



An Coimisiún Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

ACP ref: ACP-324033-26

WSP ref: IE-40000103

23 July 2026

**Applicant's response to submissions received with regard to the proposed development of a soil recovery facility in the townland Kilmartin, Coyne's Cross, Co. Wicklow.
An Coimisiún Pleanála (ACP) Case Number: ACP-324033-26.**

Dear A Chara,

This submission has been prepared in response to An Coimisiún Pleanála's ('ACP') information request issued in accordance with 37F(1)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, as set out in ACP's letter dated 15 May 2026 (ACP case number 'ACP-324033-26').

This document has been prepared by WSP Ireland Consulting Limited ('WSP') on behalf of the Applicant, Kilmartin Junction 14 Limited. Technical specialists that have contributed to this submission are:

- Dr Les Brown – Hydrogeologist (Technical Director Hydrogeology at WSP). Qualifications: PhD, MSc, BSc. Accreditations/Affiliations: PGeo EurGeol. Years experience: 27.
- Dr Luis Iemma – Ecologist (Associate Director and Ecological Team Lead for the Republic of Ireland at WSP). Qualifications: BSc, MSc, and PhD in Ecology. Accreditations/Affiliations: Chartered Ecologist (CEcol) and Full Member of CIEEM. Years experience: 15.

In addition to the Applicant's responses provided below, the following updated documents are enclosed:

- Updated Non-Technical Summary of EIAR (WSP file ref: 40000103.R01.02).
- Updated Table of Contents (TOC) for EIAR (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.00.02).
- Updated Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) chapter - Chapter 3.0: Project Description (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.03.02), including:
 - Updated proposed restoration plan provided in Appendix 3C.
- Updated EIAR chapter - Chapter 6.0: Ecology and Biodiversity (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.06.02), including:
 - Bat survey of Trees (WSP, 2026) provided in Appendix 6D, and,

- Badger mitigation strategy (WSP, 2026) provided in Appendix 6E.
- Updated EIAR chapter - Chapter 8.0: Water (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.08.02).
- Updated EIAR chapter – Chapter 16.0: Mitigation and Monitoring Measures (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.16.02).
- Updated Appropriate Assessment Screening ('AAS') Report (WSP file ref: AAS IE-40000103.R03.02).

During the preparation of the updated EIAR chapters the technical specialists reviewed EIAR Chapter 15: Interactions, Cumulative and Combined effects and confirm that the findings remain valid.

1. Hydrological and Hydrogeological Conditions

Comment on terminology used for surface watercourses in this response document:

- The watercourse that flows from west to east approximately 300 m north of the application is referred to in the EIAR as Coynes Cross Stream. The EIAR notes that the watercourse name given by the EPA is 'Dunran Demesne'. We understand this watercourse to be referred to as Inchanappa River/Coynes Cross stream in the submission made by the DAU.
- The watercourse that flows west to east approximately 45 m south of Site¹ is referred to as the Cullenmore Stream. The EIAR notes that some reports refer to it as Kilmartin Stream. The watercourse name given by the EPA is 'Cullenmore'.

These two streams (above) converge to become the Dunran Demesne Stream about 1.3 km to the southeast of the Site and flow southwards into Broad Lough where they join with the Vartry river and numerous other watercourses before discharging into the Irish Sea at Wicklow.

1A. RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNIT (DAU) (GROUNDWATER)

HYDROGEOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

The hydrogeology section of the EIAR (within Chapter 8.0: Water of the EIAR) has been updated with a revised conceptual model, which provides an update to groundwater levels and groundwater flooding. The conceptual model identifies that the Site has a single groundwater table and that the bedrock and subsoils are hydraulically connected. The conceptual model shows that groundwater flooding can occur in low lying areas of the central valley feature within the Site and that this only occurs during peak winter groundwater levels. If surface ponding occurs during the summer, then it is due to rainfall and collected runoff.

