

25/6/12

**COMHAIRLE CHONTAE MHAIGH EO**

**MAYO COUNTY COUNCIL**

**ENVIRONMENT SECTION**

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Planning Section.

**From:** Mr. L. Walsh, Senior Executive Scientist, Environment Section.

**Date:** 25<sup>th</sup> June 2012

**Re: 11/753– John Sheridan, Levally, Ballinrobe.**

I refer to the above planning application and the associated Environmental Impact Statement. The application is for the following development:

TO EXPAND THE EXISTING PIG FARM, EXTENSION TO FARROWING HOUSE, FATTENING HOUSE, NEW FARROWING HOUSE, NEW DRY SOW HOUSES, NEW WEANER HOUSE, FATTENING HOUSE, MANURE COLLECTION TANK, ADDITIONAL FEED BINS, DEMOLITION OF WEANER HOUSES 5 & 6 AND 2 MANURE TANKS, BIOGAS PLANT, 2 GEOMEMBRANE LINED MANURE STORAGE BASINS, 1 FIBRE STORE, 3 FEED TANKS, RECEPTION BUILDING, BAYS, PLANT BUILDING, PASTORISATION TANKS, WEIGHBRIDGE, AND ASSOCIATED SITE WORKS TO PRODUCE RENEWABLE ENERGY AND FERTILIZER.

The applicant has stated in the application that the pig unit proposed will be an 850 sow integrated unit. An integrated pig unit is a piggery where the pigs are bred and are reared to slaughter.

Installations for intensive rearing of pigs which have more than 2000 places for production pigs (over 30 kgs) in a finishing unit, more than 400 places for sows in a breeding unit or more than 200 places for sows in an integrated unit require an E.I.A. and the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement as part of a planning application. The applicant has submitted an EIS.

I have examined the further information that was submitted and I recommend that the following clarification information is requested:

1. The 'Table of Contents' of the EIS that was submitted contains errors and is not representative of the actual contents of the EIS. Section 3 and Section 6 of the 'Table of Contents' requires corrections in particular. There are also errors throughout the EIS in relation to the referencing of the Appendices and Attachments. There is poor editing and poor cross referencing throughout the EIS which results in a disjointed document. The applicant should be requested to re-examine the EIS and provide Mayo County Council with corrected copies of the EIS with a cover note to list where the corrections were included.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

2. The EIS states that the piggery was granted planning permission for a 200 sow integrated unit at the site in 1987, please provide the details and the planning reference number for this planning application.

**The response stated that the planning application number was P99/2416 however this planning application reference number is for the construction of a dwelling house. The further information response is not satisfactory therefore please request the applicant to provide the further information as requested.**

3. Please provide a copy of the agreement to allow the storm water pipe through the adjoining property to the OPW land drainage watercourse as the agreement was not attached in the EIS.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

4. The 'Landspreading Areas' section of the EIS refers to Ballinrobe Biogas Ltd and Sheridan Pig Farm as separate entities, please explain the relationship between Sheridan Pig Farm and the limited company Ballinrobe Biogas Ltd. Please provide the details of Ballinrobe Biogas Ltd, ownership, Directors, etc. and clarify whether the Company owns the land where the biogas plant is proposed.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

5. The Manure Spreading section of the EIS outlines that it is planned to import 11,500 tonnes of organic material per annum to mix with the pig manure, please provide details of the proposed sources of this material and, in particular, outline the quantity and source that is available locally.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

6. The Nutrient Management Plan, Attachment Form 11(B) includes a letter from Mr. Michael Sweeney, NRGE. Please clarify the purpose and contents of the letter and please also clarify the reference in the letter to the fact that Mr. John Sheridan's Pig Farm is an '*IPPC Licensed facility*' as this is not the case in our understanding. Please submit a revised letter.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

7. The Surface Water section of the EIS refers to a baseline study of the site however the data submitted is from samples taken in 2002 and the samples are therefore not representative of current baseline conditions. Please arrange for further sampling and to submit the results of the analysis, with a map of the sample locations, and an interpretation of the analytical data.

**Surface water quality sampling results for two samples taken on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2012 were submitted however the further information response is not satisfactory as the map of the sample locations and the interpretation of the analytical data that was requested was not submitted. Please request the applicant to provide the further information as requested.**

8. Drawing Number 1 refers to the re-routing of a watercourse by approximately 10 meters, please provide details of this aspect of the proposal and outline the method to be used and the mitigation measures to protect water quality and the environment.

