

1.1

In the submitted planning application, and supporting EIS, there appears to be considerable emphasis placed on the classification of the Meath facility as a “recovery facility”, and its implied consequential fit with evolving international/national/regional waste management policies. Section 4.2.2. of the EIS refers to revised national waste policy under review. Accordingly, having regard to the recent publication by the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government entitled A Resource Opportunity – Waste Management Policy in Ireland (July 2012), please indicate whether this latest policy intervention has any implications for the role of the proposed development vis-à-vis official policy. You are requested, in particular, to address any issues raised in respect of Planning for the Future (Section 3 of the Resource Opportunity document including references to regional waste management configurations and hazardous waste management planning); Recovery (Section 9 of that document); and Disposal (Section 10 of that document).

Response:

Meath WTE as a recovery facility

The recovery status of the facility has been confirmed by Indaver in a submission to the EPA. In this submission, the calculation against the R1 recovery criteria was based on the technical specifications of the plant, in line with European guidance. R1 compliance will be further validated by the EPA after one year of standard operation conditions, starting from the issue of an operational certificate by Eirgrid anticipated by the end of October 2012. As the facility is designed for maximum energy efficiency, we have no reason to doubt that the facility's recovery status will be upheld.

The Impact of the New Waste Policy – “A Resource Opportunity”

The publication of “A Resource Opportunity” – Waste Management Policy in Ireland in July 2012 sets out the approach that all stakeholders in Waste Management need to take in the coming years. The Policy reinforces the waste hierarchy, with landfill a last resort and recognises the role of the Waste Framework Directive, as adopted into

Irish law by S.I. No. 126 of 2011, in assigning responsibility to the regulatory authorities for the application of the waste hierarchy in the decision making process.

The document references the EPA National Waste Report 2010, and recognises that progress will be more challenging in relation to the further significant diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill that has to be achieved which “..is crucially dependent on the development of a network of recycling and recovery infrastructure across a range of technologies..”¹.

The Policy recognises that waste infrastructure is now provided mainly by private waste industry. The Policy also indicates that by announcing the landfill levy escalator, the Government is giving waste firms clear policy direction so they may invest in waste infrastructure with the focus being on recovery (Section 2.3.4).

It is clear from both the policy document “ A Resource Opportunity” and the National Hazardous Waste Management Plan 2008-2012 (NHWMP) that there is a need for the development of infrastructure within the state to treat both municipal and hazardous waste, having regard for the proximity and self sufficiency principles. This facility is a recovery facility, provided by the private waste industry, fulfilling the new waste policy.

Section 3 – Planning for the Future

Again, the need for the development of infrastructure is re-iterated in this section, with the prediction that municipal waste arisings will increase in coming years making the targets for landfill diversion even more challenging.

Section 3 goes on to state that Waste Management Plans must be assessed by the end of 2012 for compliance with the Waste Framework Directive, and that the number of Waste Management Regions will be reduced to no more than 3. Importantly, by rationalising the waste regions, the Policy recognises the nature of

¹ Section 2.5 – A Resource Opportunity, DEHLG, July 2012

the Irish Waste Market and the movement of waste across existing boundaries to avail of waste infrastructure such as the Meath WTE Facility.

In line with this, the increase in tonnage accepted at the Meath facility will facilitate the management of this predicted growth in municipal waste, and provide for the rational use of existing waste infrastructure.

For Hazardous Waste, the Policy states that hazardous waste management planning is a function of the EPA, with the NHWMP 2008-2012 providing direction to policy and decision makers involved in hazardous waste management. A key objective of the NHWMP 2008-2012 is “to strive for increased self-sufficiency in the management of hazardous waste and to reduce hazardous waste export”.

The new Policy provides confirmation and clarity that, as detailed in Chapter 4 of the EIS, the proposed development of a key piece of hazardous waste infrastructure, is in line with both European and Irish waste policy, will enable a reduction in the amount of hazardous waste exported, divert residual municipal waste away from landfill as well as directing waste up the hierarchy.