Groundwater pathways in the bedrock will be shallow and mostly within weathered zones, and where present via fractures. Groundwater flow in the subsoils will be by vertical infiltration down to the water table or, in areas where the water table is deeper, to rock head. If the rock head is

¹ The term 'Site' is defined by the application site boundary provided in the application submission drawing pack and presented in the EIAR and AAS Report.

weathered then the vertical infiltration will continue to the water table in the weathered bedrock, or if rock head is non-weathered then recharge will locally perch and flow along rock head to join the main water table. The conceptual model for the Site shows that the water table has a southward gradient and all lateral flow, whether in the subsoil and bedrock, drains towards the Cullenmore Stream south of the Site, which is the receiving water and receptor for all groundwater from the Site. The stream to the north of the Site, the Coynes Cross Stream, is not expected to receive any groundwater from within the Site boundary.

Hydrogeological assessment shows that the Proposed Development will not result in significant residual project impacts to quality or quantity of groundwater, nor are there be any significant residual impacts to the quantity or quality of receiving water at the Cullenmore Stream. As the valley feature fills during operation of the soil recovery facility, the infiltration pathways to the water table in the valley footprint will become longer and this will increase attenuation of recharge. As the operation develops and the valley fills then groundwater flooding at the Site will no longer occur.

The main risk to groundwater is from accidental spills and incidents during the works phase, all these potential impacts are controlled against in the EIAR by embedded design (see Section 8.6.2 in updated EIAR chapter 8.0), which includes no dewatering, management of runoff, inclusion of interceptors for all drainage, restriction of working near water course, above ground tanks and safe storage of fuels, oils and any chemicals. No likely significant adverse effects associated with substance leaks and spills are predicted to occur as a result of the Proposed Development (see updated EIAR chapter 8.0).

Not that there is no settlement pond proposed as part of this development.

CONSIDERATION OF HYDROGEOLOGICAL CONDITIONS IN THE AAS REPORT

The potential for groundwater and hydrogeological effects has been considered within the updated AAS Report and has been informed by the revised conceptual site model and hydrogeological assessment presented in the updated Chapter 8.0 of the EIAR.

The updated hydrogeological assessment demonstrates that groundwater beneath the Site is shallow, locally derived and flows southwards towards the Cullenmore Stream. Groundwater pathways are localised in nature and groundwater discharges to the Cullenmore stream. The stream to the north of the Site, the Coynes Cross Stream, is not expected to receive any groundwater from within the Site boundary.

While groundwater and surface water pathways form part of the wider downstream catchment, the hydrogeological assessment concludes that the Proposed Development will not result in significant effects on groundwater quality or quantity and will not give rise to adverse effects on downstream water-dependent receptors

Accordingly, the updated Appropriate Assessment Screening Report concludes that the Proposed Development will not result in Likely Significant Effects on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

1B. RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION FROM THE LOCAL AUTHORITY (INTERNAL DEPARTMENT REPORT CLIMATE, ENVIRONMENT, RECREATION AND AMENITY SECTION, REFERENCE TO SECTION 8.7.2 OF EIAR AND DISCHARGE TO SETTLEMENT POND CONNECTED TO KILMARTIN / COYNES CROSS STREAM)

Chapter 8.0: Water of the EIAR has been updated to clarify that there is no settlement pond proposed as part of the Proposed Development, and there will be no discharge to streams in the vicinity of the Site (including the Kilmartin Stream or Coynes Cross Stream).

1C. RESPONSE TO THIRD PARTY SUBMISSION FROM EDWARD & BELINDA CULLEN

The submission raises a concern about the potential impacts to water quality, wildlife, and the long-term sustainability of their farmland should '*other materials*' be deposited on the Applicant lands as a result of the Proposed Development. The nature of 'other material' is not defined in their submission but the term is understood to refer to materials other than clean soil. They observe that '*an open river runs partly within the site and continues through the majority of our lands. This watercourse is of critical importance to our farming activities and to the surrounding environment*'. The watercourse is not named within the submission but based on a review of ariel imagery and EPA data it is understood to refer to the Cullenmore Stream given the Cullen's lands are located to south of the Site.

We note that the fill area and the Site are defined in the application and do not impinge on the watercourse or third-party lands. Potential impacts to surface waterbodies have been assessed in the relevant technical sections of the EIAR (including updated chapters 6.0 and 8.0) and no likely significant adverse effects on water quality or wildlife are predicted to result from the Proposed Development.

Note that a response specifically on hydrogeological conditions is provided in item 1A above. The Cullenmore Stream lies to the south of the Site; it is a permanent stream and is the main receptor for water in the natural environment from the Site both for run off and for groundwater. Flooding does occur in the low-lying parts of the Site, particularly in the floor of the main valley feature. In the winter the groundwater table is at surface in the low-lying areas and can cause groundwater flooding. Runoff during storm events may also cause surface water ponding.

