

File With \_\_\_\_\_

Appeal NO: ABP 321465

Defer Re O/H

TO: SEO

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 21/7/25

from

John Conroy I recommend /not to circulate at this stage for the following

reason(s): no w [signature]

E.O.: [signature]

Date: 25/7/25

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> 3. Keep copy of Board's Letter <input type="checkbox"/>	1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____ 2. Keep Envelope: <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Keep Copy of Board's letter <input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Amendments/Comments
<u>S131 Rep x2</u>
<u>L1D 28/7</u>

<b>4. Attach to file</b> (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"/>	<b>RETURN TO EO</b> <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>28/07/25</u>

91 St Nicholas Avenue,  
Dundalk,  
Co. Louth,

19<sup>th</sup> July 2025

**An Coimisiun Pleanála**  
64 Marlborough Street,  
Dublin 1,  
D01 V902

<b>AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA</b>	
LDG- _____	
ACP- _____	
21 JUL 2025	
Fee: € _____	Type: _____
Time: 16.55	By: <i>JMM</i>

**RE: Case Numbers ABP 321465**

In response to your letter received in relation to the submissions from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage dated the 30th of June 2025 I respond in the following fashion I note to concern of the DAA, and I'm surprised these elements were not dealt with in the submissions of the applicants or consultants for the site.

The Department like other submissions are also concerned about the level of information submitted in the AA and EIAR, the issues of water runoff have not been adequately dealt with, there are obvious concerns and fears of the release of pollutants into the ground water system and the Huntstown stream and its catchment.

There are no details of the process being used in the planning files, yet we note that in separate submissions to FCC waste department the applicants have made submissions to cover the use of water in the shredding equipment to prevent dust accumulation, this additional contaminated water is not mentioned in the submitted planning files nor in the supporting environmental documentation.

We have a total disjoint in the information being presented and along with the management plan on increasing throughput in the plant based on an application for historically low tonnage of 22,000T.

The plant continues to breach these levels and operations continue at weekend periods which is outside the working hours of the regulatory local authority.

I am also concerned that no consideration has been given for the additional planning sought for a filling station that plans to use a reed bed release of surface water into the same drainage network linked to the Huntstown stream. This planning is on the owner's land, and I am deeply concerned as much as the Department of Housing and the DAA are about long-term cumulative effects of a total dependence on release of potential pollutants into the ground water system.


It must specifically be noted that we are not dealing with a general water run off as surface water may be considered, we are actually dealing with potentially contaminated water, from a risk related site

There is an emphasis on the Commission to satisfy itself that all activities will not create pollution, I believe this task is insurmountable due to lack of open information and updated information on the recycling operations and planned importation prevailed ELVs for processing.

The risks from run-off water, fire water, wind-blown contaminants also create risks to flora, fauna, and public health. As hinted at by the Department the risk is greater than the reward as far the environment is concerned and planning should be refused.

For your consideration.

Yours Faithfully



John Conway

91 St Nicholas Avenue,  
Dundalk,  
Co. Louth,  
19<sup>th</sup> July 2025

**An Coimisiun Pleanála**  
64 Marlborough Street,  
Dublin 1,  
D01 V902

<b>AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA</b>	
LDG-	_____
ACP-	_____
21 JUL 2025	
Fee: €	_____ Type: _____
Time: 16.55	By: HANB

**RE: Case Numbers ABP 321465**

In response to your letter received in relation to the submissions from the DAA dated the 30th of June 2025 I respond in the following fashion I note to concern of the DAA, and I'm surprised these elements were not dealt with in the submissions of the applicants or consultants for the site.


I believe that appropriate assessment submitted by the applicant's consultants have more questions than answers. The EIAR in itself did not deal with the local issues of surface water for discharge in a proper fashion taking into consideration all issues including pollutants when we look at even the Department of Agriculture's own methodology around the appropriate assessment is very clear. The farms and businesses are source the streams and rivers are the pathway and Natura 2000 sites are the receptors.

The keyword here is source it seems that this particular facility is seeking something similar to a derogation i.e. requesting permission to discharge potentially contaminated surface water into an ecosystem and the risks and previous issues have not been properly highlighted to prevent any risk whatsoever to the ecosystem.

This suggestion by the DAA for underground attenuation and rapid charging of the soil with surface water shows that others are more concerned, including these government bodies about the environmental risks than are those toes of the proposers or applicants. I am extremely concerned and particularly with our water bodies been under such threat as highlighted recently in the discussions of issues surrounding nitrates never mind the risk of contaminants and pollutants from processing of contaminate materials that could eventually end up in a tributary and rivers. I do not consider this development suitable in the area and there are too many unanswered risks to the environment.

For your consideration.

Yours Faithfully

  
John Conway