

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF LANDFILL FACILITY AT GORTADROMA, CO. LIMERICK

- Community Impact Assessment -

December 2003

Prepared By:
Patricia Calleary
Chartered Engineer & Town Planner

Josephine Henry Planning Consultant

For:

RPS-MCOS Ltd.

Patricia Calleary Chartered Engineer & Town Planner
Bachelors Walk, Ballina, Co. Mayo.
Tel: (096)21154; Fax (096)72919; Email: calleary@iol.ie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1 | IN | TRODUCTION | 4 |
|---|-----|---|----|
| | 1.1 | General | 4 |
| | 1.2 | Background | 4 |
| | 1.3 | Planning History of Site: | 4 |
| 2 | M | ETHODOLOGY | 5 |
| | 2.1 | General | 5 |
| 3 | EX | XISTING ENVIRONMENT | 5 |
| | 3.1 | Description | 5 |
| 4 | LI | EGISLATIVE CONTEXT AND POLICES | 6 |
| | 4.1 | Primary Legislation | |
| | 4.2 | National Waste Policy | 6 |
| 5 | SE | ETTLEMENT IMPACTS/DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY | 9 |
| | 5.1 | Description | 9 |
| | 5.2 | Methodology and Documentation Used for the Demographic Study | |
| | 5.3 | Existing Population Structure and Trends. | |
| | 5.4 | Regional Population Structure and Trends - Mid West Region | 10 |
| | 5.5 | County Population Structure and Trends - Limerick City and County | |
| | 5.6 | Rathkeale Rural Area Population Structure and Trends. | 11 |
| | 5.7 | DEDs within 10km of Gortadroma. | 12 |
| | 5.8 | Dunmoylan East and Dunmoylan West Population Structure and Trends Community Services | 13 |
| | 5.9 | Community Services | 16 |
| 6 | P | OTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT | 17 |
| | 6.1 | Population Impacts | 17 |
| | 6.2 | Population Impacts | 18 |
| | 6.3 | Impact on Local Companity Services: | |
| 7 | M | IITIGATION AND RESIDUAL IMPACTS | 18 |
| | 7.1 | Mitigation Measures | 18 |
| | 7.2 | Mitigation Measures During Construction Phase of Development | |
| | 7.3 | Mitigation Measures on Site Restoration: | |
| | 7.4 | Residual Impacts | 19 |
| 8 | S | OCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS: | 19 |
| | 8.1 | Primary Socio – Economic Effects. | 19 |
| | 8.2 | Secondary Socio-Economic Effects: | |
| 9 | P | UBLIC CONSULTATION | |
| | 9.1 | Introduction | |
| | 9.2 | Methodology of Consultation Process: | 20 |
| 1 | 0 | DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN COMPLIING THIS REPORT | 22 |
| 1 | 1 | CONCLUSIONS | 22 |

APPENDIX 1:

REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF GORTADROMA LANDFILL

APPENDIX 2:

REPORT OF THE QUESTIONAIRE SURVEY ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF GORTADROMA LANDFILL

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General.

This report has been undertaken for RPS-MCOS Ltd., Dunlaoghaire, Co. Dublin. RPS-MCOS have been requested to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (E.I.S.) for the proposed Gortadroma Landfill Extension. This report is concerned with the community impact aspects of the proposed development.

The object of the report was to prepare an assessment of the likely significant impacts from the proposed landfill extension on:

- Social, recreational and community facilities in the study area
- Population structure of the area
- General economic interactions/infrastructure within the community including any
 potential to stimulate additional developments, changes in employment, landuse,
 economic activity and population.

1.2 Background.

Limerick, Clare and Kerry County Councils together with Limerick City Council adopted the Limerick/Clare/Kerry Waste Management Plan in September 2001.

The Plan is based on an integrated and regionalised approach to the management of waste in this region. It recommends improved public information and education as well as recycling facilities, biological and thermal treatment of waste with the aim of minimising the amount of waste which is disposed in landfill.

The Regional Waste Management Plan follows the objectives as set out in the Government Publication "Waste Management – Changing our Ways" (1998) which encourages waste minimisation, recycling and waste diversion from landfill. It is recognised that notwithstanding changed practices in dealing with waste, landfills will continue to be a necessary component in the management of waste.

1.3 Planning History of Site:

Landfill operations commenced in Gortadroma in 1990. Prior to that time, the site existed as a worked out sand and gravel pit. In 1994, an improvement plan was prepared by RPS-MCOS for the landfill. In November 1999, the EPA issued a Waste Licence (17-1) for the landfill which included stringent conditions for the continued life of the landfill. In 1994, the annual waste intake to the landfill was approximately 20,000 tonnes from the

West of Co. Limerick. In 2001, this had grown to 132,677.69 tonnes from all of Limerick City and County.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 General

The methods that were used to examine the community impacts were as follows:

- a. Desk research was used which included the examining of the census data for the area. Background research of available documents was also undertaken.
- b. Site visits to the existing facility at Gortadroma were carried out as well as visits to the surrounding areas and villages.
- c. A visit to Limerick Co. Council Planning Section revealed the planning and development policies and zoning policies as outlined in the Limerick Development Plan. The policies of the Limerick/Clare/Kerry/Waste Management Plan were also researched and considered.
- d. A community consultation took place on 20th, 21th of August and 5th of September 2003. The methodology used in the community consultation was that of individual and group meetings. A description of the consultation is given in the appendix of this report.
- e. A questionnaire was prepared and given to the local residents in order to survey the perception and concerns regarding the proposed extension.

3 EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Description

Gortadroma Landfill is located 12 km north of Newcastle West and 9 km south of Foynes. The proposed site is located in a gently sloping area and is predominately in agricultural use, mainly small to medium size dairy and beef enterprises. It covers an area of approximately 41 hectares. The soils are generally poor draining, with growths of rushes noted throughout the pasturelands. A small section of land towards the south east of the landfill is being developed with forestry. The area itself forms part of the upper catchment of the White River. The proposed site of the landfill is currently located between contour lines of 110m and 120m above sea level.

The area, which surrounds the landfill is that of a basin peat soil at the lower contours with improved conditions as the ground rises.

Residential development consists primarily of medium size single storey dwellings which are scattered sparsely throughout the area. A number of small village clusters provide the community services in the area. There are no significant industrial or commercial developments in the immediate vicinity.

4 LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT AND POLICIES

4.1 Primary Legislation.

The primary legislation is the following:

- 1. The Waste Management Act, 1996 as amended by the Waste Management (Amendment) Act, 2001 and the Protection of the Environment Act, 2003.
- Council Directive 1999/31/EC on the Landfill of Waste (Landfill Directive). The main implications of this Directive relate to the siteing of landfills and the diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill.

4.2 National Waste Policy

4.2.1 'Changing our Ways (1998)

The aim of the National Waste Policy is to reduce dependence on sending waste to landfill. It recognises that landfills will continue to exist and makes recommendations in relation to future waste disposal. Some elements of the policy documents are relevant to the Gortadroma facility, including the following:

Section 4.1 Targets

Section 5.5 Short Term Flexibility

Section 6.2.4 Charging for waste services

Section 9.2 Public support and participation

4.2.2 Waste Policy for the Limerick Region:

The Waste Plan for the region recommends that the two Local Authority sites at Gortadroma (Limerick Co. Council) and North Kerry (Kerry Co. Council) will continue in the short term as well as the development of a Landfill in Inagh (Clare Co. Council). The landfill at Doora closed at the end of June 2001 as ordered by the EPA.

4.2.3 Limerick Co. Development Plan 1999: (Waste Management)

The proposed site is located within the administrative area of Limerick County Council, and the statutory development plan for the area is the Limerick County Development Plan, 1999.

Section 10.3 deals with the Policy of Waste Management, setting out the policy of the Council in relation to the use and operation of landfill as follows:

- To provide and maintain adequate landfill sites for the disposal of waste at suitable locations in the county while at the same time minimising the number of such sites to provide economies of scale.
- Operate its landfill sites to the highest standards and to ensure that all waste is disposed of in conformity with National and European Regulatory Standards.
 Section 10:4 outlines Objectives in the field of Waste Management of the County.
- To continue to provide civic amenity centres and recycling centres throughout the county.
- Provide a new waste disposal site located in the east of the County.
- To upgrade the waste disposal site at Gortadroma to operate to the highest possible environmental standards.
- To provide transfer facilities at strategic locations throughout the County.
- Monitor flows and water quality of the watercourses in the county and to protect these resources and other water channels from adverse developments/impacts.