Section 9 – Recovery

This section of the Policy makes clear that waste is a resource that can replace fossil fuels in the generation of energy by thermal treatment, and notes that “Ireland requires an adequate network of quality waste treatment facilities”.

The proposed development, coupled with the existing 200,000 tpa Waste to Energy Facility, will assist in directing waste from disposal operations as well as addressing the lack of recovery infrastructure in the state. The additional tonnage will also support the facility’s contribution to renewable energy targets, which receives recognition for this in the form of the Renewable Energy Feed In Tariff (REFIT).

Section 10 – Disposal

The Meath Waste to Energy facility is a recovery facility. The proposed development will assist Ireland to move away from “an unsustainable dependence on landfill as a

method of managing its waste" (Section 10.1 of "A Resource Opportunity") by diverting waste up the hierarchy away from disposal.

Conclusion

The new Policy recognises the lack of recovery infrastructure in the State. It has provided clarity to parties that investment in recovery infrastructure is necessary and has the full support of the policy. "A Resource Opportunity"- Waste Management Policy in Ireland was published in July 2012, it will take time for other necessary infrastructure to be developed in Ireland. Therefore, in the meantime the proposed development can offer a more immediate solution than a new waste infrastructure project.

The proposed development is consistent with and will contribute to the achievement of the objectives contained within the new Policy.

1.2

Please clarify how the proposal for up to 15,000 tpa of hazardous waste , in an overall 220,000 tpa throughput, equates to 5% maximum "bulk of the waste" described in Section 4.2.3 of the EIS, and whether the stated estimate of 5% maximum takes account of incidental hazardous materials contained within the accepted mainstream residual municipal waste. Please also state your current estimates of the amount of incidental hazardous waste content in currently accepted waste at Carranstown.

Response:

It is noted that the operational experience of accepting hazardous wastes at other grate furnace facilities is based on accepting this hazardous waste in addition to residual municipal waste. Therefore, the proportion of hazardous waste to be accepted (typically 5%) does not include the expected quantity of incidental hazardous materials contained within the accepted mainstream residual municipal waste.

Section 2.2.2 of the EIS explores the need for the scheme in the context of additional hazardous EWC codes. It states that there is approximately 10,000 – 15,000 tonnes per annum low hazard waste streams that could be treated at the Meath WTE facility.

This is our best estimate of the quantity of the specified hazardous waste streams requiring treatment annually. However, like any market, waste volumes can fluctuate significantly year on year due to e.g. the reclassification of waste already being accepted (from non-hazardous to hazardous or the reverse), campaigns relating to a specific waste stream or increased / decreased production of a particular product. Therefore it is considered prudent to seek the upper value in order to accrue the full benefit - reducing reliance on exports and improving competitiveness – of the facility for business, industry and the local authorities in Ireland.

As noted in Section 4.2.3 of the EIS, the feed ratio of hazardous waste to municipal waste in a grate furnace is typically approx. 5%. This is based on operational experience from similar facilities. The actual ratio that the facility can handle will vary depending on the type of hazard in the waste being treated, its calorific value and so on. For example, some hazardous classifications relate to handling (e.g. irritant) rather than to any particular difficulty in treating the waste in the furnace. In these circumstances, the waste is likely to be similar to MSW in terms of waste treatment.

To cater for fluctuations in the market, as highlighted above, and in view of the nature of the hazardous waste streams sought, the upper limit of 15,000t hazardous waste intake is considered acceptable to the plant (equivalent to 6.8% total).

Current Estimates of Incidental Hazardous Waste in MSW

The composition of MSW was studied in The EPA report *Municipal Waste Characterisation Surveys 2008*. These provide a breakdown of the typical household and commercial waste composition based on surveys of waste from various urban and rural waste producers.

These surveys found that residual household waste typically contains 0.9% hazardous waste while residual commercial waste contains up to 3.0%. In 2010, the mix of household to commercial waste in residual MSW (i.e. the waste type accepted at the Meath facility) was 56.4% household and 42.3% commercial. Street sweepings made up the remaining 1.3%.

