

File With E.P.

**SECTION 131 FORM**

Appeal NO: ABP 314281-24

Defer Re O/H

Having considered the contents of the submission dated received 21/05/2024  
from Elaine Moore,  
Barry Mulvaney and others 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 material issues

E.O.: Pat B

Date: 28/05/2024

**For further consideration by SEO/SAO**

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 2/3/4 weeks – BP \_\_\_\_\_

EO: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

AA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**CORRESPONDENCE FORM**

Appeal No: ABP 319281-24

M \_\_\_\_\_

Please treat correspondence received on 21/05/2024 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 <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 E. Moore, B. Mulvany + others response to S.131

07/05/24: 21/05/24 ✓

4. Attach to file (a) R/S <input type="checkbox"/> (d) Screening <input type="checkbox"/> (b) GIS Processing <input type="checkbox"/> (e) Inspectorate <input 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>Pat S</u>	AA: <u>Anthony McNally</u>
Date: <u>28/05/2024</u>	Date: <u>30/05/2024</u>

Patrick

Karl Hickey

---

**From:** Bord  
**Sent:** Tuesday 21 May 2024 15:58  
**To:** Appeals2  
**Subject:** FW: ABP - Case ref - 319281-24  
**Attachments:** Elaine Moore and Barry Mulvany ABP response.docx

---

**From:** Elaine Moore <elainemoore.ie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 21, 2024 3:57 PM  
**To:** Bord <bord@pleanala.ie>  
**Subject:** ABP - Case ref - 319281-24

**Caution:** This is an **External Email** and may have malicious content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the ICT Helpdesk.

Dear sir, madam

Please find attached observations in relation to ABP case 319281-24

Please do not hesitate to contact should you have any queries

Many thanks

Elaine Moore, Barry Mulvany, Greg & Pauline Clarke

Elaine Moore and Barry Mulvany & others  
Drakerath Lane  
Killineer  
Drogheda  
Co. Louth  
A92 Y5F7

An Bord Pleanála  
64 Marlborough Street  
Dublin 1  
D01 V902  
Date: 21 May 2024

Case Number: ABP-319281-24

Planning Authority Reference Number: 2360115

**Proposed Development:**

*Permission for development including: 1) Construction of approx. 5,719 sq.m. gross floor area (GFA) main building, to house hot dip metal galvanising plant, machinery & associated works & containing materials loading & unloading areas, chemicals storage areas & staff welfare facilities. The main building will be in two main sections, both single storey, consisting of a northern section of approx. 2,636 sq.m. GFA & a southern section of approx. 2,404 sq.m. GFA, with maximum heights above finished ground levels of 17.30m & 14.55m, respectively, together with an approx. 679 sq.m. GFA two storey over basement section with a maximum height above finished ground level of 8.90m, adjoining the east of the northern section. The main building will include 4 no. emissions stacks located on the roof of the northern section of the building, each rising to a height of 2.7m above the maximum height of the northern section & 1 no. emission vent located on the western side of the northern section of the building, at a height of 7.2m above finished ground level. 2) Construction of approx. 298 sq.m. GFA two storey office building to be located to north of main building, containing main reception area & general offices. 3) Provision of hardstanding area, processed & unprocessed materials storage areas & HGV/trailer parking spaces. 4) Provision of vehicular & pedestrian entrance. 5) Provision of 110 car parking spaces, including 7 EV charging points & 20 bicycle spaces. 6) Provision of internal access road. 7) Provision of 2 no. weighbridges 8) Installation of 2 no. LPG tanks, 9) Construction of ESB substation within the main building. 10) Provision of bunded fuel storage area. 11) Provision of stormwater drainage & treatment infrastructure, including permeable paving, attenuation unit, infiltration area, rainwater harvesting tanks & ass. works. 12) Site landscaping works, including raised soil berm on part of the western boundary of the site with a max. ht. of approx. 3m above finished ground level. 13) Firewater retention infrastructure. 14) Provision of site security fencing & entrance walls and gates. 15) Provision of signage. 16) Provision of site lighting. 17) And all ancillary site development works. An Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and Natura Impact Statement (NIS) will be submitted with the application. The proposed development will require an Industrial Emissions (IE) Licence, under the EPA Act 1992, as amended.*

Dear Sir/Madam,

We appreciate the notice issued to us in regard to the above referenced case and the opportunity to respond to the submissions & observations.