4.2.4 Land- Use Zoning.

The site at Gortadroma is unzoned in the 1999 Limerick County Development Plan. There are no specific policies and objectives relating to unzoned lands in the Plan. In effect, the land is considered to be in agricultural use. Applications for development on these lands will be assessed on their individual merits having regard to the Development Plan policies and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. None of the lands in the Gortadroma area are designated Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), National Heritage Area (NHA) or Special Protection Area (SPA). The nearest NHA is 5km south of Gortadroma along the banks of the River Daar. The Shannon Estuary, which is 8 km to the north east of the site, is listed as an SPA.

4.2.5 Development Plan - Settlement Policy

Existing planning policies in the Limerick Development Plan will be the main determinant for settlement patterns in the area.

Section 2.11 of the Development Plan deals with the issue of settlement policy It is the policy of the Planning Authority to be active in promoting alternatives to residential development in the countryside. In doing this it will promote the expansion of towns and villages (Section 2.11.1)

The Plan identifies that some parts of rural County Limerick are under extreme pressure for residential development while others are finding it difficult to maintain their indigenous population. The former "pressure area" is essentially the rural hinterland of Limerick City, where a strict policy is to be imposed while the latter "non-pressure" area is the remainder of the county where single house developments will normally be permitted subject to normal site assessment criteria (Sections 2.11.2, 2.11.3).

The site is located within the "non-pressure area". The area in which the site is located is not subject to any specific amenity designations. There are no significant settlements within the immediate vicinity of the landfill.

4.2.6 Development Plan – Policy on Industry and Employment

Section 3.9 of the Development Plan deals with policies on industry and employment. It is a policy of the Planning Authority to encourage large industrial developments to locate in industrially zoned or designated sites. It is a policy to give favourable consideration to suitable industrial developments in towns and villages.

The policies relevant to the Gortadroma area include the following:

- 1. Adopt a flexible approach in permitting systainable developments such as rural enterprise, forestry and tourism in marginalised areas experiencing population loss and rural decline
- 2. Allow proposals for agricultural diversification (particularly if they involve the use of derelict farm and other buildings).
- Permit small-scale home enterprises/cottage industries provided there is no significant loss of amenity in terms of traffic generation, residential amenity, noise levels and visual amenity.
- 4. Generally allow rural based industrial developments in the countryside, which do not create undue demands on resources for the provision of infrastructure and do not have serious environmental impacts.

4.2.7 Road Objectives:

Access to the site will continue to be via N21 National Primary Route, N69 Secondary Route and County Roads.

Details of traffic required to serve the extension are dealt with in the traffic report.

4.2.8 Social & Economic Description of the Site and Environs:

The area in the immediate vicinity of Gortadroma has dairy and beef farming as its main enterprises. The area is characterised by poorly drained soils with extensive occurrence

of rushes throughout the land. A small section of land towards the South East of the landfill is being developed with forestry. The economic value of the lands in the area would be considered low.

There are no hospitals, nursing homes, schools or other sensitive receptors located within 1 km of the landfill site. The principal receptors are the private residences and residential farms in the study area. The site of the proposed landfill extension adjoins the existing landfill operations. The only significant effect of the development on the existing land use will be where the new landfill cells are created. The value of the land in terms of alternative land uses is limited.

5 SETTLEMENT IMPACTS/DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY.

5.1 Description

The Gortadroma Landfill is located within the Rathkeale Rural District and adjacent to the Dunmoylan East and Dunmoylan West Rural Districts. It is these areas, which would be most directly affected by the proposed landfill extension so this socio-economic assessment shall concentrate on this area. The population trends within the local area and comparison with the region as a whole and with other similar rural areas are analysed.

The pattern of residential development in the local area generally is very sparse. The proposed extension is bounded by the existing roads to the north and south. To the west are the existing landfill Cells 1-13. There is a cluster of houses to the North West of the site.

An assessment of the likely significant impacts, both positive and negative, direct and indirect from the existence and operation of the proposed scheme on the population structure are considered.

5.2 Methodology and Documentation Used for the Demographic Study.

The primary methodology was desktop research and statistical analysis. Land use analysis was also undertaken.

Documentation analysed include the following:

1. Ordnance Survey, Discovery Series Map 64 1:50,000

- 2. Headline Statistics (2002) per County and District Electoral Division {DED}, (CSO).
- 3. Regional Statistics 2002
- 4. Small Area Population Statistics (SAPS) for 2002,1996, 1991, 1986, 1981 (CSO).
- 5. School Enrolment Figures for Kilcolman National School (Department Of Education, Statistics Section)

5.3 Existing Population Structure and Trends.

This is addressed by:

- Regional population, Midwest region
- County population, -Limerick City and County
- District population -Rathkeale rural area
- District Population within 10KM of Gortadroma Landfill
- DED population of Dunmoylan East and Dunmoylan West.
- School Enrolment for Kilcoman National School

5.4 Regional Population Structure and Trends - Mid West Region.

| | | OIL CL. or. | <u> </u> | |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|---|
| Population | Population | Actual Increase in | Percentage | |
| 1996 | 2002 | Population | Increase | 1 |
| | | . as Per Carley | Decrease | |
| 317,069 | 339,930 | d 22,861 | +11.6 | |

Source CSO 1996 and 2002

The Mid West has shown a significant percentage increase in population of 11.6%. This is slightly below the national average of 12.9%. The Mid West's population has not increased to the same extent as the Mid East's at 28.6% or the Midlands at 15%.

5.5 County Population Structure and Trends - Limerick City and County

| Population | Population | Actual Increase in | Percentage | |
|------------|------------|--------------------|------------|---|
| 1996 | 2002 | Population | Increase | 1 |
| | | | Decrease | |
| 165,042 | 175,529 | 10,487 | + 6.4% | |

Source CSO 1996 And 2002.

Limerick City and County Population as a percentage of the Mid West Regional Population.

| 1996 | 2002 |
|------|-------|
| 52% | 51.6% |

Source CSO 1996 And 2002.

Limerick City and County make up a significant percentage of the population of the Mid West at 51.6%. It has increased by 6.4% since 1996.

5.6 Rathkeale Rural Area Population Structure and Trends.

| Population | Population | Male | Female | Actual | % Change |
|------------|------------|-------|--------|----------|-------------|
| 1996 | 2002 | 2002 | 2002 | Increase | 1996 - 2002 |
| 13,495 | 13,733 | 6,996 | 6,737 | 238 | +1.8% |

Source CSO 1996 And 2002.

Rathkeale rural area population as a percentage of imerick City and County.

| 1996 | 2062, 20 |
|------|----------|
| 8.2% | 7.8% |

Source CSO 1996 And 2003.

Rathkeale Rural Area (in which the proposed development is sited) has experienced a slight increase in population over the six year period.

Rathkeale Rural Area contains 7.8% of the population of Limerick City. This is considerably less than the City District and Limerick District Rural 1 area (i.e the area adjacent to Limerick city but within the county boundary rather than the city), each of which contains 30% of the population of the county.

5.7 DEDs within 10km of Gortadroma

| | | Census of Population | | | | | e change |
|--------------|-------|----------------------|------------|-----------|--------|--------------|----------|
| DED: | 1981 | 1986 | 1991 | 1996 | 2002 | 1996 to | 1981 to |
| | | | | | | 2002 | 2002 |
| Ardagh | 863 | 882 | 896 | 923 | 942 | 2.1 | 9.1 |
| Glensharrold | 516 | 498 | 480 | 428 | 446 | 4.2 | -13.6 |
| Rooskagh | 335 | 323 | 316 | 303 | 286 | <i>-</i> 5.6 | -14.6 |
| Craggs | 252 | 251 | 245 | 231 | 267 | 15.6 | 5.9 |
| Dunmoylan | 506 | 489 | 475 | 432 | 442 | 2.3 | -12.6 |
| East | ļ | | | | | | |
| Dunmoylan | 121 | 117 | 125 | 106 | 94 | -11.3 | -22.3 |
| West | | | | | | | |
| Kilshannell | 476 | 450 | 435 | 433 | 70 466 | 7.6 | -2.1 |
| Lismakeery | 416 | 430 | 422 | 418 | 403 | -3.6 | -3.1 |
| Loghill | 773 | 820 | 702 | Tedit 150 | 674 | -3.7 | -12.8 |
| Mohernagh | 143 | 148 | 152 | Tedit 150 | 128 | -14.7 | -10.5 |
| Shanagolden | 1,302 | 1,270 | 12010 | 1,087 | 981 | -9.8 | -24.6 |
| Shanid | 529 | 531 | FO 371 516 | 486 | 456 | -6.2 | -13.8 |

Source: Central Statistics Office.

