

3 Consideration of Alternatives

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the reasonable alternatives considered by the developer during the design and pre-application phases of the Proposed Development.

3.2 Legislative Context

Annex IV (2) of the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU requires the consideration of reasonable alternatives which are relevant to the project and take into account the effects of the project on the environment. An EIAR must contain:

“...a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the project on the environment.”

Schedule 6 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended) sets out the information which is to be contained in an EIAR and Part 1 (d) of Schedule 6 states that the following shall be included:

“A description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the person or persons who prepared the EIAR, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the proposed development on the environment.”

In accordance with 2022 EPA Guidelines, different types of alternatives may be considered at several key stages during the process. As environmental issues emerge during the preparation of the EIAR, alternative designs may need to be considered early on in the process or alternative mitigation options may need to be considered towards the end of the process.

The EPA Guidelines (EPA, 2022) state:

“The objective is for the developer to present a representative range of the practicable alternatives considered. The alternatives should be described with ‘an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option’. It is generally sufficient to provide a broad description of each main alternative and the key issues associated with each, showing how environmental considerations were taken into account in deciding on the selected option. A detailed assessment (or ‘mini-EIA’) of each alternative is not required.”

The consideration and examination of alternatives is set out in the following sections.

3.3 Methodology

The EU Guidance Document (EU, 2017) on the preparation of EIAR outlines the requirements of the EIA Directive and states that, in order to address the assessment of reasonable alternatives, “the Developer needs to provide:

- A description of the reasonable alternatives studied, and;
- An indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option with regards to their environmental impacts.

The EU ‘Guidance on the preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (Directive 2011/92/EU as amended by 2014/52/EU)’ (EU, 2017) states that reasonable

alternatives “*must be relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and resources should only be spent assessing these alternatives*”. The guidance also acknowledges that “*the selection of alternatives is limited in terms of feasibility. On the one hand, an alternative should not be ruled out simply because it would cause inconvenience or cost to the Developer. At the same time, if an alternative is very expensive or technically or legally difficult, it would be unreasonable to consider it to be a feasible alternative*”.

The current EPA ‘Guidelines on the information to be contained in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports’ (EPA, 2022) state that “*It is generally sufficient to provide a broad description of each main alternative and the key issues associated with each, showing how environmental considerations were taken into account in deciding on the selected option. A detailed assessment (or ‘miniEIA’) of each alternative is not required.*”

With consideration of the legislative and guidance requirements taken into account, this chapter addresses alternatives under the following headings:

- Do Nothing Scenario;
- Alternative Locations;
- Alternative Designs and Layouts; and
- Alternative Technical Configurations.

3.4 Consideration of Alternatives

3.4.1 Do Nothing Scenario

Article IV, Part 3 of the EIA Directive states that the description of reasonable alternatives studied by the developer should include “*an outline of the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the project as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge.*” This is referred to as the ‘Do Nothing’ scenario.

EU guidance (EU, 2017) states that the assessment should involve the assessment of “*an outline of what is likely to happen to the environment should the Project not be implemented – the so-called ‘do nothing’ scenario.*”

In implementing this ‘Do-Nothing’ scenario, an Anaerobic Digestion Facility would not be developed and there would be no changes made to existing land-use practices. The site would likely continue to be used for agricultural grazing.

The Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021 has committed Ireland on a legally binding path to net-zero emissions by no later than 2050, and to a 51% reduction in emissions by 2030. Indigenously produced biomethane will play a significant role in enabling this transition to a net-zero economy as biomethane can to displace fossil gas in many hard-to-decarbonise sectors, such as high-temperature heat, while also playing a significant role in the decarbonisation of County Waterford’s agriculture sector. In the ‘Do-Nothing’ scenario, the opportunity to capture a volume of County Waterford’s bioenergy resource for the production of biomethane to supply the national grid would be missed.

Agriculture accounts for 39% of County Waterford's total carbon emissions, making agriculture the single largest emitter of greenhouse gasses in the county. This equates to 768,000 tCO₂e per year, resulting in a 25% emissions reduction target of 192,000 tCO₂e from agriculture by 2030. This Proposed Development alone can reduce County Waterford’s CO₂ emissions by ca. 7,680 tCO₂e per year, or 4% of the county reduction target of 25% emissions

reductions from agriculture. In the 'Do-Nothing' scenario, this contribution to a reduction in emissions from agriculture would not be achieved.