The EPA waste characterization study did not assess the components of street sweepings though they are unlikely to contain as much hazardous waste as commercial or household waste. As a worst case scenario, it can be assumed that street sweepings have the same composition as average residual municipal waste. Adjusting for street sweepings, the proportion of residual household to commercial waste becomes 57.1% to 42.9%. This is shown in the table below.

	Tonnes 2010	2010%	Adjusted for Street Sweepings
Residual household waste	843.842	56%	57%
Residual commercial waste	633.010	42%	43%
Street sweepings	18.713	1%	0%
Total	1.495.565		

Multiplying by the EPA calculated quantity of hazardous waste in each fraction, it is estimated that the quantity of incidental hazardous waste in residual MSW is 1.8%. This is shown in the table below.

	Tonnes 2010	2010%	Adjusted for Street Sweepings	Hazardous waste content
Residual household waste	843,842	56.4%	57.1%	0.9%
Residual commercial waste	633,010	42.3%	42.9%	3.0%
Street sweepings	18,713	1.3%	-	-
Total for residual MSW	1,495,565	100%	100%	1.8%

2.0

At pre-application stage the list of prescribed bodies to be notified of any planning application was discussed at meetings, and confirmed as amended to the applicant at the closure of the pre-application consultation process. The list included local authorities from whom waste is proposed to be collected. However the planning application documentation states only that the lead authorities in each waste management region have been consulted. You are

requested to clarify the rationale applied in your interpretation of the Board's advice in this matter.

Response:

For the purposes of waste management planning and regulation, the several local authorities nationwide have organised themselves into ten waste management regions. Where those regions comprise more than one local authority, a lead authority has been identified by the region. That lead authority has responsibility to co-ordinate matters relevant to waste management for the other local authorities within the region.

As it is not possible to identify specific local authorities from whom waste is proposed to be collected, it was considered prudent and conservative to alert all of the waste management regions about this application through direct notice to the lead authority for each such region. By this mechanism, the local authority functional area for the entire region of the Republic of Ireland is alerted.

Any concern regarding waste planning objectives regarding household separation of waste (also addressed below in response to query nos. 4.3 and 4.4) would arise under and in connection with the waste management plan for the relevant region.

The mechanism has proven effective. For example, Meath County Council is the lead authority for the North East Waste Management Region and was notified in that capacity. Louth County Council is part of the same region and chose to make a submission on its own behalf.

For completeness, there is nothing about the proposed development that could affect the "area of any local authority" and so article 213(1)(h) of the Planning and Development Regulations (as amended) does not apply. Furthermore, as explained in response to query no. 6.1 below, with respect to collection, the most likely wastes will be sourced from customers that are known to Indaver Ireland and from which Indaver Ireland already collect and transport waste. There would be no different impact under the proposed development.

While, in our view, unnecessary, if the Board forms the view that some other local authority might have information relevant to this application, we note the power for the Board to invite submissions from such persons under section 37F(1)(c) of the Planning and Development Act (as amended)."

2.1

Please also state whether it is anticipated that hazardous waste may be accepted from local authority areas in Northern Ireland, which includes areas more proximate to the application site than certain areas within consulted regional waste authorities.

Response:

It is not anticipated that substantial quantities of hazardous waste would be sent to the facility from Northern Ireland. The 15,000 tonnes per annum estimate of suitable hazardous waste material for the Meath facility was based on the market in the Republic of Ireland only.

Hazardous waste management planning is a function of the EPA, and their National Hazardous Waste Management Plan (Section 6.8) addresses the potential for all-island co-operation, stating:

"There are potentially considerable economies of scale to be achieved through full opening of the Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland waste markets. Certain companies already operate on an all-island basis and certain hazardous waste streams currently move across the border, including waste oils, fluorescent lamps and waste electrical and electronic equipment.

There are no policy or legislative barriers to the movement of waste for recovery or recycling. Such movements are however subject to the EU Regulation on the transfrontier shipment of waste and companies must set aside administrative and financial resources to satisfy the competent authorities in both jurisdictions. There is no scope to reduce the fundamental requirement to comply with the Regulation".