The DEDs within 10 km of Gortadroma show a pattern of population decline. This pattern can be seen since 1981 in most cases. This pattern is linked to many factors, some of which follow national patterns, others which like all local areas have local influences.

The main factors which effect population patterns include settlement pattern, local, employment opportunities, land use in the area, age profile and fertility rates and migration in and out of the area.

At a national level population decline or slow growth in some areas occurred in the census period 1981 –1996 mainly due to economic factors. Population at a national level increased from 1996 to 2002. This growth was not spread evenly within the country. The Eastern region and those areas in proximity to towns grew faster than rural areas. The

area within 10 km of Gortadroma is a rural area and local factors which have affected the local areas population are employment, settlement patterns and land use.

Dunmoylan East and Dunmoylan West Population Structure and Trends.

5.8.1 **Dunmoylan East Population Structure.**

| Population | Population | Male | Female | Actual | % Change |
|------------|------------|------|--------|----------|-------------|
| 1996 | 2002 | 2002 | 2002 | Increase | 1996 - 2002 |
| 432 | 442 | 233 | 208 | 9 | +2.1% |

Dunmoylan East DED Population 2002

As a percentage of Rathkeale Rural District Population.

3.2%

Dunmoylan East Population 2002

as a percentage of Limerick City and County Borough.

0.25%

| as a percentage of Limerick City and County Borougn. 0.25% | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------|------------------|------------|-------------|--|--|
| 5.8.2 Dunmoylan West Population Structure and Trends | | | | | | | |
| Population | Population | Male | Females | Actual | % Change | | |
| 1996 | 2002 | 2002 | 200\$i | Increase | 1996 - 2002 | | |
| 106 | 94 | 51 | ³⁰ 43 | -12 people | -11.3% | | |

Dunmoylan West Population

as a percentage of Rathkeale rural district 2002.

0.68%

Dunmoylan West Population

as a percentage of Limerick City and County 2002.

0.05%

Comparative analysis of Dunmoylan east and Dunmoylan west D.E.D.

Dunmoylan East has shown a slight population increase of 9 persons or + 2.1% in its population over the 6 yr. period. Dunmoylan West has shown a decrease of 12 persons or -11.3% of the population. This is a significant population decrease in an existing small population base. Both DEDs are characterised by a rural dispersed settlement pattern without close proximity to major settlements. The predominant land use is agricultural with some forestry. On this basis any population growth is unlikely to be urban generated but rather is a function of the local rural economy (i.e that including people who work locally rather than commuting to large urban settlements).

5.8.4 School enrolment in Kilcolman National School.

The number of pupils attending the local Kilcoman school are listed below.

| Year: | | Number of Pupils |
|-------|--------------|---|
| 2003 | | 56 |
| 2002 | | 40 |
| 2001 | | 47 |
| 2000 | | 51 |
| 1999 | | 53 |
| 1998 | | 61 |
| 1997 | | 69 |
| 1996 | | 71 |
| 1995 | | 77 |
| 1994 | | 86 |
| 1993 | | 83 _{I,IS} C. |
| 1992 | | 80 all other |
| 1991 | | 84 5 60 |
| 1990 | skon. | 86 83 80 84es after any other tase. 87 85 |
| 1989 | a inspectour | 87 |
| 1988 | of copyring | 85 |

Source: Department of Education and Science and Principal Kilcolman National School.

5.8.5 Number of Junior infants who receive bus passes to Kilcoman school on the Gortadroma route

| 1972 | 4 |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1973 | 5 |
| 1974 | 2 |
| 1975 | 5 |
| 1976 | 8 |
| 1977 | 2 |
| 1978 | 9 |
| 1979 | 2 |
| 1980 | 3 |
| 1981 | 10 |
| 1982 | 10 6 7 3 Secretary any and the secretary and |
| 1983 | 7 aly any or |
| 1984 | 3 challed |
| 1985 | 2 cult |
| 1986 getter | 3 |
| 1985 1986 1987 1989 1990 1991 | 7 |
| 1989 | 3 |
| 1990 Consett | 4 |
| | |
| 1992 | 1 |
| 1993 | 3 |
| 1994 | 5 |
| 1995 | 3 |
| 1996 | 2 |
| 1997 | 4 |
| 1998 | 2 |
| 1999 | 2 |
| 2000 | 0 |
| 2001 | 0 |
| 2002 | 0 |
| | |

Source Principal Kilcolman National School

These figures show a clear pattern of population decline in the school going age cohort. This is linked to the overall pattern of population decline in the surrounding DEDs. This may be due to many factors.

Fertility rates in the national population have fallen sharply over the past 15 years. In 1986 the national fertility rate was 3.2. In 1996 the national fertility rate has fallen to 2.6. In the 2002 census the fertility rate had fallen to 1.6. This has caused the number of primary school children nationally to drop. Therefore the number of children per family is lower than that of 15 – 20 years ago. To maintain a similar number of pupils at 1991 levels at current fertility rates, there would need to be approximately double the number of family units than exists at present. There is, however, a noted increase in school going children in this current area and indications are that these higher numbers will be maintained over the next few years.

5.9 Community Services

Gortadroma is located in the parish of Kilcolman. The Local Church, St. Colmans church is located in the village of Kilcoman as is the local 3 teacher National School. A local bus collects the school going children surrounding Gortadroma. This service requires seven children to permit its continuation. The school is considered as an intrinsic component of the social infrastructure of the area and it is felt that every effort should be made to maintain its current three teacher status.

Other local community services include a Post Office with shop in Kilcoman village. The majority of secondary school children in the area attend at Askeaton school and are transported there and back by a private bus service. There is also a secondary technical/vocational school in Shanagolden where some children attend. Coolcappagh village has a local community centre which serves the people in the vicinity of Gortadroma. Coolcappagh also has a church and shop in the village. Shanagolden has a supermarket which serves the wider area to include Gortadroma. Other shopping areas include Newcastle and Askeaton. Socialising is mainly held in Newcastle West, Askeaton and Foynes. Villages serving the 5km radius of the study area include: Ballyhahill, Kilcolman, Shanagolden and Carrigkerry.

6 POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

6.1 Population Impacts

6.1.1 Regional Level

There are no likely effects on the population structure or trends in the Mid Western Region due to the proposed development.

6.1.2 County Level

There are no likely effects on the population structure or trends in the Limerick City and County Borough due to this proposed development.

6.1.3 District Level

There are no likely effects on population structure or trends in the Rathkeale Rural District due to this proposed development.

6.1.4 Local Level

There are no significant settlements within the vicinity of the Landfill and therefore, the proposed extension to the Gortadroma Landfill will have no likely effects on the local settlement pattern.

However, there is some potential for moderate to significant impact. This is most likely to occur in close proximity to the proposed development i.e. within 1000 metres. The area surrounding the landfill has a low density of population. Small shifts in population in such areas have a greater significance than in more densely populated areas. Outside of this zone there is likely to no effect on population structures or trends. Potential residents may consider new settlement or the purchase of existing houses within 1000 metres of the proposed landfill undesirable due to a perceived degradation of the environment. These potential adverse impacts of the landfill extension site on the community relate to traffic, potential water contamination, emission of odours, litter and environmental nuisance such as birds, flies and rodents. The occupants of nearby dwelling houses are particularly sensitive to these nuisances. There are specialist technical reports dealing with these issues and nuisances in detail in other parts of this EIS. Furthermore, a human health study was prepared for the EIS which concluded that "data from the existing landfill demonstrates that no effects on air quality and surface quality could be found" and that "it is anticipated that the mitigation measures will maintain this situation for the extension".

The agricultural report considers potential impacts of loss of land and severance of farms with the landfill. Furthermore, it also deals with problems which may arise due to factors of contaminated water supplies, noise, windblown litter and debris, birds and vermin (including pests and insects) These problems have been addressed in the agricultural report as have mitigation measures which recommends solutions.

The Traffic Report presents the increase in traffic due to the landfill extension. It shows an increase in the range of 1% to 17%. It concludes that the road network has acceptable capacity limits and that the additional traffic movements will not be noticeable as the landfill is currently operational.

6.2 Do-Nothing Impact:

The Gortadroma Landfill site currently serves an area with a population of almost 175,529 people and has a disposal limit of 130,000 tonnes per annum. If the proposed development were not to proceed, the remaining void space will be exhausted by May 2005. An alternative landfill site to serve the catchments areas of the Gortadroma site would need to be found and developed. This would likely be an additional greenfield site which would raise concerns about sustainability and go against National Government Policy.

6.3 Impact on Local Community Services:

The proposed extension to the landfill facility at Gortadroma is predicted to have no significant impact on the community services in the area. The businesses/shops will not see any negative impact on their services.

