

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO: 31517322.

Defer Re O/H ☐

TO: SEO

Having considered the contents of the submission received 29/6/23. from

1st Party. I recommend that section 131 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000

be/not be invoked at this stage for the following reason(s): No new issues raised

E.O.: 

Date: 3/7/23

To EO: _____

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage. ☐

Section 131 to be invoked – allow 2/4 weeks for reply. ☐

S.E.O.: _____

Date: _____

S.A.O.: _____

Date: _____

M _____

Please prepare BP _____ - Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission

to: _____ Task No: _____

Allow 2/3/4weeks – BP _____

EO: _____

Date: _____

AA: _____

Date: _____

File With _____

CORRESPONDENCE FORM

Appeal No: ABP- 315173-23.Mr McNallyPlease treat correspondence received on 29/6/23. as follows:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant _____
2. Acknowledge with BP <u>23</u>
3. Keep copy of Board's Letter ☐ | 1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____
2. Keep Envelope: ☐
3. Keep Copy of Board's letter ☐ |
|--|--|

Amendments/Comments

1st Party response to S132.

4. Attach to file

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) R/S ☐ | (d) Screening ☐ |
| (b) GIS Processing ☐ | (e) Inspectorate ☒ |
| (c) Processing ☐ | |

RETURN TO EO ☐

	Plans Date Stamped ☐
	Date Stamped Filled in ☐
EO: <u>Anthony McNally</u>	AA: <u>Anthony McNally</u>
Date: <u>3/7/23.</u>	Date: <u>04/07/2023</u>

Alice-Faye Staunton

From: Paschal Walsh <Paschal.Walsh@boliden.com>
Sent: Thursday 29 June 2023 16:26
To: Appeals2
Subject: Ref: Case Number:ABP-315173-22
Attachments: Butress ABP June 2023.pdf; Submission to An Bord Pleanala Signed Dated 21.12.2022.pdf; Receipt of submission.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi,
Following our phone call this afternoon, I attached you letter, our submission submitted in December 2022 and a copy of ABP receipt.

Can you confirm that all is in order in terms of our response to the Appeal?


Kind Regards

Paschal.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is intended only for the addressees and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution or use of the information contained in this e-mail and its attachments, if any, is not allowed. Views expressed are those of the user and not necessarily those of Boliden AB (publ) or its subsidiaries. Any unauthorized use, copying, review or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail and any copies of it. Boliden has taken every reasonable precaution to ensure that any attachment to this e-mail has been scanned for viruses. However, we only send and receive e-mails on the basis that we are not liable for any viruses or any consequences thereof and would advise that you carry out your own virus scans before opening any attachments. For information on Boliden's processing of your personal data, please refer to our : Privacy policy - <https://www.boliden.com/privacypolicy> Svensk integritetspolicy - <https://www.boliden.com/sv/integritetspolicy>

Our Case Number: ABP-315173-22

Planning Authority Reference Number: 22331



**An
Bord
Pleanála**

Boliden Tara Mines DAC
Knockumber
Navan
Co. Meath
C15 NH63

Date: 22 June 2023

Re: Construction of a rockfill and earthen reinforcement buttress to sections of the extant embankment wall of the Tailings Storage Facility. An Environmental Report and a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) were received with this application.
Randalstown, Simonstown and Sillogue, Navan, Co. Meath

Dear Sir / Madam,

I have been asked by An Bord Pleanála to refer to the above mentioned appeal.

The Board has examined the appeal and is of the opinion that certain information is necessary for the purpose of enabling it to determine the appeal.

In accordance with section 132 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, (as amended), you are required to submit, **on or before 12th July 2023**, the following document:

- **A full copy of your response to the appeal received by the Board on 21st December 2022**

If the document/particulars/other information required is/are not received before the end of the specified period, the Board will dismiss or otherwise determine the appeal without further notice to you in accordance with section 133 of the 2000 Act, (as amended). Your submission in response to this notice must be received by the Board **not later than 5.30 p.m. on 12th July 2023**.

Please quote the above appeal reference number in any further correspondence.

Yours faithfully,

Garry Dorgan
Executive Officer
Direct Line: 01-8737152

BP71 Registered Post

Teil	Tel	(01) 858 8100
Glao Áitiúil	LoCall	1800 275 175
Facs	Fax	(01) 872 2684
Láithreán Gréasáin	Website	www.pleanala.ie
Ríomhphost	Email	bord@pleanala.ie

64 Sráid Maoilbhríde	64 Marlborough Street
Baile Átha Cliath 1	Dublin 1
D01 V902	D01 V902

Our Reference: Appeal by Sustainability 2050 / John Callaghan
Your Reference: ABP-315173-22

21 December 2022

An Bord Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

HAND DELIVERED

Dear Ms McCormack,

We refer to your letter dated 24 November 2022 enclosing a copy of the appeal received by An Bord Pleanála ("the Board") from Sustainability 2050 / Mr John Callaghan ("the Appellant") in respect of our application for planning submitted to Meath County Council under reference number 22331 ("the planning application"). Your reference for this appeal is ABP-315173-22.

