SUB 16

Environmental Protection Agency
13 OCT 2005

RE: Application for Waste Licence Ref: 212/1

I, JAMES ROCHE

Of 16 CULRUA, BROWN ST., PORTLAW, CO. WATERFORD

Wish for the following observations to be lodged with the EPA in relation to the waste licence application of the proposed development at Killowen, Portlaw, Co. Waterford

1) The developers, AES, have failed to supply an adequate Environmental Impact statement (EIS) despite being asked for further information by the EPA and a revision of their EIS by Waterford County Council.
A waste licence was applied for on 11th Nov 2004 but on 1.March 2005 they were issued with a notice requiring further information to **be** supplied by 26.April 05. As no information was received a reminder was issued on 12. May 05. Further info. Was finally received into the €PA on 29.July 05.
Under the current guidelines, the EPA may void the application in an incidence where further information has not been received within a required timeframe as appears to be the case with this application.
A licence to discharge trade effluents (ref WPW 03/2004) exists in the name of Bedminster international (Ireland) ltd to discharge waste, none has been isued to the AES element of the business. In the interests of clarity the official applicant company should be referenced on all permits and documentation.

2) There was no public participation sought at any stage when attempting to prepare or revise the EIS by not doing **so,** this planning application is out of compliance with the Environmental Impact Assesment directive 85/337/EEC as amended by Directive 97/11IEC.

3) The information submitted is not in compliance with many aspects of the national and regional directives including: the Joint Waste Management Plan for the South East **(JWPMSE),** South-East waste management plan, Waterford Sludge Management Plan, Animal by-prducts (APB) regulations 1774/2002 and with the prohibition of swill order **(SI** 597 of 2000)

4) The communtiy has serious concerns about the ability of this proposal to operate in an effectlve and environmentally safe way. In regard to the liquid waste project we are concerned about the importation of waste from outside the southeast region and the release of treated, or partially treated wastewater into the Suir. This will put further burden on the river.

5) Until the establishment **of** Michell Leather Ltd. this area of the river Suir was literally alive with an abundance of fish, otter and numerous protected flora and fauna now, however, according to the Department of the Environment, heritage and Local Government the river *"has a quality rating ("Q rating") of 3 this is not considered satisfactory for a salmonoid river.....Obviously any further loading on these waters would therefor not be acceptable.....The source of at least some at least, could be from outside the catchment of the river Suir. There is risk therefor that the operation of the treatment plant caoud therefor add to the pollution loading on the river Suir"*
The Southern Regional Fisheries Board has also objected to the proposed develoment.

6) Despite AES insisting that the Bedminster technology has been *"tried and tested"* the fact remains that this technology has serious failings. The Bedminster facility in Cairns, Australia had to close within 3 months of opening to rectify problems encountered mainly due to odours, rusting componentry and lack of quality final compost. The closure lasted 10 months. This is not the only Bedminster facility to experience set-up problems: Numerous facilities **In** America have experienced similar problems, Cobb County in Georgia is the most worrying: during start-up phase odour complaints were lodged with authorities on a daily basis and in that same year the facility burned down – *twice!* The Cobb County authorities took over the running **of** the facility but have recently announced their intent to close the plant, as it is not economically viable. Fire also devistated facilities in Pennington County and Truman, Minnesota and many other facilities using bedminster tecnology have been subject to ongoing odour complaints and difficulties finding markets for the finished compost.

Signed: James Roche

...TAE PHORT LÁIRGE
WATERFORD COUNTY COUNCIL

...nshaoil & Seirbhísí Éigeandála,
...rtha,
...ohán,
...ort Láirge.
...el.: 058-22057
Fax: 058-45606
E-mail: planninginfo@waterfordcoco.ie

My Reference
Mo Thag:

Your Reference
Do Thag:

Date
Data

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, 2001 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF SUBMISSION OR OBSERVATION ON A PLANNING APPLICATION.

THIS IS AN IMPORTANT DOCUMENT!

KEEP THIS DOCUMENT SAFELY. YOU WILL BE REQUIRED TO PRODUCE THIS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO AN BORD PLEANALA IF YOU WISH TO APPEAL THE DECISION OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITY.

WATERFORD COUNTY COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER 04/1831.

A submission / observation in writing has been received from James Roche, 16 Culrua, Brown Street, Portlaw, Co. Waterford on the 23/08/2005 in relation to the above planning application.

The appropriate fee of € 20 has been paid. (not applicable to prescribed bodies)

The submission / observation is in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Planning & Development Regulations, 2001 and will be taken into account by the planning authority in its determination of the planning application.

E Kiely
p.p. Director of Services

Date: 25/08/2005