7 MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL IMPACTS

7.1 Mitigation Measures

It is considered that the proposed development will have a moderate to significant impact on the population structure and trends at a local level within 1000m of the site. No mitigation measures are proposed. Mitigation measures however relating to nuisances are set out in other chapters. It is felt that the only effect of the development is the change of use of the extension site from low-grade agricultural land to landfill operations.

There are a number of existing houses in the vicinity of the existing landfill extension. The additional impact of the extension to the landfill site is considered to be of moderate

to significant levels of impact to these houses depending on the management of the landfill. Mitigation measures will take the form of responsible landfill management. Daily covering of waste and good compaction practice will reduce odours. Nuisance such as birds, flies and rodents can also be minimised by compaction and covering of the landfill site as well as pest control and bird management. Netting around the landfill area will act to reduce litter and so will the continuation of the litter collection programme. Environmental monitoring of the landfill site will be carried out in accordance with the license issued by the EPA. A consultation programme whereby the community can liase with the landfill management team, which currently exists will be continued.

7.2 Mitigation Measures During Construction Phase of Development.

It is considered that there will be negligible impact on the population structure and trends during the construction phase. As such, no mitigation measures are proposed beyond those advised in the technical reports.

7.3 Mitigation Measures on Site Restoration:

During site restoration, sub-soils and top-soils removed during the development phase may be replaced over the completed landfill area it suitable. The area will be graded and potentially returned to agricultural use. Therefore the loss of agricultural land in the long term is not considered to be significant.

7.4 Residual Impacts

Once the mitigation measures are put in place and good site management procedures are adopted, no significant residual impacts on the population in the immediate vicinity of the site are predicted. Reinstatement measures including rehabilitation/landscaping measures are proposed as part of this development, which will blend in with the surrounding agricultural land.

8 SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS:

8.1 Primary Socio – Economic Effects.

It is expected that during the construction phase of the proposed landfill extension employment opportunities will be presented for the local labour force. Furthermore, a knock on effect to local services within the community is envisaged.

8.2 Secondary Socio-Economic Effects:

The additional demand on electricity, telecommunications and water usage is considered minimal having regard to the existing operations.

9 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

9.1 Introduction

Consultation is a vital part of any EIA process. This process was conducted in relation to the Gortadroma extension to ensure that the views of various stakeholders, the community and individuals are taken into account in the decision making process.

A community consultation on the proposed extension to Gortadroma Landfill took place in Ballyhahill Hall on August 20th and 21st, 2003 and again on Sept 5th 2003. This was carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency's "Guidelines for the production of Environmental Impact Assessments".

9.2 Methodology of Consultation Process:

On June 21st 2003, the scoping document for the project was given to the elected representatives prior to a Council meeting. On June 26th, the scoping document was also presented to the Gortadroma Joint Monitoring Committee, which is made up of council officials and representatives of the local residents. Meetings are chaired by a local Councillor. Details of the proposed consultation were given at these meetings and advertised in the local papers two weeks prior to the date of the consultation meetings. hot line was set up by Limerick County Council for people to allow for consultation bookings.

The team for the first consultation was made up of the community impact assessment consultants, Patricia Calleary and Josephine Henry, staff from RPS MCOS. These included, Conrad Wilson who is assessing the Agricultural Impact and co-ordinating the EIS and Eleanor Boland and Larry O'Toole who attended to provide information on design and technical aspects. Professor Dieter Schrenk (from Germany) attended at the August consultation to provide information on potential health impacts. The consultation where also attended by two members of Limerick County Council staff.

The consultation in August had three sessions each day. In addition to advertising the sessions in local newspapers, letters regarding the consultation were hand-delivered by staff from Limerick Co. Council to residents in the proximity of the landfill. Details of the consultation were also given to the Parish Priests of Kilcolman, Shanagolden, Ardagh and Ballyhahill for distribution. Details of the consultation were also provided to the Gortadroma Action Group.

At each session, maps and plans for the existing landfill indicating the extent of the proposed extension and new buffer zone were provided. The location of all houses within 1000m of the proposed extension and its tenure type were included on these maps. Other plans which were provided included technical plans detailing the proposed design of the extension.

A meeting was held with the elected representatives on Wednesday 20th August to ascertain their views. Following this meeting, individual focus consultations took place on Wednesday evening, Thursday morning and Thursday afternoon.

A further consultation meeting which included members of the Gortadroma Action Group and the general public took place on Thursday night, 21st August. This was chaired by the community impact consultant and 28 people attended.

At the request of the Action Group and mainly to accommodate others who were unable to attend the first session, a second public consultation session was held in Ballyhahill Community Hall on Friday 5th September at 7.30 p.m. The session was attended by Mr. Tom Tarpey, Senior Engineer, Environmental Section with Limerick Co. Council, Conrad Wilson and Eleanor Boland from RPS-MCOS Ltd. and Patricia Calleary, Planning Consultant who chaired the Public Consultation. A full account of the public consultation including issues raised is presented in Appendix 1.

A questionnaire was prepared to assist in ascertaining opinions on the existing landfill and the proposed extension. One questionnaire with a stamped addressed envelope was provided to each individual who attended the consultation session to allow a further response. Questionnaires were also hand delivered to most of the resident's homes within 2kms radius of the landfill site. A covering letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaires and a stamped addressed envelope, addressed to the community impact consultant was included. The results of the questionnaires and analysis are presented in Appendix 2.

10 DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN COMPILING THIS REPORT

The difficulties encountered include mainly the following:

CSO publication schedule on the population classed by occupation due on December 2003. Due to the timing of EIS we will not be able to use these figures. However the current results are considered more than adequate and should be considered an appropriate analysis.

11 CONCLUSIONS

The site is conveniently located adjacent to an existing landfill operation. It is relatively remote from existing residential nuclei. There is convincing evidence to indicate that the proposed extension would pose no significant adverse impacts to the neighbouring community in terms of social, recreation and community facilities in the area. There are some potential significant impacts on the population structure within 1000m of the extension of the landfill. There is no predicated significant or other impacts on the population structure outside of this zone. There is no predicated impact on the general economic interactions/infrastructure within the community.

APPENDIX 1:

REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF GORTADROMA LANDFILL

Prepared by: Patricia Calleary BE MEngSc MSc (Planning) & Josephine Henry B.AgSc MSc(Planning)

1.1 Introduction

A community consultation on the proposed extension to Gortadroma Landfill took place in Ballyhahill Hall on August 20th and 21st, 2003 and again on Sept 5th 2003. This was carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency's "Guidelines for the production of Environmental Impact Assessments".

1.2 Methodology

Initial Scoping

The scoping document for the proposal was given to the elected representatives prior to a Council meeting on June 21st 2003. The scoping document was also presented to the Gortadroma Joint Monitoring Committee, which is made up of area councillors and local residents on the 26th of June 2003. Details of the proposed consultation were given at these meetings.

Notification of Meetings

The team for the first consultation was made up of the Community Impact Assessment consultants, Patricia Calleary and Josephine Henry. Staff from M.C. O'Sullivan charged with the co-ordination of the EIS attended including Conrad Wilson who is assessing the Agricultural Impact and co-ordinating the EIS. Eleanor Boland and Larry O'Toole attended to provide information on design and technical aspects. Professor Dieter Shrenk (from Germany) attended at the August consultation to provide information on potential health impacts.

A hot line was set up by Limerick County Council for people to book in. The consultation had three sessions each day: 10am-1pm; 2pm-5pm; and 6pm-9pm. Letters regarding

the consultation were hand delivered by staff from Limerick County Council. Details of the consultation were given to the parish priests of Kilcolman and Shanagolden for distribution. Details of the consultation were provided to the Gortadroma Action Group.

Material Provided at Meetings

Maps and plans for the existing landfill, the extent of the proposed extension and new buffer zone were provided. Included on these plans were the location of all houses within 1,100m of the proposed extension and its tenure type. Other plans provided, included technical plans detailing a proposed design of the extension.

Attendance at Meetings

A meeting was held with the elected representatives on Wednesday morning, 20th August, to ascertain their views. A copy of these minutes is on file. Individual focus consultations took place on Wednesday evening (6 attendees), Thursday morning (8 attendees) and afternoon (individual consultation with principal of local school followed by consultation with 4 people attending). A consultation meeting which included member of the Gortadroma Action Group took place on Thursday night, 21st August. This was chaired by the community impact consultant and was attended by 28 people.

2.0 Public Consultation

2.1 Wednesday 20th August 2003.

Six people attended this consultation session. Two individuals raised concerns about the associated actions at the Crowley and Keane Quarry, approximately 4 miles from Gortadroma Landfill. Their main concerns were: dust, the condition of local roads and truck movements.