We are referred to as "Appeal A" by the developer. Please note that we will not be responding to all observations and failure to comment on specific observations does not deem that we accept or agree with the developer.

The developer here is stating that the development of the largest galvanising facility in Ireland is classified as not being heavy industrial. We believe that this is clearly a heavy industry facility and is not appropriate for the area, particularly as it will be within meters of our house and our neighbours.

"Light Industrial" is one where the activities can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area, by reason of noise, vibration & smell. A galvanising plant, which requires an EIAR, certainly does not sit within these parameters.

We also feel that the water concerns have not been answered satisfactorily.

The EIAR assumes a groundwater flow direction based on two groundwater level monitoring events. However, the EIAR lacks conceptual understanding of the underlying groundwater bodies. The hydraulic properties referred to are based solely on desk studies and assumptions. Site specific information has not been utilised, i.e., a number of private wells surround the Site, and the Applicant missed the opportunity to obtain valuable information of the private wells regarding hydraulic properties of the groundwater bodies in the vicinity of the Site.

We have a well on our property (that services all our water needs) that is adjacent to the proposed facility, and we believe that the arguments of the composition of the soil have not been fully verified in the reports and there could be an effect on our water supply with both reliability and contamination.

Our well is relatively shallow at a depth of around twelve meters (forty feet) but the clay is only to a depth of five meters so our well is within the gravel aquifer and so could be affected.

Two boreholes (BH05 and BH06) are situated within the Site. The borehole logs show varying depths of GRAVEL and gravelly CLAY at shallow depths beneath the Site. Gravelly CLAY subsoil was identified at location BH06 at depths between 0.4 m and 4.3-meter. No gravelly CLAY was identified at location BH05. Instead, GRAVEL was identified from 0.3 m to 7 m below ground. The total thickness of the GRAVELS remains unknown. The GRAVELS overlay a bedrock classified as poorly productive aquifer.

While CLAY soil is typically considered a low permeability soil, potentially offering protection for underlying groundwater bodies, in this Site's case, the CLAYEY soils will be removed during the proposed construction works, resulting the development to be constructed on natural gravels. The EIAR and subsequent submissions lodged by the Applicant refer to the poorly productive bedrock aquifer but fail to mention the gravel beneath the Site. It's worth noting that the gravels and fractured bedrock aquifer are hydraulically connected, forming a pathway for contamination (in the event of an incident or leak), with the potential to impact receptors both downgradient and cross-gradient from the Site.

We are under the belief that Rosehall Reservoir is still active, however in the report received they are stating that it is decommissioned since 2015. Please show documentation of the decommissioning of this reservoir.

They have tried to stress that they are a family business and are trying to develop the area. This is a worthy sentiment but through the whole process they have never once reached out to us who are most directly affected by it to try to address the concerns we have on multiple fronts. There is the physical stress caused by the noise, air and potentially water pollution that will have to endure in both the construction and running of the facility. There is the emotional stress caused by this whole process since the very first proposal.

We feel that the developer has not adequately addressed the grounds for appeal, and that our concerns are being disregarded. They must understand that living within the proximity of such a vast, heavy industrial plant will have significant adverse effects to the quality of our lives.

We trust that An Bord Pleanála will review our concerns and objections that we have raised, and that you will conclude that the proposed location is not suitable for a heavy industrial facility.

Thank you for your time in reading this objection and please do not hesitate to contact us if there is any further information that you require from us.

Yours sincerely,

Elaine Moore

Barry Mulvany

Greg & Pauline Clarke