To clarify, the categories of materials that will be accepted onto the Site for deposition are set out in Section 3.6 of Chapter 3.0 of the EIAR and are suitable for their intended use. Robust waste acceptance and handling procedures are set out in Section 3.5.8 of Chapter 3.0 of the EIAR and include a description on how materials that are unsuitable for acceptance to Site will be identified and managed in the event such materials were to be brought to the Site. A proposed compliance sampling and testing approach is outlined in section 3.5.8.3 of Chapter 3 of the EIAR that aligns with EPA requirements. Furthermore, the Applicant will seek a Waste licence from the EPA for soil recovery operations and comply with any requirements set out therein.

EIAR chapter 8.0 considers the potential for impacts associated with potential substance leaks and spills and with potential disturbance and mobilisation of existing ground contamination. No adverse impacts are anticipated and no likely significant adverse effects predicted.

2. Appropriate Assessment

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNIT (DAU) (BIRDS)

The Applicant acknowledges the observations of the Development Applications Unit regarding the assessment of birds within the Appropriate Assessment Screening, including the recommendation that breeding and wintering bird surveys be undertaken and the findings incorporated into the assessment.

The ecological baseline conditions and Appropriate Assessment Screening have been reviewed in light of these observations. The Site comprises predominantly improved agricultural grassland, dry meadows and grassy verges, hedgerows and limited areas of scrub, together with areas of seasonally wet ground within the central valley. These habitats are commonplace within the wider agricultural landscape surrounding the Site and may provide opportunities for occasional foraging and/or roosting by mobile bird species, including species associated with nearby European sites. However, the extent of habitat affected is limited and forms part of a substantially larger and widely available habitat resource within the surrounding landscape.

We note that breeding bird surveys and wintering bird surveys are seasonally constrained and cannot be undertaken within the appropriate survey windows available prior to the statutory deadline for submission of the Further Information response.

Notwithstanding this constraint, WSP considers that sufficient information is available to inform a robust Appropriate Assessment Screening determination, having regard to the habitats present, the ecological surveys undertaken to date, available desktop records and species records for the area, the nature and scale of the Proposed Development, and the extensive availability of comparable habitat within the surrounding landscape.

The Appropriate Assessment Screening has specifically considered the potential for impacts arising through habitat loss and disturbance. The extent of potentially suitable habitat affected is limited and forms part of a substantially larger habitat resource that is widely available throughout the wider landscape. The habitats affected do not represent a unique or limiting ecological resource and extensive areas of comparable habitat remain available in the surrounding area.

The assessment of disturbance effects has also been reviewed. Any disturbance associated with the Proposed Development, including vehicle movements and operational activities, would be localised in nature and would occur within a landscape already influenced by agricultural activity, transport infrastructure and existing human activity. The scale and nature of the proposed disturbance is not such that it would be expected to affect the distribution, abundance, survival or conservation status of SPA bird populations.

Having regard to the habitats present, the limited scale of habitat affected, the availability of extensive comparable habitat within the surrounding landscape, the absence of any identified impact pathway capable of adversely affecting the conservation objectives of a European site, and the conclusions of the updated Appropriate Assessment Screening, the Applicant remains satisfied that the Proposed Development will not give rise to Likely Significant Effects on any European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects

Given the above, should the Competent Authority consider that additional site survey information is required, the Applicant will undertake to conduct breeding and wintering bird surveys within the appropriate seasons and in line with best practise guidance and requests that ACP allow for this as a condition of any permission granted in respect of the Proposed Development. Should ACP find this survey work cannot be conditioned, the Applicant requests an extension of time in order to undertake the survey works within the next available survey periods and subsequently provide ACP with the survey data.

The Applicant proposed that findings would be reviewed with the relevant statutory consultees, including the National Parks and Wildlife Service and Wicklow County Council Biodiversity Officer, and any appropriate measures arising from those findings would be incorporated into the project, where required. The resulting information would be used to supplement the ecological assessment and Appropriate Assessment Screening, as appropriate.