Agricultural manures and slurries will be sourced from agricultural operators within a 25km radius of the Proposed Development. Pig slurry will be supplied to the facility from the neighbouring Piggery (IPPC Licence Ref: P0573) located 200m to the southeast of the Proposed Development. In the 'Do-Nothing Scenario' these agricultural wastes would not be treated locally through the AD process. Untreated and unpasteurised manures and slurries would continue to be applied directly to the land at current volumes, with the continued addition of chemical fertiliser. Furthermore, the associated CH₄ would not be captured within the AD process. In addition, the current traffic movements associated with the movement of manures and slurries from source to lands for spreading would remain unchanged.

The Proposed Development will provide important construction stage employment. The construction phase will also have secondary and indirect 'spin-off' impacts on ancillary support services in the area of the site, such as retail services, together with wider benefits in the building supply services, professional and technical professions etc. These beneficial impacts on economic activity will be largely temporary but will contribute to the overall future viability of the construction sector and related services and professions over the construction period.

The operational stage will offer direct employment in the Anaerobic Digestion Facility, while also supporting existing employment opportunities on surrounding farms. Further indirect employment will be created as a result of the induced benefits of the development such as surrounding businesses catering for employee subsistence and hauliers, transporting materials to the facility. The Proposed Development will be of considerable benefit to the area in terms of employment provision and economic gain leading to a positive, medium-term impact which is significant in the context of its rural location.

The Proposed Development can deliver between 70-75 jobs to the immediate area (consisting of ca. 5 full time jobs in the AD Facility, 13 jobs supported in the applicant operational team, ca. 45 contractors, and an estimated ca. 10 supporting roles) specifically across rural locations and protect existing farming employment.

Under the 'Do-Nothing' scenario the opportunity to generate direct and indirect local employment would be forgone. It would lead to a missed opportunity for an increase in employment opportunities in the area generally, and a missed opportunity for rural employment objectives of the County Development Plan to be fulfilled. The overall economic and social benefits that the development would bring to the area would not be experienced by the community in the event of the Proposed Development not occurring.

The 'Do-Nothing' scenario is discussed in further detail within each EIAR technical assessment chapter.

3.4.2 Consideration of Alternative Locations

A detailed site selection process was undertaken by the Applicant, with reference to the following criteria:

- Transport Network and Access
- Availability and proximity to Feedstock Supply
- Availability and proximity to Digestate Receivers
- Existing Land Use
- Landscape Sensitivity

ORS

- Ecological Designations
- Archaeological Designations
- Access to Gas Grid
- Access to Electricity Grid
- Proximity to Sensitive Receptors
- Available Land Size
- Land Availability
- Landscape and Visual Amenity
- Proximity to Suitable Water Course or Sewer
- Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer
- Topography
- Flood Risk

The applicant devised a scoring matrix based on each of the site specific criteria outlined above. Site visits and desk based studies were completed for all candidate sites. Each candidate site was then assessed and an overall score assigned. The site-specific selection criteria and basis for assessment is included in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1: : Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Basis for Assessment

Criteria	Scoring	Score	Weighting	Total Score
Transport Network and Access	1. Greater than 5km from Regional Roads, 2. 1 - 5km km from Regional Road 3. Less than 1km from Regional Road. 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock allowing for transport internally.		3	
Proximity to Feedstock Supply	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock.		3	
Proximity to Biobased Fertiliser Receivers	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km		3	
Existing Land Use	1. Urban or greenfield 2. Rural Brownfield, 3. Zoned Industrial		2	
Landscape Sensitivity	1. Proximate to Sensitive Landscape 2. Greater than 1km 3. Greater than 5km		2	
Ecological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to designated site 2. >1km from designated sites 3. >5km from designated sites		2	
Archaeological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to archaeology sites 2. >1km from archaeology sites 3. >5km from archaeology sites		1	
Access to Gas Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km		3	
Access to Electricity Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km		1	