In response to the appeal, we make the following points:

1. The Appellant appears to be operating under a fundamental misunderstanding in respect of the nature of the proposed development and what exactly it is. This is apparent by reference to the number of irrelevant classes in Part 1 and Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 – 2022 (the "Planning Regulations") to which the Appellant has referred in his appeal, which the proposed development is not relevant to. The proposed development, as stated at the outset of the Appellant's appeal, is for the construction of a reinforcement buttress to the extant embankment walls of the Tailings Storage Facility ("TSF"). The dam itself is not changing in any way, nor the height or storage capacity of the dam.
2. Specifically, the planning application requests permission for the construction of a reinforcement buttress to the extant embankment walls of the TSF. The works will consist of the construction of a rockfill and earthen reinforcement buttress to sections of the extant embankment walls of the TSF. The proposed buttress, to be constructed on the downstream slope and at the crest of the Stage 1, 2 and 3 starter embankments, will provide additional support and increase the overall stability of the extant upstream raises i.e. Stage 4 and Stage 5. In essence, and in simple terms, the proposed development solely involves the addition of rock to the existing embankment of the TSF to further buttress it. For ease, we will refer to this as the "proposed development" in this letter.
3. The proposed development (buttressing) is not an EIA development. It is not itself listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning Regulations.
4. We have analysed whether the proposed development (buttressing) would amount to a change to or extension of the existing dam, within the meaning of Class 22, Part 1 of Schedule 5 or Class 13, Part 2 of Schedule 5. Our conclusion is that the proposed development is not

significant in and of itself, nor in comparison to the size of the dam, and does not comprise a change or extension:

- 4.1 which results in an increase in size greater than 25% of the dam or
- 4.2 which results in an increase in size greater than an amount equal to 50% of the appropriate threshold.
5. In fact, the quantity of materials (circa 95% of which are by-product materials as opposed to virgin materials, a fact which does not appear to be acknowledged by the Appellant) required to build the proposed development would constitute 8.65% of the total material used to build the embankments to the dam to date.
6. The quantity of water impounded or the area of land on which the dam sits is not changing in any respect; only the buttressing is changing insofar as additional rock is being added to it.
7. Contrary to the assertions made by the Appellant, the proposed development (buttressing) is not or does not involve any one of the following:
 - 7.1 A quarry or open cast mine where the surface exceeds 25 hectares within the meaning of Class 19, Part 1, Schedule 5.
 - 7.2 The extraction of minerals within the meaning of Class 2(c), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.3 The construction of private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length within the meaning of Class 10(dd), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.4 Groundwater abstraction where the annual volume of water abstracted is equivalent to or exceeds 10 million cubic metres within the meaning of Class 11, Part 1, Schedule 5 or 2 million cubic meters within the meaning of Class 10(l), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.5 Artificial groundwater recharge scheme where the annual volume of water recharged is equivalent to or exceeds 10 million cubic metres within the meaning of Class 11, Part 1, Schedule 5.
8. In relation to the assertion that the proposed development (buttressing) is sub-threshold development likely to have significant effects on the environment, we refer the Appellant and the Board to the enclosed Environmental Impact Report. This concludes that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment for the reasons set out therein.
9. For all of these reasons, and without prejudice to the fact that the proposed development (buttressing) is not an EIA project in and of itself, we are satisfied that, the conclusion is that the need for an environmental impact assessment can be screened out for the proposed development.
10. Further, the Appellant has himself identified in his appeal the worthiness of the objective of the proposed development in noting the flooding risks associated with dams and the appropriateness of continually improving and upgrading dams to ensure compliance with modern safety standards and current international practice. This objective is the very same objective of the proposed development. In particular, as noted in the enclosed Environmental Impact Report, Tara Mines wishes *“to address the risk of tailing embankment failure through conservation design criteria, independent of trigger mechanisms, in order to minimise potential impacts”*. This is a key objective of the *“Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management”* which Tara Mines is in the process of adopting, having recently become a

member of the International Council for Mining and Metals. In this regard, the Appellant and Tara Mines appear to be aligned as to the worthiness of the objective of the proposed development.