Four local people living within 400 meters of the proposed extension also attended on Wednesday evening.

They identified a range of issues of concern to them. They can be divided into construction phase and operational phase:

Construction Phase:

The issues identified during this phase were:

- Health and Safety, i.e. the potential for accidents during this phase was felt to be greater
- Hours of construction. Standard hours were requested so as to control the noise during the construction stage.
- Mud and Dirt.
- Increase in traffic movements with increased vibration, damage to road surface and potential road traffic accidents.

Operational Phase:

Issues identified as concerns during the operational phase are presented below.

Noise

This was felt to be most likely to cause problems during the construction phase, but the ongoing noise was felt to be "not rural".

Odour

Odours from the landfill were problematic. Some improvement had occurred with the installation of the burners, but on frosty mornings and during the recent warm weather in August, both gas and foul odours were felt to be a problem.

Bird and vermin control

The existing bird control method was felt to be insufficient. It was also felt to occur too early in the morning (6.30am). The vermin control also needed to be more frequent.

Fly spraying

During hot weather in the summer, the fly numbers increased. Fly spraying at the landfill had improved the situation from what it had been but concerns still existed.

Traffic

The potential for accidents was felt to be high. To date there has been no accidents in proximity to the landfill. The school bus picks up and drops each child at his/her own

home. This was commended by all. It was stated that children were not permitted to walk on the road until the landfill closed each evening. The speed limit on this section of road has been recently reduced to 40 miles an hour

Litter

There was an improvement in the level of litter on surrounding lands. Previously this had been a major issue. It was stated that it was important to make sure that all lorries had netting over them entering and exiting the landfill.

Landscaping

The existing landscaping around the landfill was felt to be insufficient. Mature trees on the proposed buffer zone were requested. The trees planted recently are too small and do not hide the landfill sufficiently.

Drainage of the soil & water quality

The soil on the proposed extension was said to be of poor quality. Concerns were raised regarding surface water drainage. Existing water quality was also queried. It was noted that Limerick County Council had recently undertaken water quality monitoring in local wells and that information would be passed on to the local community.

Value of homes

The existing landfill reduced the value of people's homes. Any extension of the landfill would continue this trend.

Loss of School population.

It was believed that the reduction in the value of houses, combined with nuisances from the landfill, created a loss of local population resulting in a knock on reduction in children for Kilcolman Primary School.

2.2 Thursday 21st August 2003 (morning session)

Eight people attended this consultation session. The issues raised included the following:

Odours/Smell

Same issues as previous consultees. Frosty mornings were considered particularly bad.

Water quality

Concern was expressed regarding the protection of the water quality in the White River and the local wells.

Traffic

Similar to previous consultees. Concern was expressed over the difficulty in moving cattle across roads from one field to another.

Devaluation of Property

The landfill and the proposed extension removed the market in the sale of sites for one-off housing.

Viability of agricultural holdings

Should land be compulsorily acquired for the extension, concern was expressed over the viability of the remainder of the land holding to provide an economic return.

Timing of the Compulsory Purchase Order

Concern was expressed over the distress a potential CPO could have on an older person. It was felt that clear information, given well in advance would assist this situation.

2.3 Thursday 21st August 2003 (afternoon session)

Individual consultation took place with the local school Principal and issues raised are described below.

School Population Concerns

Population decline in Kilcolman Primary School:- Kilcolman Primary School was amalgamated with Moneymohill Primary School in 1974. 35 pupils came from Moneymohill to Kilcolman School. Children come to Kilcolman School either by walking (i.e. they live in proximity to Kilcolman village), or they take the school bus, which requires 7 pupils to operate. This bus serves the Gortadroma area. Kilcolman School

has currently got a concessionary teaching post, but there is concern that this will be lost if the school population declines further (i.e. below 50 pupils). The school has no special designation currently. The school population has declined since the 1980's. The location of the landfill has reduced the number of potential houses being built in the Gortadroma area. The school is looking for a letter from the Department of the Environment to the Department of Education and Science asking for a special case to be made for Kilcolman Primary School to keep the third teacher in the school.

A Meeting was also held with four local residents living within 600 metres of the proposed extension. The issues raised are described below:

Compulsory Purchase Orders

Same concerns as previous consultees.

Stress/Health issues

The proposed extension was causing a lot of stress among local people. This was on top of existing stress which people felt dealing with existing issues surrounding the landfill. Concern was expressed regarding Health stress including odours and water quality.

Noise

Same concerns as previous consultees.

<u>Flies</u>

Same issues as previous consultees. They did note the situation had improved.

Water quality

Same concerns as previous consultees.

Use of gas as potential local fuel

The consultees felt that by burning off the gases from the landfill, a supply of beneficial fuel for local homes was being wasted. If an energy conversion unit was used then some benefit could be accrued.

Recycling Service

The consultees wanted to see an improved recycling service in Limerick and quicker implementation of the regions Waste Management Plan.

School population

Same issues as previous consultees which mainly included falling numbers.

2.4 Thursday 21st August 2003 (evening session)

A meeting was held with the Gortadroma Action Group. This meeting was chaired by Patricia Calleary Planning Consultant. An introduction to the process was given by the chairperson. The issues of concern raised by the Action Group are described below:

Odours/Smells

Similar concerns to those raised by previous consultees were brought up. The issue of smells on frosty mornings were raised frequently. A member of Limerick County council pointed out that when the sludge treatment plant in Limerick was operational it would remove the requirement for the landfill to deal with it. A 28-day period of odour monitoring was recently completed and results would be available soon. Residents expressed concerns over the placement of the monitoring equipment. It was stated that the equipment was placed near a number of residences to establish the odour levels beside houses

Noise

Similar issues to those brought up by previous consultees were noted. In particular, the construction phase was felt to be problematic.

<u>Traffic</u>

The speed and level of traffic were the main concerns. It was stated that people felt unsafe on the road and that the road network was not capable of taking a high level of traffic.

Safety

Issues of safety relating to road traffic and health were raised.

Construction Phase

The Construction Phase was seen to be the most problematic phase, involving most disturbance to the local community. Times of work, noise, dust and safety were all of concern during this phase.

Bees

A large number of bees were noticed in local households, and it was felt that the landfill encouraged them.

Flies

Large numbers of flies were felt to breed due to the landfil. It was noticed that there was some improvement due to spraying, but recent wanter weather had caused an increase in their numbers.

<u>Vermin</u>

It was noticed that there was frequent vermin control applied in the area, but some people felt it was a continuing problem.

<u>Dust</u>

Levels of dust, in particular from the surrounding road network and lorries were felt to be problematic on gardens, hedges, and windows.

<u>Birds</u>

Bird control was noted to have improved. There were concerns raised over individuals finding dead birds in their fields, and this raised health concerns for some people.

Animal deaths

It was noted that there had been one or two cattle deaths in the past five years suspected to be caused from animals eating litter (e.g. plastics).

Population decline

Similar concerns were raised to that of previous consultees regarding population decline. It was felt that they landfill prevented people from purchasing sites and building houses in the locality.

School population decline

Similar concerns were raised to that of previous consultees regarding school population decline.

Property devaluation

Similar concerns were raised to that of previous consultees regarding property devaluation.

Stress/Psychological health

People stated that they suffered from high levels of stress due to issues surrounding the landfill. They wanted a detailed psychological assessment of their levels of stress. It was noted by Dr. Dieter Schrenk that this would be difficult to do as no similar studies had ever been done.

Health

Questions were raised about the safety of this technology in relation to physical health. In particular, questions regarding pregnancy were raised. Dr. Dieter Shrenk stated that all technologies have risks and if managed properly these risks can be minimized. He quoted various epidemiological studies which showed that no determinable effects on human health resulted when proper management was in operation.

Water Quality

Similar issues were raised as were raised by previous consultees. It was noted that recent monitoring had taken place and results would be made available to the Joint Monitoring Committee.

Legality of the process

Concerns were raised regarding the legality of the proposed extension. It was pointed out that Limerick County Council was following the legal process, best practice and national government policy in seeking the proposed extension.

Competency of Limerick Council in operating the landfill

It was pointed out that Limerick County Council operated under a license from the Environmental Protection Agency and was frequently monitored for their management of the landfill.

Potential for privatisation of the landfill

Questions were asked if the landfill could become privatised. Limerick County Council responded by stating that that issue had not arisen yet but they still had an obligation in law to provide sites for the management of waste.

Views

People spoke of their views being removed and the need for improved landscaping.