Northern Ireland Waste Management plans also acknowledge the need for all island solutions to hazardous wastes. The waste management plan for the Arc 21 region (Northeast of Northern Ireland) states that in terms of all island co-operation, particular priorities might include utilising existing or planned treatment facilities on an all island basis. The plan for the region acknowledges that the development of waste to energy facility for hazardous waste is unlikely in the region due to the very low quantities compared to an economic size of facility.

3.0 (a)

At pre-application stage, it was indicated by the Board's representative that the health implications of the proposed development would be a material consideration in the assessment of any submitted planning application. It appears that the now submitted EIS gives limited direct attention to any potential health implications raised by the proposed development, including the outcomes of any consultations undertaken with the relevant official bodies in respect of this consideration. Please clarify the extent and outcomes of any consultations undertaken in this regard prior to the making of the current planning application.

Response:

Regarding consultation with the relevant prescribed bodies, on the 28th March 2012, Indaver wrote to the HSE advising them that the application and EIS was being prepared and that we would welcome any input that they had to the EIS. We also submitted a briefing paper with the letter to outline the extent and nature of the amendments proposed. The letter and briefing paper are attached in **Appendix 1**. We received no communication from the HSE until the application documents and EIS were submitted to them on the 30th April 2012 when a site visit was arranged for the 09th May 2012. Subsequent to their visit and in their submission to the Board in relation to the application, the only issue raised was the extension of the hours of waste acceptance which had been scaled back in any event after consultation with the local residents.

It should also be noted that the compilation of an EIS in itself has the purpose of identifying and mitigating, if required, the impacts of a development on the environment and consequently human health. Having regard to the nature and extent of the proposed development, the application and environmental impact statement gives careful and appropriate consideration to health implications throughout the document in the analysis of the following list (non exhaustive) topics:

- Air
- Traffic
- Noise
- Water
- Visual Impact
- Cultural Heritage
- Human Beings

Hence, we are of the opinion that, contrary to the Board's view that the EIS "gives limited direct attention to any of the potential health implications of the proposed development", the EIS gives the appropriate consideration required.

During the preparation of the EIS, WYG provided Dr. Martin Hogan with current emissions data from the facility, a summary of the proposed amendments to the facility and the Air Quality and Process Description Chapters of the EIS. Dr Hogan confirmed that if no substantive changes to the facilities emissions/procedures were proposed, then there would be no impact on health. Having reviewed the outcome of the air quality study prepared as part of the EIS, Dr Martin Hogan concluded that "It is therefore not considered necessary to reassess the potential impacts of the facility on human health".

Having received the further information request from the Board, WYG requested a written response from Dr. Martin Hogan which confirms the original conclusion drawn in the EIS. This written response is contained in **Appendix 2** to this document.

3.0 (b)

Arising from submissions received by An Bord Pleanála in response to the current planning application, comprising approximately 15 no. submissions up to and including the Meath County Manager's Report and related County Council meeting minutes of July 2012, you are invited to submit any observations you may have on these submissions at this time, and, in particular, any observations you may have in respect of the following matters:

Response:

Helpfully, the Board has identified the principal issues for clarification arising from the submissions made. We have reviewed the submissions made and do not have other observations. Where directed at Indaver Ireland, the matters raised are covered within the application documents or are not relevant to the proposed development.

MEATH COUNTY MANAGER'S REPORT

4.1

Regarding the proposed increase in tonnage of waste to be accepted, and the consequential projected increase in bottom ash residue, the Report notes the limited lifespan of the currently-used landfill facility at Whiteriver Dunleer, County Louth and queries where the bottom ash will be disposed when the Whiteriver facility ceases to be operational. Please submit your observations to An Bord Pleanála as appropriate.

Response:

As noted by the Board, it is anticipated that the Whiteriver landfill will close in mid 2013. Indaver is currently in discussion with a number of other landfill operators with a view to setting up an agreement with them for the acceptance of bottom ash.

Although some landfills are now temporarily closed, this is not due to a shortage of capacity but was done for commercial reasons. Therefore, subject to permissions being maintained, there is more than sufficient landfill capacity available for bottom ash management. In the unlikely event of this capacity becoming unavailable, there is the option of exporting this material to the continent.