ORS

Sensitive Receptors	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1 km		3	
Available Land Size	1. 1- 2ha 2. 2-3ha 3. Greater than 4ha		3	
Land Availability	1. Not for Sale or Lease 2. Available for Sale or Lease but financially unviable 3. Owned or for sale/lease at		3	
Landscape and Visual Amenity	1. Site is elevated or exposed 2. Site has existing cover and partial views 3. Site is hidden and with little or no receptors overlooking the site.		2	
Proximity to Suitable Water Course Or Sewer	1. Greater than 1km 2. Less than 1km. 3. Immediately adjacent or on site		3	
Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1km		1	
Existing Topography	1. Undulating or severe level changes 2. Moderate level changes that can be engineered out. 3. Relatively flat and level.		2	
Flood Risk	1. In a Flood Risk Zone 3. Outside Flood Risk Zone		3	
Total Ranked Score				

4 no. alternative site locations within County Waterford were assessed under the above criteria, with the site at Curraghmagarraha, Reatagh, and Curraghballintlea, County Waterford scoring highest overall. The Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Basis for Assessments for each candidate site are included in **Appendix 3.1**.

The rationale used in the identification of the Proposed Development site at Curraghmagarraha, Reatagh, and Curraghballintlea, County Waterford is further discussed in the following sections.

3.4.2.1 Transport Network and Access

The Proposed Development is located southeast of the town of Carrick-on-Suir and approximately 550m (via access road) northeast of the Piquet's Cross Roads / Scrouty Road / R677 junction. Vehicles travelling between the Proposed Development and the R677 corridor will make use of Scrouty Road. As the Proposed Development is located in the vicinity of the R677, it offers connectivity to various locations across the county.

3.4.2.2 Proximity to Feedstock Supply and Biobased Fertiliser Receivers

The Proposed Development has been designed to accept and treat up to 90,000 tonnes per annum of predominantly locally sourced agricultural manures, slurries, food processing residues and crop-based feedstocks. The geographical distribution of these feedstock suppliers and biobased fertiliser receivers is represented in **Figure 3.1**. 59% (36) of these sources are located within a 10km radius of the site and 100% (61) within a 25km radius of the site. Pig Slurry will be supplied to the Proposed Development by tanker from the neighbouring Piggery located 200m to the southeast.




Figure 3.1: Feedstock Suppliers and Digestate Receivers

Alternative sites considered were deemed unsuitable for two primary reasons. Firstly, there was uncertainty regarding the availability of sustainably sourced agricultural feedstocks. Secondly, the distances required to transport these feedstocks from their source locations to the alternative sites would result in significantly more HGV (heavy goods vehicle) movements compared to the current proposal. The increased HGV traffic would lead to higher estimated greenhouse gas emissions, which would conflict with the overall sustainability goals of the Proposed Development.

3.4.2.3 Proximity to the Existing Gas Network

Proximity to the existing gas network was a key consideration when considering alternative locations. In comparison to other locations considered, the site at Curraghmagarraha, Reatagh, and Curraghballintlea benefits from existing infrastructure as the existing medium pressure distribution pipeline is located ca. 4.9km from the Proposed Development. The existing medium pressure distribution gas pipeline and the proposed route for the pipeline linking the site to the existing local gas network is shown in **Figure 3.2**.




Figure 3.2: Local Existing Gas Network (Source: Gas Networks Ireland)

All other site locations considered are located significant distances from the existing national gas network, meaning a direct connection point via a Grid Injection Unit (GIU) would not be feasible and/or economically viable.

3.4.2.4 Proximity to Sensitive Environmental Receptors and Designated Sites

The Proposed Development is not within or immediately adjacent to any site that has been designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or a Special Protection Area (SPA) under the EU Habitats or EU Birds Directive. Furthermore, the application site is not within or immediately adjacent to any nationally designated site, such as a Natural Heritage Area or a

proposed Natural Heritage Area. Although there is a pathway to European sites from the application site, any risk of impact on those sites will be mitigated as provided for in the NIS and EIAR

All work within the Proposed Development site will take place in areas considered to be of low biodiversity value on a local level.

3.4.2.5 Landscape and Visual Impact

Alternative site locations were visited for preliminary landscape and visual impact surveys during spring 2024. Each site location and hinterland were examined and a preliminary assessment with respect to viewpoint sensitivity and the likely magnitude of change was made.