Lack of trust in Limerick County Council

It was stated that due to the continuing use of Gortadroma as a landfill, that trust had broken down between the local community and Limerick County Council. Gortadroma was previously a small scale landfill. Today it caters for the waste of Limerick City and County, with the extension it will cater for the waste of the city and council area for the next 15-20 years.

Length of time carrying burden for Limerick

It was felt that with the proposed extension local people would be suffering the consequences of waste disposal for Limerick City and County for 28 years. This was felt to be too long a length of time and that other areas should help carrying the burden.

2.5 Friday 5th September 2003

At the request of the Action Group and mainly to accommodate others who were unable to attend the first session, a second public consultation session was held in Ballyhahill Community Hall on Friday 5th September at 7.30 p.m.

The session was attended by Mr. Tom Tarpey, Senior Engineer and Ms Sinead Kennedy, Environmental Section; Conrad Wilson and Eleanor Boland from RPS-MCOS and Patricia Calleary, Planning Consultant who chaired the Public Consultation.

An Introduction to the process and project was given by the chairperson. Issues of concern raised by the public are described below:

Odours/Smells/Gas

Similar concerns to those raised at the first Public Consultation were raised including the odours particularly on still frosty mornings.

Sinead Kennedy (LCC) pointed out that the Figre is now operational and that the Council are working towards improving its operation. Ms.Kennedy also pointed out that monitoring over a 28 day period was complete and the results had been returned. She said that these would be made available to any one who wished to obtain a copy. Residents expressed concerns over the placement of the monitoring equipment and that Limerick County Council inferred that they (residents) would tamper with them if placed on their properties. Residents also expressed concern that the timing of the odour monitoring was wrong and that it should have been carried out when the odour levels were at peak. LCC pointed out that it is intended to reduce the problem of odour. Ms. Boland from RPS-MCOS pointed out that the nature of the material was that of degrading waste. She explained that it was possible to reduce the odour and gave a comparison with a domestic bin which, if left uncovered and full with refuse will cause odour problems. If the bin has new waste and is covered, it will not be such a problem. The Gortadroma cells will be capped as soon as they are full in an effort to minimize the odour. One resident asked if the gas currently being burnt off could in fact be put to better use. Sinead Kennedy stated that a feasibility study had been prepared and showed positive results in relation to using this gas for energy and connecting to the ESB network.

Noise

Similar issues to those brought up by previous consultees were noted.

<u>Traffic</u>

It was stated that people felt unsafe on the road and that the road network was not capable of taking a high level of traffic.

<u>Flies</u>

Large numbers of flies were stated to exist in the area. The local residents referred to being able to determine the difference between flies which originated at the landfill and those which did not as those which originated at the landfill were "dosy" and were easier to kill. One lady presented a photo of a number of flies in her kitchen window. The local residents accepted that fly spraying was an acceptable method but was nonetheless a nuisance factor.

Dust

Levels of dust, in particular from the surrounding road network and lorries were felt to be problematic on adjoining properties.

Birds

Bird control was raised as problem. The residents wanted a guarantee that the gun would not be fired before 8.00 a.m. Mon-Friday and 9.00 on Saturday.

Animal deaths

One farmer referred to health problems in his animals which he feared were related to the landfill.

Population decline

Similar concerns were raised to those of previous consultees regarding population decline. It was felt that they landfill deterred people from purchasing sites and building houses in the locality.

School population decline

Similar concerns were raised to those of previous consultees regarding school population decline. The school principal outlined the concern regarding a reduction of school numbers. She pointed out that the school had been allowed a concessionary post for 2 years. She further pointed out that the numbers would look up for a few years due to the new children in the area but that the longer term picture was not good. She was supported by the gentleman providing the school bus service. His points concurred with that of Ms. Liston (School Principal).

Property devaluation

Similar concerns were raised to that of previous consultees regarding property devaluation. Residents felt that there was potential for rural sites but nobody wanted to purchase a site near a landfill. Limerick County Council were accused of bringing in policies of depopulation by virtue of extending the landfill.

<u>Health</u>

Questions were again raised about the safety of this technology in relation to physical health.

Stress/Psychological health

The public asked if a study on mental health would be carried out. RPS-MCOS (Conrad Wilson) stated that it was not intended to carry out such a study. He explained that following consultation with Professor Dieter Schrenk (Health specialist who attended the earlier Public Consultation), it would be very difficult to carry out such a study and reach firm conclusions as it was difficult to quantify "mental health". He added that the best way to handle stress and mental health issues was to mitigate against it, e.g. odour – ensure that it will be below levels which are causing stress.

Water Quality

The issues raised were similar to those brought up by previous consultees. It was noted that recent monitoring had taken place and results were now available. The results showed that a number of wells had microbial contamination. This contamination is unlikely to be due to the landfill but was likely to have originated from difficulties with

existing septic tanks or from agricultural sources. Mr. Tarpey said that LCC had noted contamination in a groundwater borehole at the landfill which was traced back to the septic tank associated with the office on site. Effluent from this septic tank has now been directed to the treatment plant. Mr. Tarpey outlined that sludge is currently being accepted at the landfill site and is placed into the lined cells. Residents asked if he could ensure that this lining was safe and Mr. Tarpey replied that the lining was tested to the required standards to ensure leakage could not occur.

Residents asked why the quality of the wells had deteriorated so much since the much better results of 2000. Mr. Tarpey replied by pointing out the different weather patterns of this year and that of 2002 and 2001. He referred to the fact that the higher temperatures could affect the survival rates of bacteria. He also stated that an environmental engineer would examine each well and carry out a risk assessment. Questions were asked about leachate and the potential to pollute ground water through the underlying soil of cells 1-4. The presence of a bentonite wall which seals the cells and is keyed into a dense clay layer was discussed. Eleanor Boland from RPSMCOS explained the progress of technology from original dilute and disperse through to current day technology which will ensure all new cells are lined with impermeable layers. Mr. Tarpey of LCC explained that the groundwater pressure at this location was upwards, which would also discourage any seepage down through the soil. This was backed up by results of site investigation which indicated artesian pressure.

Views

People spoke of their views being removed and the need for improved landscaping.

Policies of Limerick County Council.

It was stated by the public that Mr. Tarpey (representing Limerick County Council) had recommended refusal for a windfarm due to the threat to the hen harrier and Mr. Tarpey was asked if the hen harrier existed in Gortadroma, would the extension not go ahead. (It was inferred that the hen harrier was more important to LCC than the people of Gortadroma).

A debate emerged between the residents and Limerick County Council, LCC being accused by the residents of having little regard to policies of re-cycling. LCC outlined

their and Government Policies in relation to the need for Landfill notwithstanding improvemed policies of re-cycling and inroads made in terms of waste permits for the region. Mr. Tarpey on behalf of LCC pointed out the reality of the issue of education and awareness of the public. The residents stated their disagreements, outlining that the public was ahead of LCC in terms of being educated on re-cycling but that unfortunately LCC had not delivered the facilities to do so.

Compensation:

A Representative from the IFA (A qualified environmental scientist) spoke of his feeling sorry for the people of Gortadroma due to the population decline, the dwindling of level of trust and now the expansion of the landfill at the existing site.

He outlined how he recognized that this was government policy and had to be done. He also stated that Gortadroma was being well managed. He pointed out that this was a case of the minority looking after the majority and that it has a dramatic effect on the minority and he argued that a system of compensation needed to be introduced. He pointed out that no alternatives were being considered such as re-cycling and incineration. He also stated out that the project was not being explained in language which the local people could understand. He again stressed that the people affected should be compensated.

3.0 Closing of Public Consultation.

The chairperson thanked those people for attending the Public Consultation session and for giving their views and concerns.

The chairperson closed the meeting and thanked people for attending.