3. Bat Survey

RESPONSE TO SUBMISSION FROM DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNIT (DAU) (BATS)

The Applicant acknowledges the observations of the Development Applications Unit regarding bats and refers to the updated ecological assessment contained within Chapter 6.0 of the EIAR, together with the additional bat survey information (provided in Appendix 6D of EIAR Chapter 6.0) submitted in support of this Further Information response.

A detailed assessment of potential bat roosting habitat was originally undertaken during the ecological surveys completed for the Proposed Development. This included ground-level assessment of trees with potential roost features (PRFs), followed by aerial inspection and climbed surveys of identified trees in September 2022. Three sweet chestnut trees and one ash tree were identified as containing PRFs with varying suitability for roosting bats.

In response to the observations raised by the DAU, a further bat survey was undertaken on 1 June 2026 in accordance with current Bat Conservation Trust guidance (Collins, 2023). The survey comprised a detailed reassessment of all previously identified trees and associated PRFs. Features were inspected using binoculars, torch and endoscope inspection equipment, with trees climbed where necessary to allow direct examination of all identified PRFs.

The survey confirmed the continued presence of a number of PRFs suitable for use by bats. However, no bats and no evidence of current or recent occupation were identified within any of the inspected features. The absence of bats or field evidence, including droppings, staining, feeding remains or other indicators of use, combined with the detailed inspection of all identified PRFs, indicates that no roosts were present at the time of survey. While bat roosts in trees may be used intermittently, the survey findings indicate a low likelihood of regular or established roost presence within the surveyed trees.

The results of the additional survey significantly reduce uncertainty regarding the presence of bat roosts within the Site and provide an updated evidence base for the ecological assessment. Accordingly, the assessment has been updated to reflect the findings of the June 2026 survey.

The Applicant has also considered the potential for disturbance associated with lighting. The Proposed Development does not include permanent high-intensity lighting infrastructure and any

temporary lighting required during operations will be directional, cowled and designed to minimise light spill beyond operational areas. In addition, the identified trees containing PRFs will be subject to ecological controls and supervision prior to any works. Given the absence of confirmed roosts, the limited nature of proposed lighting and the availability of suitable habitat within the wider landscape, significant effects on bats are not predicted.

Notwithstanding the survey findings, the Applicant will continue to apply a precautionary approach. Prior to any works affecting trees with identified PRFs, an appropriately qualified bat ecologist will undertake a pre-construction inspection and advise on any additional measures required. Any works will be undertaken in accordance with relevant wildlife legislation and current best practice guidance.

On the basis of the original surveys, the additional June 2026 bat survey and the proposed precautionary measures, it is concluded that the Proposed Development will not result in significant adverse effects on bats or bat roosts. No bat roosts have been identified within the surveyed trees, and no evidence of current or recent roost occupation was recorded. Accordingly, no derogation licence is currently considered necessary. However, recognising that Potential Roost Features remain present within some trees, a precautionary approach will be maintained, and pre-construction inspections will be undertaken by a suitably qualified bat ecologist prior to any works affecting such features.

4. Badgers

The Applicant acknowledges the observations of the Development Applications Unit regarding badgers and confirms that a dedicated Badger Mitigation Strategy has been prepared to address the identified impacts to badger arising from the Proposed Development. The Badger Mitigation Strategy is provided in Appendix 6E of updated EIA Chapter 6.0.

5. Hedgerows

It is proposed to retain that linear hedgerow along the boundary of the agricultural fields in which the Site is located. In response to the DAU submission the Applicant further proposes the addition of the following within an updated restoration plan provided in Appendix 3C of the Chapter 3.0²: Project Description (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.03.02) to act as a screening measure to allow for the movement of local flora and fauna around the fields in which the Site is located:

- Bolstering of existing hedgerow at the field boundaries of the Site using native species. This bolstered hedgerow will be planted during the Phase 1A enabling works and retained following restoration phase, to ensure high-quality linear hedgerow is provided within and around the perimeter of the Applicant's lands throughout the duration of the operation of the soil recovery facility.
- Provision of approximately 200 m of new linear hedgerow comprised of native species within the southern section of the Site located broadly parallel to, and set back from, the Cullenmore Stream at a distance sufficient to maintain bank stability, facilitate livestock access and allow for ongoing management of the riparian corridor. This new hedgerow will be planted during the early Works Phase will be retained throughout the works phase,

² The measures in this section for hedgerow planting and biodiversity enhancement are documented section 3.8.1 of updated chapter 3.0 of the EIA and updated Appendix 3C therein.

restoration phase, and beyond, to ensure high-quality linear hedgerow is provided within the Applicant's lands throughout the duration of the operation of the soil recovery facility.