11. Finally, we wish to draw the Board's attention to the fact that the Appellant is seeking to collaterally attack the long established Tara Mines operations in the context of this planning appeal, where the application for consent relates specifically and solely to the proposed development (buttressing). the Appellant cannot do this as the statutory time period within which any such challenge may be brought has long since passed. Any and all allegations relating to our existing dam infrastructure are entirely irrelevant in these circumstances and are denied as incorrect, inaccurate and untrue. We therefore do not propose to address these comments as part of this application.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Paschal Walsh'.


Paschal Walsh EHS Manager

Boliden Tara Mines DAC

AN BORD PLEANÁLA
GENERAL RECEIPT
ADMHAIL

No. IR 116759
Uimh. IR

An Bord Pleanála



RECEIVED FROM
FUARTHAS Ó

Beliden

The sum of
Sum

€

W/A

in respect of:
ar:

Appeal or other Statutory Fee
Achomharc nó ar Tháille Reachtúil eile

Submission

Purchase of Statutory Documents
Doiciméid Riachtúil a cheannach

Other - Please specify
Eile - Sonraigh le do thoil/len bhur dtail

(2) Documents in relation to:
Doiciméid a bhaireann le:

SEE NOTE ON BACK OF RECEIPT
LEIGH AN NOTA AR CHUL

KLADIA

Signed
Sínithe


[Signature]

Date
Dáta

21/12/22


Our Case Number: ABP-315173-22

Planning Authority Reference Number: 22331



**An
Bord
Pleanála**

Boliden Tara Mines DAC
Knockumber
Navan
Co. Meath
C15 NH63



Date: 22 June 2023

Re: Construction of a rockfill and earthen reinforcement buttress to sections of the extant embankment wall of the Tailings Storage Facility. An Environmental Report and a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) were received with this application.

Randalstown, Simonstown and Sillogue, Navan, Co. Meath

Dear Sir / Madam,

I have been asked by An Bord Pleanála to refer to the above mentioned appeal.

The Board has examined the appeal and is of the opinion that certain information is necessary for the purpose of enabling it to determine the appeal.

In accordance with section 132 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, (as amended), you are required to submit, **on or before 12th July 2023**, the following document:

- **A full copy of your response to the appeal received by the Board on 21st December 2022**

If the document/particulars/other information required is/are not received before the end of the specified period, the Board will dismiss or otherwise determine the appeal without further notice to you in accordance with section 133 of the 2000 Act, (as amended). Your submission in response to this notice must be received by the Board **not later than 5.30 p.m. on 12th July 2023**.

Please quote the above appeal reference number in any further correspondence.

Yours faithfully,

Gárry Dorgan
Executive Officer
Direct Line: 01-8737152

BP71 Registered Post

Teil
Glaio Áitiúil
Facs
Láithreán Gréasáin
Ríomhphost

Tel
LoCall
Fax
Website
Email

(01) 858 8100
1800 275 175
(01) 872 2684
www.pleanala.ie
bord@pleanala.ie

64 Sráid Maoilbhríde
Baile Átha Cliath 1
D01 V902

64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

AN BORD PLEANÁLA
GENERAL RECEIPT
ADMHÁIL

No. IR 116759
Uimh. IR

An Bord Pleanála



RECEIVED FROM
FUARTHAS Ó

Balideen

The sum of
Sum

€

N/A

in respect of:
air:

Appeal or other Statutory Fee
Achoimharc nó ar Tháille Reachtúil eile

☐

Submission

Purchase of Statutory Documents
Doiciméid Riachtúil a cheannach

Other - Please specify
Eile - Sonraigh le do thoil/in bhur dtóil

(2) Documents in relation to:
Doiciméid a baineann le:

KLADIA

SEE NOTE ON BACK OF RECEIPT
LEIGH AN NOTA AR CHUL

Signed
Sínithe

Almudia

Date
Dáta

21/12/22

Our Reference: Appeal by Sustainability 2050 / John Callaghan
Your Reference: ABP-315173-22

21 December 2022

An Bord Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

HAND DELIVERED

Dear Ms McCormack,

We refer to your letter dated 24 November 2022 enclosing a copy of the appeal received by An Bord Pleanála (“the Board”) from Sustainability 2050 / Mr John Callaghan (“the Appellant”) in respect of our application for planning submitted to Meath County Council under reference number 22331 (“the planning application”). Your reference for this appeal is ABP-315173-22.

