

# Memorandum

**To:** Board  
**CC:** Tom O'Connor, Planning Officer  
**From:** Des Johnson, Deputy Planning Officer  
**Date:** 4<sup>th</sup> June 2004  
**Re:** PL 16.207212 Corrib Gas

---

The principal differences between the current proposal and that refused by the Board under Reference PL 16.126173 include the following:

## ***Peat Management***

- the removal of 450,000 m<sup>3</sup> from the site to a repository 11 km away
- the associated increase in traffic generated on the public roads.

## ***Elevation***

Change in footprint elevation to 33.4m AOD Malin from 32m AOD.

## ***Terminal Footprint***

Reduction in area from 15ha. to 13ha.

## ***Plant and Site Changes***

- provision of 4,935 m<sup>2</sup> of buildings, up from 4,385 m<sup>2</sup>
- flare stack (highest feature at 40m) to be founded at 35.08m AOD
- warehouse, maintenance and administration buildings to be founded at 34.1m AOD
- increased capacity of each generator set from 1MW to 1.3MW
- horizontal heating medium heater to be used
- relocation of tanker loading station

- road widening at entrance
- landscape changes

A lengthy Oral Hearing was held in relation to the previous appeal and many issues, relevant to the current proposal, were discussed in detail. The Board's Direction dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 2003, addresses some of the major issues raised.

I understand that the removal of peat from the site to a repository (similar to the current proposal) was contained as an option in the previous proposal but was not pushed as a solution by the developers. The development, which is the subject of the planning authority's decision currently under appeal, would include improvements to the road infrastructure.

The grounds of appeal in the current case are numerous and wide - ranging. I have compiled a list of some of these following a review of the appeal submissions (see Appendix A).

There are **material changes in circumstances** since the previous Board decision as follows:

- the Mayo County Development Plan 2003 - 2009 has been adopted
- the legislative background has changed under the Planning & Development Act, 2000 and the Board must now consider all environmental factors, subject to the provisions of section 34(2)(c) of the Act.

I also note the Board Direction in relation to the previous case (Reference: PL 16.126073) and, in particular, the following statement - "*finally, the Board noted that alternatives are available for the development of the Corrib Gas Field*"

There are multiple 3<sup>rd</sup> Party appeals and a 1<sup>st</sup> Party appeal in this case. A number of appellants have requested an Oral Hearing.

### Recommendation

On balance, having regard to the following:

- the nature and scale of the proposal
- the nature and range of issues raised in the grounds of appeal (both 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Party)
- the material changes to the current proposal compared with the previous, and the significant new issues which these raise
- the material change of circumstances since the previous Board decision
- the terms of the Board Direction relating to PL 16.126073

I recommend that an Oral Hearing be held in this case.

  
Jto.  
A.H. June 2004.

June 4, 2004

## Appendix A

The grounds of appeal include submissions relating to the following issues:

- the viability of removing, transferring and depositing 450,000m<sup>3</sup> of peat
- environmental, residential and traffic implications relating to the above
- health and safety considerations
- adequacy of the EIS
- adequacy of Traffic Management Plan
- potential for serious environmental pollution and impact on designated habitats
- potential for bog slides
- visual impact
- sustainability
- impacts from environmental emissions
- devaluation of property
- project splitting
- impacts from boring and blasting
- adequacy of the consideration of alternatives
- request to omit, modify and/or clarify the terms of 12 conditions attaching to the planning authority's decision

It should be noted that this list is not intended as a complete list of the issues raised in the grounds of appeal.

 4/6/04.

June 4, 2004

For inspection purposes only.  
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.