Following the preliminary assessments, the Proposed Development location was preferred as the existing topography and natural screening offered benefits in terms of minimising potential impacts.

Furthermore, existing agricultural development types are found in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Development. The operational piggery located ca. 200m from the Proposed Development comprises a number of existing agricultural units of various types and scales which are currently visible from the surrounding road network.

3.4.2.6 Flood Risk

A preliminary flood risk assessment was undertaken for all candidate sites considered. There have been no recorded historic flooding incidents within the Proposed Development site boundaries and no part of the Proposed Development work is scheduled within an area which has been declared as Flood Zone A or B.

A Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment accompanies the planning application (Document Ref: **231926-ORS-XX-XX-RP-EN-13d-011**)

3.4.3 Consideration of Alternative Design and Site Layout

The design of the Proposed Development has been an informed and collaborative process from the outset, involving design, engineering, planning, environmental, hydrological, geotechnical, archaeological, landscape and traffic specialists. The design process has also taken account of the comments of the relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees as detailed in **Chapter 1: Introduction**.

Throughout the preparation of the EIAR, the layout of the Proposed Development has been revised and refined to take account of the findings of all site investigations and baseline assessments, which have brought the design from its first concept layout (**Figure 3.3**) to the final site layout.



Figure 3.3: Concept Site Layout

Layout selection was an iterative process, with the objective of identifying a suitable layout that;

- Optimised the existing topography of the site in order to minimise excavation works.
- Optimised the existing topography of the site in order to minimise potential visual impacts on the local landscape.
- Met the design and operational requirements of DAFM guidance document CN11: Conditions for approval and operation of Biogas Plants transforming Animal By-Products and derived products in Ireland.
- Met the design and operational requirements of the EPA Industrial Emissions licencing.

The design of emissions stacks was considered throughout the design and planning process. Air dispersion modelling undertaken as part of the Air and Odour impact Assessment detailed in **Chapter 8: Air, Odour & Climate Change** informed the suitable height of the 1 No. CHP stack, 1 no. Biomethane Boiler stack and 1 No. Odour Treatment stack.

The Concept Site Layout (**Figure 3.3**) was revised in order to provide additional area along the

north, south, east and west boundary of the Proposed Development to be utilised for landscaping. In addition, the proposed site entrance was relocated to allow for retention of existing mature trees. A landscape plan has been incorporated and accompanies the application (Document Ref: **24/NRG/ORS/Rt/M/001**).

The landscape plan (**Figure 3.4**) offers short to long term buffering and is specifically developed to assist in integrating the Proposed Development into its surrounds. In addition, native planting is proposed adjacent to attenuation ponds, in order to provide enhanced biodiversity areas within the Proposed Development. The alternate layout considered initially, which did not include this additional buffering, would have given rise to a higher degree of landscape and visual impact from the Proposed Development, compared to the design and layout ultimately selected.



Figure 3.4: Extract from Landscape Plan (Document Ref: 24/NRG/ORS/Rt/M/001)

3.4.4 Consideration of Alternative Technical Configurations

Alternative Technical Configurations were considered as part of the design process of the Proposed Development.

There are several different process configurations around which AD systems may be designed. Factors considered when making design decisions included whether the process is 'batch' or 'continuous' feed, whether it is a 'dry' or 'wet' system, whether it is a 'single stage' or 'multi-

stage' process and whether the anaerobic digester is operated at 'mesophilic' or 'thermophilic' temperatures.

3.4.4.1 Process Configuration

A Batch' Flow system involves the single addition of feedstock to a digester at the start of the process. When the feedstock has been placed in the digester, the unit is sealed for the duration of the process with no more material added. The process was ruled out as it is deemed unsuitable given the characteristics of the agricultural manures, slurries, food processing residues and crop-based feedstocks available locally.

In contrast, Continuously Stirred Tank Reactor (CSTR) systems have feedstock added consistently or in stages with substrate displaced as new material is added. A multi-stage CSTR anaerobic digestion system is chosen for the Proposed Development, providing primary and secondary digestion within suitably sized Digestion Tanks. In comparison to single stage systems, multi-stage CSTR anaerobic digestion systems provide greater process stability, increased energy efficacy and better control over crucial parameters such as temperature, mixing, and substrate concentration. CSTR systems are fed consistently resulting in a steady-state and a consistent biogas production rate.

