



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Record of 2nd Meeting ABP-321557-24

Case Reference / Description	Proposed Development of a Solar Farm, 110kV Substation, an Associated 110kV Grid Connection and all associated ancillary site work located in Drumroe East, Cappoquinn and adjacent townlands, Cappoquinn, Co. Waterford.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th Meeting	2 nd Meeting		
Date	30/04/2026	Start Time	11:00am
Location	Virtually	End Time	11:30am

Representing An Coimisiún Pleanála

Una Crosse, Assistant Planning Director, Chair

Paul Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector

Sinead White, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant

Muireann Carroll, McCutcheon Halley

Matt Williamson, McCutcheon Halley

Robert Gaffney, Amerenco

Charles Coyle, Amerenco

Introduction

The Commission referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant requesting a second pre-application meeting and referred to the first meeting held on 6th February 2025.

Presentation made by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant set out their presentation, which is on the file.

Discussion:

Matters including the following were discussed:

Position remains the same as the preliminary opinion confirmed at the first pre-app meeting, namely that only the substation and grid connection come within the scope of SID. Accordingly, an application can be made directly to the Commission under Section 182A for these elements.

Prospective applicant confirmed that one grid connection route was now confirmed as detailed in the presentation.

Prospective applicant confirmed that the proposed BESS element was in the early stages of design. The current proposed location relative to the substation was briefly discussed as detailed in the presentation. The prospective applicant confirmed that the BESS would be the subject of a separate S.34 application to the local authority at a later date.

Commissions representatives noted that the policy context remained unchanged, and that the local, regional and national policy position was supportive of electricity and renewable energy development in principle.

It was considered that a TTA was unlikely to be required, but that an RSA should be considered in consultation with the local authority. It was noted that a CEMP and CTMP would be included. It was recommended that this gave clarity as to the traffic management measures which would impact residents together with the timing and schedule for the progression of the works.

It was noted that it was proposed to use an existing (field) access to the substation site. ACP representatives advised that the national and local development plan policy position in relation to restricted access onto national roads should be comprehensively addressed.

ACP representatives advised that an AA Screening report should be prepared together with an NIS as required, noting that an NIS was previously triggered by hydrological connection with two Natura 2000 sites both of which appeared to remain connected.

It was acknowledged that the electricity development was not a class for the purposes of EIA, but it was recommended that a screening exercise be undertaken in respect of other classes.

The prospective applicant was advised to consider all cumulative and in-combination effects in the environmental and ecological reports including the development as a whole (solar, BESS, substation and grid connection) and other relevant projects, noting consented windfarms in the wider area.

ACP representatives noted that a noise impact assessment was being prepared and advised that this include impacts on residential properties along the GCR particularly if this included HDD works or activities.

ACP representatives noted the presence of NIAH and built heritage features in the vicinity of the site and GCR and recommended an appropriate appraisal of same, and the presence of both flood zones and protected waterbodies and recommended a flood risk assessment, surface water management plan and that WFD considerations are addressed as required.

Next Steps

Prospective applicant hopes to close out consultation as soon as possible.

Conclusion:

The Commission's representatives advised that the onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Commission's representatives advised that the record of the instant meeting will be issued in the meantime and that the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting.

The Meeting concluded at 11:30am.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Una Crosse', is written over a horizontal line.

Una Crosse

Assistant Director of Planning