4.2

The Report queries also the applicants ash strategy, which it is considered should address possible removal of certain non-ash residues from bottom ash and resultant reduction of ash to landfill. Please submit any observations.

Response:

In Ireland, it is a requirement of the EPA Pre-Treatment Guidance² that metals and, where possible, other fractions are recovered. Only the residues from this recovery process are consigned to landfill.

The bottom ash currently consigned to landfill has already been processed. This includes:

- *Screening & Return of oversize:* on exit from the furnace, bottom ash is screened then:
 - Any oversized, unburned residues are removed and are sent back to the bunker to be treated again
 - Oversized metals are returned to the ash hall for off-site recycling.
- *Ferrous metal recovery:* remaining ash is sent to the ash hall for recycling. An overband magnet removes ferrous metals amounting to about 2,700 tonnes per annum.

In addition, Indaver is currently assessing the potential for the recovery of non-Ferrous metal from the residues. As per the existing EPA licence condition 7.5b, we are preparing a proposal on the recovery of non ferrous metals which will be submitted to the EPA in accordance with the conditions of the licence.

² EPA, Municipal Solid Waste – Pre-treatment & Residuals Management. An EPA Technical Guidance Document: Consultation Draft, 2008, available at <http://www.epa.ie>

4.3

Regarding the acceptance of some additional EWC waste types, the report signals some concern that any public perception of hazardous waste being incinerated, as proposed, could undermine public interest efforts to encourage the separation of waste by SME producers and households. Please submit your observations on this consideration, and the recommendation in the Report that the applicant should be required to make financial contributions towards the promotion of public waste management awareness.

Response:

Initiatives to separate household hazardous wastes streams such as Batteries, End of Life Vehicle wastes, Waste Electrical Electronic Equipment etc would not be affected as these do not form part of the additional waste streams applied for. The promotion of the separation of household hazardous waste by the producers of such waste is important when the final destination is landfill, therefore schemes such as producer responsibility campaigns and financial disincentives are in place to prevent this happening. The Waste Management (Amendment) Act, 2001 provides for the establishment of an Environment Fund, to be managed and controlled by the Minister for the Environment and Local Government. Revenues including those from the landfill of waste (landfill levy) contribute towards the Fund, which is utilized for a range of purposes such as 'promotion of awareness of the need to protect the environment, including national and regional campaigns'.

Indaver believe Local Authorities should continue their current awareness campaign but that this should be funded from the Environment Fund vis-à-vis the Landfill Levy.

4.4

The concern expressed in the Meath County Manager's report is echoed in the submission of Louth County Council Environment Department. In this regard you are invited to comment as appropriate on this issue in the context of the queries raised in Paragraph 2.1 (2.0 as clarified with An Bord Pleanála) above of this letter.

Response:

Please See our response to question 2.0 regarding appropriate consultation with local authorities within the ten different waste management regions, and also the response to 4.3 above addressing the concerns of the Meath County Council and Louth County Council.

Having regard to the limited nature, extent and volume of waste the subject of this application, no prejudice is likely. If there was some widespread concern among local authorities, we expect the lead authority for each waste management region would have raised that concern by way of submission or observation to the Board.

4.5

The report refers to the reasonable application of the "proximity principle" in waste management planning and operation, and goes on to query specifically the volumes of each type of waste listed in Table 5.2 of the EIS and the regions from which they would come. Please provide information, as appropriate, in response to this query, and the related query raised of the long-term strategy of hazardous waste use in the Carranstown facility. Comprehensive information on the types/sources/quantities of hazardous waste materials should be provided to facilitate consideration of the proposed development.

Response:

The NHWMP leaves the development of hazardous waste treatment capacity to the private sector, which must "judge whether investment in an Irish hazardous waste management incineration facility, or alternative treatment technologies, would make commercial sense in the context of the evolving European market".

The rational use of capacity at the Meath waste-to-energy plant for hazardous waste streams is the most cost effective immediate solution available. As outlined in Chapter 1 of the EIS, the additional EWC codes represent waste streams that fit within the existing acceptance criteria and that are similar in physical and chemical characteristics to what is accepted at the Meath WTE facility today.