**Please request clarification and proposals from the applicant with regard to placement of temporary bales of straw at a number of locations along the length of proposed diverted watercourse and also the main water course to allow for the sedimentation of suspended solids?**

9. Please submit details of the landscaping plan for the overall site, in particular the screening plans for the 14m digester tank.

**Planning Section to examine this response.**

10. Please provide details and locations of similar anaerobic digester plants using pig slurry and organic material within Ireland and Europe.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

11. Please provide technical details of the construction method and the technical details of the proposed geomembrane to be used for the lined storage basins.

**It is stated in the further information response that the depth of the pit for the lined storage basins depends upon the groundwater level and that the groundwater level is high and therefore it is proposed to excavate the central area of the proposed site to approximately 2.0m deep. Please clarify this information by providing the details of the site investigations to determine the groundwater level, bedrock depth and subsoil type at the proposed locations for the lined storage basins. The site investigations should also take into account the ground below the proposed lined storage basins where the leak detection perforated pipe work is proposed to be located to ensure that it is above the groundwater table.**

**A specialist lining contractor should be consulted in accordance with DAFM Minimum Specification for Geomembrane Lined Slurry/Effluent Stores and Ancillary Works (S126).**

12. Please provide technical details and the proposed layout of the leak detection pipe work system.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

13. Please provide summary details of the process control system, in particular, the reporting and alarm systems relevant to environmental monitoring and control.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

14. Please provide the details and a summary of the responses received from the various organizations and bodies listed in the EIS that were consulted.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

15. The EIS section on 'Pig Manure' refers to a NMP 2010 report which contains confidential information and that it is attached in a folder clearly marked 'CONFIDENTIAL'. Please clarify this section of the EIS as the folder or report was not submitted as part of the application.

**It should be noted that the applicant did not respond to this request for Further Information. Please request that the further information is submitted.**

16. The Waste Management Plan does not cover waste management generated during the construction and the associated demolition of buildings and the existing manure tanks. Please provide a waste management plan for the construction phase of the development.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

17. The Waste Management Plan contains copies of Contracts and Collector Agreements that appear to be out of date. Please provide up to date copies of Contracts and Agreements with Permitted Contractors and provide Permit Numbers.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

18. Please provide clear details of the phasing of the construction of the proposed development and, in particular, clarify whether the existing pig farm will continue to operate during the proposed construction. Clarify at what stage the demolition of the existing manure tanks will take place and the arrangements for waste that will be in place to cater for the operation of the pig farm.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

19. Please clarify the relevance of the final paragraph in Section 5.3.6 Flora and Fauna to the subsection.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

20. Please provide technical details of the proposed CHP plant and the estimated emissions from the plant under normal operation. Provide details also of the proposed acoustic enclosure for the CHP.

**The response to the Further Information request is satisfactory.**

21. Please clarify why Appendix 6 was entitled 'Appropriate Assessment Screening' and outline if it was determined that an Appropriate Assessment screening was necessary for the project.

***The response to the further information received stated that the 'screening was done to eliminate/to assess the need for and in this case eliminate an Appropriate Assessment from the consideration of the project.'***

**It is considered that the information provided with regard to the 'Appropriate Assessment Screening' is therefore not satisfactory as AA Screening.**

**Please clarify whether a qualified ecological specialist, with the assistance of a hydrogeologist where necessary, determined under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive whether Appropriate Assessment was necessary with regard to the proposed site and also the proposed spread land areas as they are an important part of the proposed development. It is noted that there are SAC's/SPA's in the area of the proposed site and also, in particular, in close proximity to the proposed spread lands.**

**The Appropriate Assessment Screening as a minimum should involve the following process:**

- **Description of the project and local site area characteristics (including spread lands).**
- **Identification of relevant Natura 2000 Sites and compilation of their qualifying interests and conservation objectives.**
- **Assessment of the likely effects - direct, indirect or cumulative – undertaken on the basis of available information as a desk study or field survey or primary research as necessary.**
- **Screening Statement with Conclusions.**

*L. Walsh.*

L. Walsh.

Senior Executive Scientist.

25<sup>th</sup> June 2012