ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

2 5 FEB 2011

## I wish to object to a your proposal to grant an IPPC Licence to Cooksgrove Ltd t/a Euro Farm Foods.

The reasons for my objection arise from my concerns about groundwater and surface water pollution from the spreading of waste effluent from the abattoir on lands designated for that purpose. I have particular concerns about a need to protect the Hurley River and its environs.

An abattoir is not just a business activity with economic effects. It also is an activity that generates much waste at a point source with potential for serious immediate and long-term effects on the environment. Maintenance (or restoration) of water quality and conservation of biodiversity are my objective concerns. I must ask the question: which is the most important, the economic benefit or the adverse environmental consequences? The magnitude of the problem may be gauged from the number of temporary storage units available to Euro Farm Foods for containment of effluent during the season when spreading on land is forbidden. The storage places are in a number of counties.

The addition of waste from outside sources to the tanks at the cattle sheds at Rathfeigh is forbidden and this regulation needs closer monitoring. No satisfactory explanation has been given for the frequent visits (as many as 8 per day) of a laden tanker to the cattle sheds. Instead, Mr Fox asks — under threat of court action - what proof does the Rathfeigh Historical Society have that transfer of waste from abattoir to his cattle sheds has taken place. The local authority was informed about such tanker movements and should have an answer.

That authority witnessed evidence of spread of forbidden waste close to the Reilly residence.

The actual number of cattle slaughtered at the abattoir is not clear. This lack of clarity arises from written statements emanating from Mr Fox and which are a cause of confusion. The RME Nutrient Management plan 2009 provides a table setting out the number of animals slaughtered for a number of years, including the number 75,000 for 2008. Rathfeigh Historical Society used that figure from that source. Mr Fox finds that this figure of 75,000 is "totally inaccurate" and a "false allegation". Yet, the Introduction to your determination also uses this figure – 300 per diem may be extrapolated to 75,000 per annum. The conflict in the evidence begs the question about motivation behind the phrases "totally inaccurate" and a "false allegation" used against a society with a published record of interest in and conservation of the heritage and the natural environment of the area. I, and the Society which I helped to found 25 years ago, has no reason to be malicious towards a neighbour but we do have good reason to be concerned about our environment.

I could expand my reasoned and reasonable comments on these and other related matters here, and I am prepared to do so if requested.

Les (marc Date: 24/02/11

I enclose my cheque for €126.

Signed: Leo Curran

[Address: "Cúilín", Macetown, Tara, Co. Meath]

----Original Message----

From: info@epa.ie [mailto:info@epa.ie]

Sent: 25 February 2011 15:12 To: Wexford Receptionist

Subject: Online message or query from the site

EPA recently received a message via our online contact form at http://www.epa.ie/about/contact/

The message is reproduced below.

MESSAGE or QUERY.

Please note an Erratum in my objection to Cooksgrove t/a Euro farm Foods:the 4th line in the 3rd paragraph should read "Mr Fox asks - under his threat of court action - ..."

Please accept my apologies for any confusion caused. Leo Curran, Tara, Co. Meath

OPTIONAL] EMAIL ADDRESS.