However, many hazardous waste streams from important industrial sectors in Ireland cannot and will not be handled at the Meath plant. In the longer term, Indaver's proposed Ringaskiddy plant is required as part of a network of solutions (including hazardous waste landfill and cement kilns) that will support industry and enable Ireland to become self-sufficient in hazardous waste treatment. This will help to fulfill the National Hazardous Waste Management Plan for which self-sufficiency is a key objective.

Should the proposed development be granted permission, and licensed by the EPA, the immediate situation would be that a portion of "suitable" waste streams from all over the island could be accepted at the Meath WTE, while unsuitable (e.g. chlorinated, high metal bearing etc) waste would continue to be exported as they are now. If the Ringaskiddy WTE becomes operational, the more difficult wastes from all over the island could be accepted at Ringaskiddy, whilst the Meath WTE would retain only "suitable" hazardous streams from the areas in closer proximity to Meath than to Ringaskiddy.

Tables 2.1 and Figure 5.2 of the EIS set out the types of hazardous waste materials that could be handled by the Meath waste-to-energy project. This list also specified the typical industry source for such material. As with most markets, the volumes and sources are subject to change depending on production trends, demand, and other influencing factors.

In total, Indaver handled over 9,700 tonnes of the waste streams listed in 2011 (This can be seen in **Appendix 3**). This represents a portion of the waste arisings for these EWC codes but the national figures for that which was exported under TFS can be

seen in **Appendix 4**. These figures were obtained from the National TFS Office (NTFSO) Public Register 2011 and a total of approximately 66,000 tonnes for the year 2011, with only the TFS Notifications containing any of the proposed new EWC Codes listed. It is to be noted that some TFS Notifications contain more than one EWC code, and **Appendix 4** lists those for completeness where they contain one of the new proposed codes. (The full unedited version of the Public Register can be obtained from The National TFS Office, Dublin City Council, Marrowbone Lane, Dublin 8.) It was not possible to obtain the regional origin of each TFS from the NTFSO as they did not have this information readily available from their computer system.

For the waste that Indaver handled in 2011, we have endeavoured to identify sources of waste. **Appendix 3** gives the source by Waste Management Region of the waste streams applied for. However, the data does not provide a completely accurate picture due to the activities of waste collectors on an all- island basis, with waste going from original collection point into Waste Transfer Stations and then being dispatched from these facilities to Indaver.

As noted, since the market varies from year to year, this is provided as an illustration only of the possible profile of hazardous waste accepted. Indaver frequently works with companies undertaking campaigns to produce a particular product or to modify a process, in which case we could see a sudden increase in volumes of a corresponding waste stream. It is also noted that, insofar as Indaver cannot currently offer a local outlet for these streams, it does not currently handle all of the waste streams listed.

In terms of calorific value, the plant requires a constant input of 69MW thermal and therefore, the different streams will be sourced and managed in order to maintain this. If for example, very high CV waste streams are obtained then it may be necessary to source low waste streams e.g. aqueous waste in order to balance this and achieve the 69MW input requirement. The converse is also true.

Waste types

It is recognised that one EWC code can be correctly used to describe waste that varies greatly. In Table 2.1 and Figure 5.2 of the EIS, typical examples of the waste types proposed were provided along side each EWC Code. For further clarity, an expanded list detailing additional examples of the waste falling under each EWC Code is provided in **Appendix 5**.

4.6

Please also comment on the matter of disposal method of hazardous bottom ash, should this occur.

Response:

Indaver has undertaken an extensive study on bottom ash classification, involving the analysis of over 50 samples in a batch and release system prior to moving any of the ash to landfill for disposal. This has consistently demonstrated that bottom ash is non-hazardous.

From operational experience at other similar plants, bottom ash will continue to be classified as non-hazardous when accepting hazardous waste. This is because the waste streams accepted for treatment contain hazards (e.g. Harmful (H5) relating to the hydrocarbon content of oily waste / rags) that are destroyed by the incineration process and therefore cannot pass into the bottom ash.