3.4.4.2 Operating Temperature

It is proposed to operate the AD process at mesophilic temperature range (30°C – 40°C). Mesophilic digestion systems are generally more stable than thermophilic systems (50°C-60°C) because a wider diversity of bacteria grow at mesophilic temperatures and these bacteria are generally more robust and adaptable to changing environmental conditions.

Thermophilic digestion offers the advantages of faster reaction rates compared to mesophilic digestion, leading to shorter retention times. However, thermophilic systems require significant additional energy to maintain the higher operating temperatures which is considered contradictory to the sustainability goals of the proposed project. The additional heat demand would increase the volume of biomethane required to be used on site as a fuel for the CHP engine and boiler, thereby reducing the overall volume of biomethane available for export to the national gas network thereby reducing the positive environmental impact of the proposed development with regard to the displacement of fossil fuels.

3.4.4.3 Biogas Uses Considered

Biomethane

A number of options were considered for the utilisation of the biomethane produced from the AD process.

- On-site generation of electricity and heat using a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant.
- Injection of biomethane to the existing gas network for industrial, commercial, or residential use.

The Proposed Development is conceived to adopt both options above, as both electricity and heat are required to support the process and enable the production of biomethane. On-site generation of electricity and heat using a CHP plant is incorporated to ensure the Proposed Development can be self-sufficient in terms of electrical and thermal energy demand.

The Irish Government is committed to supporting delivery of up to 5.7TWh of indigenously produced biomethane by 2030. The National Biomethane Strategy published by the Department of Environment, Climate, and Communications and the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine on the 28th of May 2024, sets the primary objective to deliver on the ambitious target set by the Government as part of the agreement on the sectoral emission ceilings.

Considering the proximity of the Proposed Development to the existing gas network, injection of biomethane to the existing gas network for industrial, commercial, or residential use was deemed the most suitable option. The Grid Injection Unit (GIU) within the Proposed Development will allow for the direct injection of biomethane into the gas network. A distribution gas connection to the Proposed Development will be delivered separately by GNI under a separate consenting process (with this gas connection considered in this EIAR).

Biomethane supplied to the existing gas network in this manner will be used as a direct substitute for fossil gas in various applications, such as high-temperature heat, electricity generation and transport. The biomethane produced by the Proposed Development will therefore directly contribute to meeting the national target of 5.7TWh of indigenously produced biomethane by 2030. Furthermore, direct entry into the gas network is more efficient in terms of GHG emissions compared to virtual pipeline as no additional fuel is required for the transport of the renewable energy. Traffic is also less with the direct entry method as opposed to a virtual pipeline.

Biogenic CO₂

A CO₂ liquefaction system has been included within the Proposed Development. The biogenic CO₂ that is extracted during the biogas upgrading process can be captured and liquefied. By utilising this process, the biogenic CO₂ will be captured, purified, and reused.

3.4.4.4 Best Available Techniques (BAT)

The processes outlined in **Chapter 2: Project Description** were selected following a thorough review of Best Available Techniques (BAT) detailed below, site conditions, and regulatory requirements.

- Best Available Techniques (BAT) Waste Treatment - Commission Implementing Decisions (CID)
- Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for the Animal By-products and/or Edible Co-products Industries
- Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Energy Efficiency
- Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document Emissions from Storage

The chosen techniques and technologies are industry-standard, support the effective implementation of emission control measures, and are well-established and proven within the industry.

3.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has thoroughly examined the practicable alternatives considered during the design and pre-application phases of the Proposed Development, in compliance with the legislative context and guidelines provided by the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU and the EPA.

The methodology followed a structured approach, ensuring all reasonable alternatives were assessed with respect to their environmental impacts.

Detailed considerations were given to the 'Do Nothing' scenario, highlighting the significant environmental, economic, and social benefits that would be forfeited if the project were not implemented.

The chapter also detailed the alternative locations considered, using a comprehensive scoring matrix to evaluate site-specific criteria. By presenting a clear rationale for the selected option, this chapter underscores the careful and informed decision-making process that ensured environmental considerations were taken into account in deciding on the selected options.