In response to the appeal, we make the following points:

1. The Appellant appears to be operating under a fundamental misunderstanding in respect of the nature of the proposed development and what exactly it is. This is apparent by reference to the number of irrelevant classes in Part 1 and Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 – 2022 (the “Planning Regulations”) to which the Appellant has referred in his appeal, which the proposed development is not relevant to. The proposed development, as stated at the outset of the Appellant’s appeal, is for the construction of a reinforcement buttress to the extant embankment walls of the Tailings Storage Facility (“TSF”). The dam itself is not changing in any way, nor the height or storage capacity of the dam.
2. Specifically, the planning application requests permission for the construction of a reinforcement buttress to the extant embankment walls of the TSF. The works will consist of the construction of a rockfill and earthen reinforcement buttress to sections of the extant embankment walls of the TSF. The proposed buttress, to be constructed on the downstream slope and at the crest of the Stage 1, 2 and 3 starter embankments, will provide additional support and increase the overall stability of the extant upstream raises i.e. Stage 4 and Stage 5. In essence, and in simple terms, the proposed development solely involves the addition of rock to the existing embankment of the TSF to further buttress it. For ease, we will refer to this as the “proposed development” in this letter.
3. The proposed development (buttressing) is not an EIA development. It is not itself listed in Part 1 or Part 2 of Schedule 5 of the Planning Regulations.
4. We have analysed whether the proposed development (buttressing) would amount to a change to or extension of the existing dam, within the meaning of Class 22, Part 1 of Schedule 5 or Class 13, Part 2 of Schedule 5. Our conclusion is that the proposed development is not

significant in and of itself, nor in comparison to the size of the dam, and does not comprise a change or extension:

- 4.1 which results in an increase in size greater than 25% of the dam or
- 4.2 which results in an increase in size greater than an amount equal to 50% of the appropriate threshold.
5. In fact, the quantity of materials (circa 95% of which are by-product materials as opposed to virgin materials, a fact which does not appear to be acknowledged by the Appellant) required to build the proposed development would constitute 8.65% of the total material used to build the embankments to the dam to date.
6. The quantity of water impounded or the area of land on which the dam sits is not changing in any respect; only the buttressing is changing insofar as additional rock is being added to it.
7. Contrary to the assertions made by the Appellant, the proposed development (buttressing) is not or does not involve any one of the following:
 - 7.1 A quarry or open cast mine where the surface exceeds 25 hectares within the meaning of Class 19, Part 1, Schedule 5.
 - 7.2 The extraction of minerals within the meaning of Class 2(c), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.3 The construction of private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length within the meaning of Class 10(dd), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.4 Groundwater abstraction where the annual volume of water abstracted is equivalent to or exceeds 10 million cubic metres within the meaning of Class 11, Part 1, Schedule 5 or 2 million cubic meters within the meaning of Class 10(l), Part 2, Schedule 5.
 - 7.5 Artificial groundwater recharge scheme where the annual volume of water recharged is equivalent to or exceeds 10 million cubic metres within the meaning of Class 11, Part 1, Schedule 5.
8. In relation to the assertion that the proposed development (buttressing) is sub-threshold development likely to have significant effects on the environment, we refer the Appellant and the Board to the enclosed Environmental Impact Report. This concludes that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment for the reasons set out therein.
9. For all of these reasons, and without prejudice to the fact that the proposed development (buttressing) is not an EIA project in and of itself, we are satisfied that, the conclusion is that the need for an environmental impact assessment can be screened out for the proposed development.
10. Further, the Appellant has himself identified in his appeal the worthiness of the objective of the proposed development in noting the flooding risks associated with dams and the appropriateness of continually improving and upgrading dams to ensure compliance with modern safety standards and current international practice. This objective is the very same objective of the proposed development. In particular, as noted in the enclosed Environmental Impact Report, Tara Mines wishes "*to address the risk of tailing embankment failure through conservation design criteria, independent of trigger mechanisms, in order to minimise potential impacts*". This is a key objective of the "*Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management*" which Tara Mines is in the process of adopting, having recently become a

member of the International Council for Mining and Metals. In this regard, the Appellant and Tara Mines appear to be aligned as to the worthiness of the objective of the proposed development.

11. Finally, we wish to draw the Board's attention to the fact that the Appellant is seeking to collaterally attack the long established Tara Mines operations in the context of this planning appeal, where the application for consent relates specifically and solely to the proposed development (buttressing). the Appellant cannot do this as the statutory time period within which any such challenge may be brought has long since passed. Any and all allegations relating to our existing dam infrastructure are entirely irrelevant in these circumstances and are denied as incorrect, inaccurate and untrue. We therefore do not propose to address these comments as part of this application.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Paschal Walsh'.

Paschal Walsh EHS Manager

Boliden Tara Mines DAC