It is noted that the Applicant also proposes installation of bird nesting boxes and bat boxes at suitable retained boundary features and mature trees within the Site.

Large stones and some deadwood from the site during the works will be retained on wider site for later placement within field margins for enhanced lizard basking and insect habitat.

HEDGEROW BOLSTERING AND NEW HEDGEROW PLANTING

It is proposed that the enhancement of existing hedges (where appropriate) and planting of new hedgerow will be as follows:

- Carry out work between 1 November and 31 March each year;
- Prepare the ground along a 0.75 m wide strip adjacent to the existing hedge on one side only to provide good soil conditions and as little competition from other vegetation as possible;
- Where necessary, vegetation within the planting strip may be managed using appropriate methods, including mechanical control and, where justified, targeted herbicide application in accordance with best practice and relevant environmental guidance, taking account of proximity to watercourses and sensitive ecological receptors;
- Plants must be approximately 2-year-old transplants and at least 450 mm to 600 mm high;
- Native species, with no one species making up more than 70% of the total;
- Planted in a single row 30 cm apart with a minimum of 3 plants per linear metre and kept clear of weeds until they are established;
- Remove individual guards and tree shelters once the plants are established;
- Replace all failures in the following planting season;
- Trim the newly planted hedge in at least the first 2 years to encourage bushy growth, allowing the hedge to become taller and wider at each cut; and
- Prevent livestock and grazing animals from damaging the hedge by setting fencing at least 1.2 m from the centre of the hedge, or, if there is a bank, as close to the base of the bank as possible.

Table 3-3 in Chapter 3.0 of the EIAR sets out the proposed native planting mix. Native species of local provenance will be used and the final hedgerow and tree planting specification will be agreed with Wicklow County Council as part of the detailed restoration and landscape proposals.

HEDGEROW MANAGEMENT

The proposed hedgerow enhancement and new hedgerow planting measures are intended to strengthen ecological connectivity across the Site and provide habitat for birds, bats, invertebrates and other fauna throughout the operational and restoration phases of the Proposed Development.

The proposed hedgerow enhancement and new hedgerow planting measures are intended to strengthen ecological connectivity across the Site and provide habitat for birds, bats, invertebrates and other fauna throughout the operational and restoration phases of the Proposed Development.

Existing retained hedgerows will be strengthened through supplementary planting using native species of local provenance. In addition, approximately 200 m of new native hedgerow planting will be established during the early Works Phase and retained throughout the operational, restoration and aftercare phases of the Proposed Development.

Together, these measures will provide continuous linear habitat throughout the life of the soil recovery facility, improve ecological connectivity across the Site and contribute to local biodiversity enhancement objectives.

The establishment and long-term management of all new and enhanced hedgerows will be undertaken in accordance with the approved landscape and restoration proposals.

6. Responses to wider comments in the submissions cited in the ACP letter dated 21st April 2026.

ACP provided an invitation to respond to submissions received from five parties the statutory consultation for the Proposed Kilmartin Soil Recovery Facility as set out in ACP's letter dated 21 April 2026. The five parties are:

- Development Applications Unit (DAU).
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII).
- Uisce Éireann.
- Wicklow County Council (WCC).
- Edward & Belinda Cullen (third-party submission).

6A. SUBMISSION FROM THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNIT (DAU)

ARCHAEOLOGY

The Applicant welcomes the observations of the DAU regarding archaeological requirements.

NATURE CONSERVATION (BIRDS)

See response provided to Item 2 (Appropriate Assessment – Birds) above. The conclusions of the ecological assessment remain unchanged and no significant adverse effects on birds are predicted.

NATURE CONSERVATION (HYDROLOGY/HYDROGEOLOGY)

See response provided to Item 1A (Consideration of Hydrogeological Conditions in the AAS Report) above.