ORS

Appendix 3.1

RECEIVED: 17/09/2024

Waterford CCC Planning Authority - Inspection Purposes Only

Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Assessment: Reatagh and Curraghmagarraha, Co. Waterford

Criteria	Scoring	Score	Weighting	Total Score
Transport Network and Access	1. Greater than 5km from Regional Roads, 2. 1 - 5km km from Regional Road 3. Less than 1km from Regional Road. 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock allowing for transport internally.	4	3	12
Proximity to Feedstock Supply	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock.	4	3	12
Proximity to Biobased Fertiliser Receivers	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km	3	3	9
Existing Land Use	1. Urban or greenfield 2. Rural Brownfield, 3. Zoned Industrial	1	2	2
Landscape Sensitivity	1. Proximate to Sensitive Landscape 2. Greater than 1km 3. Greater than 5km	1	2	2
Ecological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to designated site 2. >1km from designated sites 3. >5km from designated sites	3	2	6
Archaeological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to archaeology sites 2. >1km from archaeology sites 3. >5km from archaeology sites	3	1	3
Access to Gas Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	3	6
Access to Electricity Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	1	3
Sensitive Receptors	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1 km	2	3	6
Available Land Size	1. 1- 2ha 2. 2-3ha 3. Greater than 4ha	3	3	9

ORS

Land Availability	1. Not for Sale or Lease 2. Available for Sale or Lease but financially unviable 3. Owned or for sale/lease at	3	3	9
Landscape and Visual Amenity	1. Site is elevated or exposed 2. Site has existing cover and partial views 3. Site is hidden and with little or no receptors overlooking the site.	3	2	6
Proximity to Suitable Water Course Or Sewer	1. Greater than 1km 2. Less than 1km. 3. Immediately adjacent or on site	3	3	9
Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1km	3	1	3
Existing Topography	1. Undulating or severe level changes 2. Moderate level changes that can be engineered out. 3. Relatively flat and level.	2	2	4
Flood Risk	1. In a Flood Risk Zone 3. Outside Flood Risk Zone	3	3	9
Total Ranked Score				110

Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Assessment: Kilmacthomas, Co Waterford

Criteria	Scoring	Score	Weighting	Total Score
Transport Network and Access	1. Greater than 5km from Regional Roads, 2. 1 - 5km km from Regional Road 3. Less than 1km from Regional Road. 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock allowing for transport internally.	4	3	12
Proximity to Feedstock Supply	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock.	4	3	12
Proximity to Biobased Fertiliser Receivers	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km	3	3	9
Existing Land Use	1. Urban or greenfield 2. Rural Brownfield, 3. Zoned Industrial	1	2	2
Landscape Sensitivity	1. Proximate to Sensitive Landscape 2. Greater than 1km 3. Greater than 5km	3	2	6
Ecological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to designated site 2. >1km from designated sites 3. >5km from designated sites	3	2	6
Archaeological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to archaeology sites 2. >1km from archaeology sites 3. >5km from archaeology sites	1	1	1
Access to Gas Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	1	3	3
Access to Electricity Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	1	3
Sensitive Receptors	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1 km	2	3	6
Available Land Size	1. 1- 2ha 2. 2-3ha 3. Greater than 4ha	2	3	6

ORS

Land Availability	1. Not for Sale or Lease 2. Available for Sale or Lease but financially unviable 3. Owned or for sale/lease at	3	3	9
Landscape and Visual Amenity	1. Site is elevated or exposed 2. Site has existing cover and partial views 3. Site is hidden and with little or no receptors overlooking the site.	2	2	4
Proximity to Suitable Water Course Or Sewer	1. Greater than 1km 2. Less than 1km. 3. Immediately adjacent or on site	1	3	3
Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1km	3	1	3
Existing Topography	1. Undulating or severe level changes 2. Moderate level changes that can be engineered out. 3. Relatively flat and level.	2	2	4
Flood Risk	1. In a Flood Risk Zone 3. Outside Flood Risk Zone	3	3	9
Total Ranked Score				98

Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Assessment: Old Molloy Factory, Cleaboy Road, Waterford City, Co. Waterford