Summary of issues raised during public consultation

| Principal Issues | Sub-issues | Issues addressed by the following |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Dust | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 7.1 of |
| | | current licence 17-2) |
| | · | EIS - Main report, Sections 3.2.4.6, 3.4.5.2 |
| | · | and 3.11.4.1 |
| | Health and Safety | Limerick County Council is required by law to |
| | | highlight all potential risks at the site to the |
| | | contractor. This is provided in the Preliminary |
| | | Health & Safety Plan. The contractor |
| | | responsible for the works is required to |
| Construction | | address the risks raised and monitor Health |
| Construction | | & Safety at the site during the works. |
| | Hours of | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 6.1.2 |
| | construction | of current licence 17-2) |
| | Mud and dirt | EIS - Main report, Sections 3.2.4.7, 3.4.5.2 |
| | | and 3:11.4.1 |
| | Traffic | ES - Main report, Section, 3.11.4.1 |
| | Water run-off from the construction | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 3.14 of |
| | construction & | current licence 17-2) |
| | * Office fit | EIS - Main report, Sections 3.8.5, 3.9.6.2 and |
| | | 3.11.4 |
| | Odour | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 7.2 of |
| Operational | | current licence) |
| | | EIS - Main report, Sections 2.2.6 and 3.4.5.1 |

| Principal Issues | Sub-issues | Issues addressed by the following |
|------------------|-------------------|---|
| | Noise | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 7.8 of |
| | | current licence 17-2) |
| | | EIS - Main report, Section 3.5.5 |
| | Bird and vermin | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 7.1 of |
| | | current licence 17-2) |
| | | EIS - Main Report Sections, 3.2.4.5, 3.11.4. |
| | | Tenders for a new bird control contract are |
| | | due for return to Limerick County Council in |
| | | late January, 2004. The tender documents |
| | | stipulate that the principal method of bird |
| Operational | | control is by bird of prey. Following the |
| | | meetings, current bird control personnel were |
| | | requested to refrain from firing the shotgun |
| | | prior to \$100am. |
| | Flies and fly | EPA Licence (addressed in Conditions 7.1 & |
| | spraying | 10.7 of current licence17-2). |
| | Traffic Forthelm | Recent reduction in speed limit to 40 miles |
| | of cop, | per hour. |
| | Litter Consent Or | EPA Licence (addressed in Condition 7.1 of |
| | | current licence 17-2) |
| | | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.11.4 |
| Landscaping | | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.3.5 |
| Groundwater Qual | ity | EPA Licence (addressed in Conditions 3.15 |
| | | & 8.6 of current licence 17-2) |
| | | EIS - Main Report Sections, 3.2.4.5, 3.8.5 |
| | | and 3.9.6.1 |

| Principal Issues | Sub-issues | Issues addressed by the following |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| BERTHROLD STATESTERS, E.J. | Devaluation of | There is currently no method for |
| | property | compensating for possible de-valuation of |
| | | property, however, there is a levy on gate |
| | | charges that is used for local community |
| | | projects and house holders within a 2 |
| | | kilometer radius do not pay for their refuse |
| Property | | disposal. |
| | | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.1.4.4 |
| | Viability of | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.11.4 |
| | agricultural property | |
| | Timing of CPOs | Clear information, well in advance of CPO |
| | | will be given to all concerned. |
| | Compensation | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.11.4. |
| | Physical health | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.2 |
| | Stress | The area of stress is addressed by the |
| | ූජ | implementation of measures to ensure that |
| Health | त गाउँदिय | nuisances such as odour, flies, vermin, litter |
| | for its that the fortified the second its the secon | etc. are minimised by operational practices at |
| : | sent of | the landfill. |
| | Animal health | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.11.4. |
| | Recycling services | Limerick County Council is obligated under |
| | | the Regional Waste Management Plan to |
| | | increase recycling. LCC provide a civic |
| | | amenity site at the landfill and 2 additional |
| | | Civic Amenity sites are to be operational in |
| Social and | | the county by mid 2004, in addition to the |
| Community | | existing network of bring banks. Limerick |
| | | County Council is actively enforcing the |
| | | requirement for domestic collectors to |
| | | provide a kerbside collection to customers as |
| | , | outlined in the Waste Management Plan for |
| | | the Region. |

| Principal Issues | Sub-issues | Issues addressed by the following | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Gas as a potential | EIS - Main Report Section, 2.2.12 | | | | |
| - - - - | local fuel | | | | | |
| | Population decline | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.1.4 | | | | |
| Social and | Loss of school | EIS - Main Report Section, 3.1.4 | | | | |
| Community | population | | | | | |
| Community | Length of time | Limerick Co. Co. is following government | | | | |
| | Gortadroma has | policy in extending an existing landfill. | | | | |
| | carried the burden of | EIS – Main Report , Section 1.4 | | | | |
| | landfill | | | | | |
| | Competency in | Continuous monitoring of Gortadroma | | | | |
| | operation of landfill | Landfill by the EPA. | | | | |
| | Lack of trust | There is a perception that Limerick County | | | | |
| | | Council gave a commitment to the closure of | | | | |
| | | the and fill following the filling of Cells 11-13. | | | | |
| | , is | Limerick County Council has no knowledge | | | | |
| | inspect | of any such agreement being made and are | | | | |
| | Ed Helphilan | following Government Policy in extending the | | | | |
| | entof | landfill at Gortadroma. | | | | |
| Issues regarding | Little regard to re- | Limerick County Council is obligated under | | | | |
| Limerick County | cycling policies | the Regional Waste Management Plan to | | | | |
| Council | | increase recycling. LCC provide a civic | | | | |
| | | amenity site at the landfill and 2 additional | | | | |
| | | Civic Amenity sites are to be operational in | | | | |
| | | the county by mid 2004, in addition to the | | | | |
| | | existing network of bring banks. Limerick | | | | |
| | | County Council is actively enforcing the | | | | |
| | | requirement for domestic collectors to | | | | |
| | | provide a kerbside collection to customers as | | | | |
| | | outlined in the Waste Management Plan for | | | | |
| | | the Region. | | | | |

| Principal Issues | Sub-issues | Issues addressed by the following |
|------------------|------------------|---|
| | Potential for | Limerick Co. Co. is legally obliged to provide |
| | privatization of | for waste disposal facilities for domestic |
| | landfill | waste. There are no proposals for Limerick |
| | | County Council to handover the operation of |
| loouse reserving | | the landfill to a private operator, however, if a |
| Issues regarding | | private waste contractor were to take over |
| Limerick County | | the operations at Gortadroma, EPA approval |
| Council | | would be required and the operator would be |
| | | required to operate within the licensing |
| | | requirements for the facility and in |
| | | accordance with the Regional Waste |
| | | Management Plas: |

ent F

ent F

for its pection purposes only any other

for its pection purpose only any other

for its pec

APPENDIX 2.

REPORT OF THE QUESTIONAIRE SURVEY ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF GORTADROMA LANDFILL

Prepared by: Patricia Calleary BE MEngSc MSc (Planning) & Josephine Henry B.AgSc MSc(Planning)

1.0 Survey of Public Opinion with Questionnaire.

A questionnaire was prepared seeking peoples' opinions on the existing landfill and the proposed extension. A questionnaire with a stamped addressed envelope was provided to each individual who attended the consultation session to allow a further response. These questionnaires were also hand delivered to most resident's homes within 2kms. A covering letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaires and a stamped addressed envelope, addressed to the community impact consultant was included. Additional copies were placed in two local Post Offices and at the Landfill site office. The chairperson explained the purpose of the questionnaire and asked people to take copies home with them. She further explained that copies would be delivered in the local area. Local people queried the area in which questionnaires were to be distributed, and the design of the questionnaire. The chairperson explained that the questionnaire was designed by an experienced social researcher and had been peer reviewed by two other social researchers. People at the meeting stated that they thought it was a good idea if people from the Action Group assisted in helping people fill in the questionnaires.

A copy of the questionnaire and covering letter is attached.

2.0 Results of Questionnaire.

The results of the questionnaire are presented in Table A.

3.0 Analysis of Questionnaires:

In total, approximately 120 questionnaires were made available. Questionnaires were accepted up to and including Friday 19th September. 33 No. completed questionnaires were submitted. Most of those who responded gave their names and addresses. Most were local people rather than anyone representing organizations.

Existing Operations

Responses to concerns in relation to the existing landfill operation (Q4) included loss of land, water pollution, air quality, traffic impacts, health, personal upset, devaluation of property, depopulation, nuisances of odour, flies, vermin, noise, windblown refuse. The responses did give credence to improvements on the landfill management.

Suggested Improvements

In response to views on improvements (Q.5), closure was the main answer. Other suggestions included re-location, immediate cover of waste, restrict the volume of waste and more screening of trees. Responses indicated that management of the landfill had improved.

Proposed Extension

Concerns about the proposed extension were answered in Q6. Concerns were raised in relation to Noise, Traffic including road safety, Rodents & Flies, Effect on Community, Dust, Odour, Water contamination, Health, Loss of Bird Habitat, Depopulation, Devaluation of Property, windblown rubbish, loss of agricultural land, declining school numbers, effect on environment and culture, visual impact and personal upset. The replies to this question indicated enormous opposition to the extension.

Effects of the Proposed Extension

The responses to Q7, which dealt with the effects of the Proposed extension, revealed similar responses to that of Q.6. The answers portrayed reduced quality of life, reduced population in the area, closure of local school and increase in pollution.