Any compromise to the classification of bottom ash (i.e. if it were to become hazardous) would have a significant financial implication for the plant due to the additional transport and disposal costs involved in disposing of hazardous ash. Therefore we would regard it to be of utmost importance that any waste streams that could compromise emissions limits on flue gases or bottom ash (e.g. containing compounds that are not destroyed through incineration) are screened out as part of the waste characterisation and classification process as described in Section 5.6.1 of the EIS.

As an ongoing measure, bottom ash will continue to be monitored in line with EPA requirements during the acceptance of any hazardous waste.

4.7

Regarding the proposed modular building in the currently proposed development, the Report notes that the site characterisation report relating to the associated new on-site effluent treatment plant, has not taken account of the relevant 2009 EPA Code of Practice. The Report states the imperative of applying the relevant 2009 criteria. You are invited to submit revised information or otherwise comment, as appropriate, to address this issue as raised in the County Manager's Report.

Response:

The County Managers report states that the Site Characterisation Report (SCR) submitted as part of this Application has been carried out in accordance with the EPA Wastewater Treatment manuals, treatment systems for single houses (EPA 2000), which is in reference to an SCR that was submitted as part of the 2009 EIS. This SCR referred to the EPA manual and guidelines that were in force at that time.

In the 2012 EIS, Section 9.5.2 states "All domestic effluent will be treated by an appropriate system prior to discharge to a suitable percolation area designed and constructed in accordance with current EPA requirements"

Section 11.3.1(operation) states It is proposed that an additional system will be installed for the proposed modular office block. The system will be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the recently published EPA Guidance on the Authorisation of Discharges to Groundwater.

However, Section 10.7.2 of the EIS states "...the proposed treatment plant and secondary/tertiary treatment system will be designed and constructed in accordance with the EPA's requirements as per the EPA Waste Water Treatment Manual for

Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999) and recently published EPA Guidance on the Authorisation of Discharge to Ground (2011)”.

The reference to the 1999 manual was incorrect and should have read “the proposed treatment system will be designed and constructed in accordance with the Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses p.e.<10 (EPA 2009) and with respect to the recently published EPA Guidance on the Authorisation of Discharges to Groundwater where appropriate”.

The proposed treatment plant will be designed and constructed in accordance with the EPA document; Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatment Systems for Single Houses (2009). A condition to that effect could be imposed, in the event permission is granted.

4.8

Regarding the matter of air quality vis-à-vis any impact on the Bru na Boinne World Heritage Site, as raised on page 26 of the County Manager’s Report, please comment as appropriate.

Response:

Please see **Appendix 6** for the response from AWN Consulting on the impact of the proposed development on the Bru na Boinne World Heritage Site. The study updates the exercise carried out in 2004 and finds that the impact at the Bru Na Boinne site will be insignificant.

4.9

Regarding the matter of Appropriate Assessment (AA), the Report notes that screening assessment undertaken does not appear to form part of the documentation submitted in support of the planning application. Please comment, as appropriate, and/or submit a copy of the relevant screening assessment or assessments. In this regard, your attention is drawn to prevailing official advice given to planning authorities and An Bord Pleanála,

that the findings and conclusions of any AA screening process should be documented complete with supporting evidence and objective criteria.

Response:

Please find attached **Appendix 7**, the Habitats Directive Screening Statement produced by WYG in April 2012. The screening assessment confirms that an Appropriate Assessment was not required for the proposed development.

Arising from consideration of other submissions made to An Bord Pleanála, please comment, in particular, in respect of the matters set down below.

5.0 Roads and Traffic

5.1 Submitted that traffic generation predictions are flawed for reasons including the likelihood of a greater overall number of commercial vehicular movements associated with the delivery of hazardous waste; and traffic generation associated with the centralisation of the spare parts for the Company's business nationwide at Carranstown.