Criteria	Scoring	Score	Weighting	Total Score
Transport Network and Access	1. Greater than 5km from Regional Roads, 2. 1 - 5km km from Regional Road 3. Less than 1km from Regional Road. 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock allowing for transport internally.	3	3	9
Proximity to Feedstock Supply	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock.	1	3	3
Proximity to Biobased Fertiliser Receivers	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km	1	3	3
Existing Land Use	1. Urban or greenfield 2. Rural Brownfield, 3. Zoned Industrial	3	2	6
Landscape Sensitivity	1. Proximate to Sensitive Landscape 2. Greater than 1km 3. Greater than 5km	3	2	6
Ecological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to designated site 2. >1km from designated sites 3. >5km from designated sites	3	2	6
Archaeological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to archaeology sites 2. >1km from archaeology sites 3. >5km from archaeology sites	3	1	3
Access to Gas Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	3	9
Access to Electricity Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	1	3
Sensitive Receptors	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1 km	1	3	3
Available Land Size	1. 1- 2ha 2. 2-3ha 3. Greater than 4ha	2	3	6

ORS

Land Availability	1. Not for Sale or Lease 2. Available for Sale or Lease but financially unviable 3. Owned or for sale/lease at	3	3	9
Landscape and Visual Amenity	1. Site is elevated or exposed 2. Site has existing cover and partial views 3. Site is hidden and with little or no receptors overlooking the site.	2	2	4
Proximity to Suitable Water Course Or Sewer	1. Greater than 1km 2. Less than 1km. 3. Immediately adjacent or on site	3	3	9
Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1km	3	1	3
Existing Topography	1. Undulating or severe level changes 2. Moderate level changes that can be engineered out. 3. Relatively flat and level.	3	2	6
Flood Risk	1. In a Flood Risk Zone 3. Outside Flood Risk Zone	3	3	9
Total Ranked Score				97

Site-Specific Selection Criteria and Assessment: Lands and Industrial Unit at Gracedieu, Co. Waterford

Criteria	Scoring	Score	Weighting	Total Score
Transport Network and Access	1. Greater than 5km from Regional Roads, 2. 1 - 5km km from Regional Road 3. Less than 1km from Regional Road. 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock allowing for transport internally.	2	3	6
Proximity to Feedstock Supply	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km 4. Immediately adjacent to major source of feedstock.	2	3	6
Proximity to Biobased Fertiliser Receivers	1. 80% available >10km 2. 80% available within 10km 3. 80% Available within 5 km	2	3	6
Existing Land Use	1. Urban or greenfield 2. Rural Brownfield, 3. Zoned Industrial	3	2	6
Landscape Sensitivity	1. Proximate to Sensitive Landscape 2. Greater than 1km 3. Greater than 5km	2	2	6
Ecological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to designated site 2. >1km from designated sites 3. >5km from designated sites	3	2	6
Archaeological Designations Score	1. Adjacent to archaeology sites 2. >1km from archaeology sites 3. >5km from archaeology sites	3	1	3
Access to Gas Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	1	3	3
Access to Electricity Grid	1. Greater than 5km, 2. 1-5km, 3. <1km	3	1	3
Sensitive Receptors	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1 km	2	3	6
Available Land Size	1. 1- 2ha 2. 2-3ha 3. Greater than 4ha	3	3	9

ORS

Land Availability	1. Not for Sale or Lease 2. Available for Sale or Lease but financially unviable 3. Owned or for sale/lease at	3	3	9
Landscape and Visual Amenity	1. Site is elevated or exposed 2. Site has existing cover and partial views 3. Site is hidden and with little or no receptors overlooking the site.	2	2	4
Proximity to Suitable Water Course Or Sewer	1. Greater than 1km 2. Less than 1km. 3. Immediately adjacent or on site	3	3	9
Proximity to Drinking Water Source/Aquifer	1. Less than 250m. 2. less than 1km. 3. Greater than 1km	3	1	3
Existing Topography	1. Undulating or severe level changes 2. Moderate level changes that can be engineered out. 3. Relatively flat and level.	3	2	6
Flood Risk	1. In a Flood Risk Zone 3. Outside Flood Risk Zone	3	3	9
Total Ranked Score				98