

File With _____

Appeal NO: ABP 321465

Defer Re O/H

TO: SEO

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 2/7/28
from

S. Griffin I recommend ~~to~~ not to circulate at this stage for the following

reason(s): no m lssu

E.O.: [Signature]

Date: 28/2/28

To EO: _____

TO BE CIRCULATED Y/N

S.E.O.: _____

Date: _____

S.A.O.: _____

Date: _____

M _____

Please prepare SC _____ - enclosing a copy of the attached submission

to: _____ Task No: _____

Allow 2/3/4weeks - SC _____

EO: _____

Date: _____

AA: _____

Date: _____

File With _____

CORRESPONDENCE FORM

Appeal No: ABP 321465

M _____

Please treat correspondence received on 21/7/25 as follows:

1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant _____	
2. Acknowledge with SC <u>20</u>	1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____
3. Keep copy of Board's Letter <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Keep Envelope: <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Keep Copy of Board's letter <input type="checkbox"/>

Amendments/Comments
<u>S131 Rep 72</u>
<u>L1D 28/7</u>
<u>* To be scanned</u>

4. Attach to file (a) R/S <input type="checkbox"/> (d) Screening <input type="checkbox"/> (b) GIS Processing <input type="checkbox"/> (e) Inspectorate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (c) Processing <input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN TO EO <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--

	Plans Date Stamped <input type="checkbox"/>
	Date Stamped Filled in <input type="checkbox"/>
EO: <u>[Signature]</u>	AA: <u>[Signature]</u>
Date: <u>25/7/25</u>	Date: <u>28/7/25</u>

AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA	
LDG- _____	
ACP- _____	
2 1 JUL 2025	
Fee: € _____	Type: _____
Time: <u>16.55</u>	By: <u>HAND</u>

**27A Calderwood Road,
Dublin 9
D09 VA8X**

18th July 2025

**An Coimisiun Pleanála,
64 Marlborough St,
Rotunda,
Dublin 1,
D01 V902.**

Re: St. Margaret's Recycling & Transfer Centre Ltd ABP321465

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am responding to the letter issued by you to me on the 30/6/2025 and the copy of the DAA submission, I thank you for the opportunity to highlight my concerns. I have previously noted that the original application by the applicants was not made in the name of the legitimate or legal entity and therefore I do have reservations about the fact that the Planning process is continuing.

Now I do take on board the concerns that the DAA have noted in their submission to you and I am personally concerned about this particular development and the likely and continuous issues created by the processing of scrap and hazardous materials that would have a dire effect on the environment. Like the DAA. I believe that the creation of ponding or pooling of water or in fact allowing water of any sort to be released directly from any waste facility-into open ditches or the natural water system that has the risk to carry contaminants and pollutants is extremely risky to both the environment in proximity to the airport and further field ,additionally the risks to public health cannot be subdued.

The DAA themselves are acutely aware of the cost incurred by them from the processing of surface water that contained, residues of aviation fuel and particularly de-icing compounds that were sprayed on planes, thankfully the DAA has water treatment plants at the extremity of its boundary and was able to capture these

compounds to some degree but also at great financial expense as we observed the continuous removal of water by tankers assuming to better waste water treatment facilities.

We enjoy the amenity created by DAA for plane watching, we do notice the plums of dust and litter emanating from the direction of this waste facility from time to time, it's surprising that the activities are not operated indoors and occasionally the thudding sound of the machines can be heard over and above the airplanes landing.

I am not a specialist in the area of water or wildlife but I am aware of manmade impacts that occur when not properly managed , I don't think that the facility creates any benefits to the functioning of the airport nor have I had an opportunity to explore all the submissions made by the facility over the years because of incorrect application name.

This facility should not be allowed planning when simple issues like emissions cannot be contained within the facility and create anxiety for the DAA having had their own experience in environmental and water protection issues.

Regards



J. Griffin

**27A Calderwood Road,
Dublin 9
D09 VA8X
18th July 2025**

**An Coimisiun Pleanála,
64 Marlborough St,
Rotunda,
Dublin 1,
D01 V902.**

AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA	
LDG- _____	
ACP- _____	
21 JUL 2025	
Fee: € _____	Type: _____
Time: 1655	By: HANO

Re: St. Margaret's Recycling & Transfer Centre Ltd ABP321465

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am responding to the letter issued by you to me on the 30/6/2025 along with a copy of the submission from the Department of Housing, Local government and Heritage, I thank you for the opportunity to highlight my concerns. I have previously noted that the original application by the applicants was not made in the name of the legitimate or legal entity and therefore I do have reservations about the fact that the Planning process is continuing.

Like the Department of Housing, I do find it extremely difficult and challenging to comprehend how the water from this facility is allowed to be discharged into our natural drainage systems, I am very familiar with the area and all of its shortcomings. I have noticed that this facility has substantially grown in the amount of material stockpiled in plain view of R 122 at the entrance area and I have seen regularly water run-off from this area onto R122.

I was never aware of the fact that the surface water from the facility is allowed run directly into an open ditch without reasonable treatment through a bona fide water treatment process on the site, I was in the area when there was a major fire incident at the site and I have seen the emergency services visit the site on occasion. I have never brought material to the site, but I have noticed all sorts of trucks, vans, cars, tractors and trailers and big articulated trucks

and trailers enter and leave this site. They have at times left trail marks of muck, generally black, on the entrance and road area.

The idea that the facility would self-manage its own pollutants and that any government agency would allow or even risk allowing the water that would emanate from such a facility be allowed pass directly into a ditch and culvert feeding the Huntstown stream seems ludicrous. We have seen over the last few days the effect of an oil spillage from a fuel tank delivery one of our National Banks on the south side of Dublin and the spillage entering the lake and stream of the nearby water system The Bank responsible for this particular fuel tank spill, Bank Of Ireland, apologise for this spillage but the damage has already been done, including water life, fauna, and Water fowl.

Accident do occur, accidents have occurred on the site and by allowing the unabated continuance of processing and importation of potentially toxic pollutants for the local water system to be processed at the site will not prove beneficial to the local community or environment.

I believe that if this facility is allowed to continue the water treatment should be of a standard that creates no potential risk and therefore should have a treatment works contained within the facility. This would be a better option than expecting pollutants to dissipate through the use of ground water charging. I am disappointed that regardless of who the applicants are that such risks were not covered in their environmental reports, highlighting really that the safeguards that the Department of Housing now rely on the Commission to impose restrictions, to an extent to prevent pollution, downstream and the Malahide estuary.

This facility is not fit for purpose, should not be allowed planning when simple issues like surface water discharges cannot be contained within the site and create anxiety for the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage and should not be allowed to continue.

Regards


J. Griffin