The updated hydrogeological assessment revised conceptual site model and associated conclusions have been incorporated into the updated EIAR Chapter 8.0 (Water). The conclusions of the hydrogeological assessment are robust and that no significant adverse effects on hydrology, hydrogeology or water-dependent ecological receptors are predicted.

MATTERS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIODIVERSITY CHAPTER) (BATS)

See response provided to item 3 above.

The ecological assessment has been reviewed and updated in light of these observations. In addition to the original bat assessments undertaken for the Proposed Development, a further bat survey was completed on 1 June 2026 in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust guidance (Collins, 2023). The survey included detailed inspection of all previously identified Potential Roost Features (PRFs) using binoculars, torch and endoscope equipment, together with climbed inspections where required.

The survey confirmed the continued presence of a number of Potential Roost Features suitable for use by bats. However, no bats and no evidence of current or recent occupation were identified. The absence of droppings, staining, feeding remains or other indicators of use, combined with the detailed inspection of all identified Potential Roost Features, indicates that no evidence of current roost occupation was identified at the time of survey.

The findings of the additional survey have been incorporated into the updated EIAR Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity), where the bat baseline, impact assessment and mitigation measures have been reviewed and updated accordingly. The additional survey significantly reduces uncertainty regarding potential bat roosting within the Site and provides an updated evidence base for the ecological assessment.

The potential for disturbance associated with lighting has also been considered. The Proposed Development does not include permanent high-intensity lighting infrastructure and any temporary lighting required during operations will be directional, cowled and designed to minimise light spill beyond operational areas. Accordingly, significant effects on bats arising from lighting are not predicted.

On the basis of the original surveys, the additional June 2026 bat survey and the proposed precautionary measures, it is concluded that the Proposed Development will not result in significant adverse effects on bats or bat roosts. No bat roosts have been identified within the surveyed trees, and no evidence of current or recent roost occupation was recorded. Accordingly, no derogation licence is currently considered necessary. However, recognising that Potential Roost Features remain present within some trees, a precautionary approach will be maintained, and pre-construction inspections will be undertaken by a suitably qualified bat ecologist prior to any works affecting such features.

Reference should be made to the updated EIAR Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity) and Appendix 6D for full details of the additional bat survey and associated assessment.

MATTERS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIODIVERSITY CHAPTER) (BADGERS)

See response provided to Item 4 (Badgers) above. The findings of the updated assessment and the Badger Mitigation Strategy have been incorporated into the revised EIAR Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity), and the conclusions of the assessment remain unchanged.

MATTERS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIODIVERSITY CHAPTER) (BIRDS)

The ecological baseline presented within Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity) has been reviewed in light of the observations received and against the most recent available ecological information, including available National Biodiversity Data Centre records. This review has not identified any information that would materially alter the conclusions of the ecological assessment.

The Site comprises predominantly improved agricultural grassland, dry meadows and grassy verges, hedgerows and limited areas of scrub, together with areas of seasonally wet ground within the central valley. These habitats are representative of the wider agricultural landscape surrounding the Site and are widely available throughout the area.

The Applicant acknowledges that breeding bird surveys and wintering bird surveys are seasonally constrained and cannot be undertaken within the appropriate survey windows available prior to the statutory deadline for submission of the Further Information response. Notwithstanding this constraint, the ecological baseline remains sufficient to inform the EIAR, having regard to the habitats present, ecological surveys undertaken to date, available desktop records, the nature and scale of the Proposed Development, and the extensive availability of comparable habitat within the surrounding landscape.

The assessment of habitat loss and disturbance effects contained within updated EIAR Chapter 6.0 has been reviewed and remains unchanged. The extent of habitat affected is limited and the habitats present form part of a substantially larger habitat resource available throughout the wider landscape. The Proposed Development is not predicted to result in significant adverse effects on bird populations at a local, county, regional or national level.

Accordingly, the conclusions of Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity) remain valid and no significant adverse effects on birds are predicted.

Should ACP consider that additional breeding bird and/or wintering bird surveys are necessary to inform its determination, the Applicant is willing to undertake such surveys during the next available survey periods.

MATTERS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIODIVERSITY CHAPTER) (HEDGEROWS)

See response provided in item 5 above.

In response to the DAU's observations, the Proposed Development has been reviewed to identify opportunities to further avoid, reduce and compensate for the loss of hedgerow habitat. As a result, additional hedgerow enhancement and planting measures have been incorporated into the updated restoration and landscape proposals.

