's report dated 3rd July 2024 is not altered in any way.

Alaine Clarke

Senior Planning Inspector