Response:

Section 1 of the report prepared by Roughan & O'Donovan in **Appendix 8** addresses this issue. In summary, the TIA performed in 2012 was conservative and third party submissions suggesting higher traffic numbers associated with the additional 20,000 tonnes per annum capacity are exaggerated. The main difference is the assertion that the intention is to accept all of the clinical waste produced in the country and that the average truck weight is 1.5 tonnes. In the context of a National Tender for clinical waste (which includes state-run hospitals only and is due for issue in 2014) Indaver would be interested in participating but would work with a logistics/collection partner to optimise the deliveries to the Meath facility. This would increase the average weight per truck but it is likely that not all of the waste collected would go to the Meath facility in any event and existing facilities would also be used in order to make the collection and treatment of the waste as efficient as possible. Hence a more realistic scenario which is included in the attached report from Roughan &

O'Donovan conservatively assumes 4,250 tonnes of clinical waste (approximately half of what is produced nationally) at an average weight of 1.75 tonnes per truck. It should be noted that 1.75 tonnes per truck is the current average weight of vehicles collecting clinical waste in the country. This more realistic scenario demonstrates that the TIA performed in 2012 is representative.

5.2

Submitted that further heavy traffic generating development would be premature pending the construction and opening of the Duleek by-pass.

Response:

Indaver notes the Meath County Council Planning Report acknowledges its previous contribution of €600,000 to the Duleek Bypass, the R152 and R150/N2/R153. The Report advises that “a commitment was given by MCC to fast track the design and procurement of a bypass for the village. This process was commenced in 2010 with the appointment of DBFL as consultants to carry out the work and is currently at the preferred route stage”

Indaver have no objection to the Meath County Manger's suggestion that 10% of original contribution be levied to facilitate the Duleek bypass and be apportioned similarly as their previous contribution.

Section 2 of **Appendix 8** in further addressing this query also notes that there has been a general reduction in traffic volumes recorded passing through Duleek in the last number of years, (confirmed by the traffic surveys) that show a decrease of about 8% between May 2009 and December 2011, and this should off-set the very small increase in traffic movements which would result from the proposed development.

5.3

Submitted that there has not been effective compliance with the terms and conditions of the existing planning permission(s) relating to the existing Development.

Response:

Condition 9 of PL.17.219721 states” The Developer shall submit to the planning authority for written agreement details of a Traffic Management Plan which shall include the prohibition of traffic associated with the proposed facility , between its junction with the Regional Road R153 to the west and the N2 to the east”.

Enclosed please find in **Appendix 9** the Public Road Traffic Plan submitted to Meath County Council (The planning authority) and MCC Agreement with same. Also in **Appendix 9** is a copy of the written instructions given to each customer who delivers waste to the facility.

Hence Indaver feel that we have fully complied with this condition.

5.4

Implications of the proposed development for route selection planning options for the Leinster Orbital route.

Response:

See traffic assessment in Section 3 of **Appendix 8 (and associated route maps)** which concludes the increase in traffic associated with the proposed development on the R152 is estimated at no more than 1%, which is considered negligible in terms of the implications of the route selection of the Leinster Orbital Route.

6 On site infrastructure

6.1

Contention that existing and planned on-site infrastructure would be inadequate having regard to the need for such as additional inspection and holding areas and facilities associated with the new waste streams proposed

Response:

Indaver offer Total Waste Management packages to large industrial customers across Ireland. Each site has a specific project team of dedicated, highly trained members led by a TWM Contract Manager. These teams have an in-depth knowledge of the waste generated on their site. The source of the proposed new waste streams will be mainly from TWM sites (which vary due to contracts expiring, tenders etc) and there are currently 50 Indaver people on these sites that know the waste processes that give rise to the waste.

In addition to on-site TWM site employees, Indaver's highly skilled Technical Team of 10 people characterise and classify the waste in conjunction with information provided by the knowledge of our own people on site.

Indaver do not intend to accept any waste streams that would require any staging, storage, repackaging or pre-treatment on site at the Meath facility. We already have a licensed Hazardous Waste Transfer Station in Dublin Port (30 km from the Meath site) where these types of activities are already carried out prior to sending waste overseas for treatment. There is a highly equipped laboratory at the Dublin Port site for sampling and analysis of waste streams as required.

Waste analysis and classification will be screened by the staff at Meath plant to assess the waste streams suitability for treatment and will decide whether to accept or reject the material for treatment prior to the material ever coming to site.