The findings of the updated assessment and associated mitigation measures have been incorporated into the revised EIAR Chapter 6.0 (Ecology and Biodiversity), Chapter 3.0 (Project Description) and the updated restoration proposals.

Accordingly, the conclusions of Chapter 6.0 remain valid and no significant adverse effects are predicted in respect of hedgerows or ecological connectivity.

6B. SUBMISSION FROM TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IRELAND (TII)

The TII submission highlights the vicinity of the Proposed Development to the N/M11 Junction 4 to Junction 14 Improvement Scheme. We take this opportunity to observe that the Applicant has engaged with the project team delivering that scheme during the pre-planning stage of the Proposed Development. The comments/observations raised by the project team and responses from the Applicant to address these are documented in Section 3.16 of the Pre-consultation Report provided within the Applicant's SID application submission. No potential significant adverse effects are predicted to arise as a result of the Proposed Development.

6C. SUBMISSION FROM UISCE ÉIREANN

Uisce Éireann recommend that 'the design and construction of the Water & Wastewater pipes and related infrastructure to be installed in this Development shall comply with the Uisce Éireann Connections and Developer Services Standard Details and Codes of Practice.'

To clarify, the Proposed Development does not propose connection to the local water supply network or local sewage network (see section 3.5.3 of Chapter 3.0 of the EIAR, and section 14.8.3 of Chapter 14.0 of the EIAR, for details).

6D. SUBMISSION FROM WICKLOW COUNTY COUNCIL (WCC)

OBSERVATION RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE AA SCREENING / SUBMISSION OF A NIS

The Proposed Development does not require or include for the provision of a settlement pond (see response to item 1B), therefore no revision to the AAS Report is proposed with regard to this matter.

OBSERVATION RELATING TO THE SUBMISSION A PROPOSAL FOR THE LANDSCAPING AND BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT

Details on landscaping and biodiversity enhancement are provided in updated chapter 6.0 of the EIAR. See also response in item 5 above.

6E. THIRD-PARTY SUBMISSION FROM EDWARD & BELINDA CULLEN

The submission raises a concern about the risk of soil instability or landslides affecting their property, particularly given the increasingly unpredictable and severe weather patterns experienced in recent years. To clarify, the fill area is located within a natural valley on the Applicant's land with the final levels designed to tie in with the levels of the surrounding existing landscape with gentle grading of slopes towards to south of the Site. The natural existing valley slopes will naturally prevent any landslides or slippage to the north, east and west of the valley.

The only area with potential for slippage is on the southern end of the fill area and the fill levels and profile have been designed to provide a shallower slope to mitigate slippage. The construction methodology set out in the EIAR also mitigates the potential for slippage at the southern end of the site. The lands will return to agricultural field once the final ground levels are reached. During the operation of the proposed facility, the emplacement of the fill material will be managed in line with chapter 3 of the EIAR.

The Applicant confirms that the entrance at the Cullenmore end of the Cullen's farm adjoining the site will not be obstructed by the Proposed Development. The Proposed Development provides for adequate queuing space for trucks within the Site, should this be required, and reasonable parking provision for private vehicles for site staff and visitors.

We trust that this response addresses the clarifications sought in the request for information satisfactorily. Should any further clarification be required, please advise.

Yours sincerely



Ruth Treacy
Technical Director

Encl.

Appendix A- Updated Non-Technical Summary of EIAR (WSP file ref: 40000103.R01.02).

Appendix B- Updated Table of Contents (TOC) for EIAR (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.00.02).

Appendix C- Updated Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) chapter - Chapter 3.0: Project Description (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.03.02),

Appendix D- Updated EIAR chapter - Chapter 6.0: Ecology and Biodiversity (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.06.02)

Appendix E- Updated EIAR chapter - Chapter 8.0: Water (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.08.02).

Appendix F- Updated EIAR chapter – Chapter 16.0: Mitigation and Monitoring Measures (WSP file ref: 40000103.R02.16.02).

Appendix G- Updated Appropriate Assessment Screening ('AAS') Report (WSP file ref: AAS IE-40000103.R03.02).



APPENDIX A



APPENDIX B



APPENDIX C



APPENDIX D



APPENDIX E



APPENDIX F



APPENDIX G