Information to be included in the EIS

When asked about the information which the public would like to be included in the Environmental Impact Statement (Q.8), responses included heath and environmental issues, consideration of health risks to humans and animals, reasons why West Limerick was chosen as a site, how will specific waste (e.g. batteries and aerosols) be treated and if the gas can be put to better use than simply burning it off.

Suggested License/Planning Conditions

In response to **Q.9** which related to opinions of approval conditions to be imposed should the landfill extension be approved by An Bord Pleanala, the main response was that of closure. Very few suggested conditions were identified but these few included the restriction of waste to the Limerick area only and assurance that no incineration would take place at this site. A suggestion that amenity grants be made available to allow children to join swimming and other such clubs was put forward. One respondent wished for a guarantee to be given that this would be the final extension. Conditions in relation to monitoring and responsibility were suggested.

Any Additional Comments

The final question (Q10) allowed for additional comments from the respondents. Such comments included information such as feelings of stress and worry as a result of the landfill, feelings of being ignored by Limerick Con Council and suggestion that income earned from the landfill should be put back into the local community.

Attached: Questionnaire and cover letter.

CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF GORTADROMA LANDFILL

| Coding: | Date: | Time: |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | | |
| 1) Nomes (Ontional) | | |
| 1) Name: (Optional) | | |
| 2) Address: (Optional) | | |
| 3) Organisation: (if relevant) | | |
| 4) What are your concerns | and experiences regarding t | he existing landfill? |
| | and experiences regarding to | at the |
| | Only any C | |
| | | |
| | : Of Priced | |
| 5) What changes would imp | prove the existing landfill? | |
| | For Figh | |
| | d of cu' | |
| | orove the existing landfill? | m prompt graphed data and a second specific second |
| 6) Please list your concerns | regarding the proposed exter greatest concerns, 2 your nex | |
| 1. | | |
| 2. | | |
| 3. | | |
| 4. | | |
| 5. | | |
| 6. | | |
| 7. | | |

| 8. | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 7) Please detail the | offects the extension of the landfill will have in your eninians |
| 7) Please detail the | e effects the extension of the landfill will have in your opinion: |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | on or questions do you wish to be addressed in the Environmental |
| Impact Statement | <i>(</i> |
| | alle Tre. |
| | 94. org |
| | or birding of for r |
| | tion full faire and the second |
| 9) Should this exteattached? | ension be approved what conditions would you wish to see |
| attacheu. | F COLLEGE |
| | nsert or |
| | - Cor |
| | |
| | |
| 10) Any other com | iments: |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Patricia Calleary Chartered Engineer & Town Planner

Bachelors Walk, Ballina, Co. Mayo.

Ph (096)21154 Fax: (096)72919 Email: calleary@iol.ie

Re: - Enclosed Questionnaire –
Proposed Extension of Gortadroma Landfill

Please find enclosed a questionnaire for the proposed extension of the Gortadroma landfill. The purpose of the questionnaire is to collect the views and concerns of persons who live in the proximity of the project.

This is an opportunity for populate influence the final proposal. Your views are valued and will benefit you and your community. The information provided in the questionnaire will be treated in strictest confidence.

Please kindly fill in and return the questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope provided or alternatively drop it into the Gortadroma Office in the envelope provided by Sept 8th 2003.

Thanking you for your time and views.

Patricia Calleary

21st August 2003.

| | | | | Q5 | Q6 | | Q7 | Q8 | Iqe | Q10 |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------|------------------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Q.1 | Q.2 | Q.3 | Q4 | | | Q6 | | | | |
| lame | Address | Organisation | Concerns Existing Landfill | Changes to improve | List concerns | Ranking | Effects of extension | Information required in EIS | What approval conditions | Other comments |
| lichael Downey | Briskagh, | Not Provided | None | Don't know | No concerns | 1 | None | None | None | Keep up good work |
| , | Shanagolden, | | | | | | | | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | | | | | | |
| atrick & Catherine O'Brien | | Not Provided | Need to leave our | Close landfill | Noise | 1 | Not suitable | Wet Land (site) | Do not approve | Stress & Strain |
| district de delicities de district | Ballyhahill, | | home if landfill comes | | Traffic | 2 | | Close dump | Close Dump | Enough after 12 |
| | - Danymanny | | closer | | Rodents & Flies | 3 | | | | years |
| | | | 0.0001 | | Ruin community | 4 | | | | Worry |
| | | | | | Dust | 5 | | | | Live .25 mile from |
| | | | | | Smell | 6 | | | | Dump |
| | | | + | | Contaminate water | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | Disease | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | | Birds | 9 | | | | |
| (athleen O' Brien | Newcastle West | Not Provided | Own Land for | Close dump | Leave home | 1 | Do away with | Close dump | Don't approve | Cant build house |
| AUTOGII O DIIGII | 1.40WGastie West | 1401 1001060 | Proposed Expansion | | Stress | 2 | some income | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | Community ruined |
| | | | Frohosed Exhausion. | | Income loss of land | 3 | | | | |
| | - | | | | Destroy trees | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | | Disease | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | | Water | 6 | Ø1* | | | |
| | | | | | Rodents | 7 | · IIse. | | | |
| | | | | | Birds | 8 | NOT | | | |
| | | 11.5 | | Closure | Water contamination | 1 | Traffic will increase | Close dump | Don't extend | Live 1.5 miles away |
| Michael & Mary Guiney | Finnoe, | Not Provided | Water | Ciodate | River contamination | 1/2 1/ | Increased pollution | for good | No previous planning | Bad smells |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Wet site | | Cattle will die | OKOT V | Depopulation | lor good | Not suitable | Dead birds on land |
| | Co. Limerick | | Future care | | Disgusting smell; | 00 4 | Loss of Wildlife | | NOT SUMBIC | Garbage dropped |
| | | | | | Loss of bird habitat | 5 | Loss of fish | | | to cattle troughs |
| | | | | | People must move | 6 | E033 01 11311 | | | to como mongrio |
| | | | | | Depreciation of property | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | Loss of community | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | | Wasteland | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | 01 | | | t | Risk - human disease | No outeraine | No extension - |
| Not Provided | | Not Provided | Pollution | Closure | Water politition | 1 | Increased pollution | Risk - numan disease Risk - animal ill health | No extension | Area has taken |
| | | | Taken enough to date | Find alternative site | Air Pollution | 2 | Devaluation of property | Dimmishment of | | sufficient burden to date |
| | | | | | Vermin & Flies | 3 | Increase human disease | | | |
| | | | | | Noise pollution | 4 | Increase animal disease | general environment | | Stop Nowl |
| | | | | | Traffic | 5 | Heavy Traffic | | | |
| | | | | | Devaluation of property | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | | Depopulation of area | 7 | | | | |
| | | | ļ | | Taking unequal share | 88 | | | | |
| | | | | | of landfill burden. | | | 1 | | |
| Margaret Hayes | Carnagh, | Not Provided | Smell of gas | Close it down | Uncalled for | 1 | Terrible effect on all | Close dump | Close dump | |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Flies | | Disgrace to think of | 2 | Need to leave homes | | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | Traffic | | sickening thought | 3 | Gas terrifies me | | | |
| | | | | | close to back door | 4 | I am 70 years of age | | | |
| | | | | | | | Disgrace | | | |
| Seamus O'Connor | Duncaha, | Not Provided | Concerned about | Restrict waste amount | Health | 1 | Depopulation | Health issues | Restrict waste to | Close dump ASAP |
| | Shanid, | | air quality | Close site (2-3 years) | Environment | 2 | Deterioration- air quality | Environmental Issues | Limerick area | |
| | Shanagolden | | Effect of ground water | | Loss of population | 3 | Deterioration -water quality | Definite closure date | No incineration | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | Loss of employment | 4 | Closure of School | | | |
| | CO. Limerick | | | | | | Increase in Rodents | | 1 | |
| | CO. Elmenck | <u> </u> | | | Gas & smell | 1 | Depopulation | Want closure of dump | Should not be | Affect wife's lung illnes: |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | | Not Provided | Smell | Cover with topsoil | | | | | | |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Smell Flies | Cover with topsoil Close dump | Volume of traffic | 2 | | | approved | Too close to house |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies | | | | | | approved | |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, | Not Provided | Flies Traffic volume | | Volume of traffic | | | | approved | Too close to house |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies Traffic volume Speeding | | Volume of traffic (During construction) | 2 | | | approved | Too close to house |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies Traffic volume | | Volume of traffic (During construction) Dump coming nearer | 3 | | | approved | Too close to house |
| Patsy & Mary Hayes | Carnagh, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies Traffic volume Speeding | | Volume of traffic (During construction) Dump coming nearer Health | 3 4 | | | approved | Too close to house |

| Q.1 | Q.2 | Q.3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 |
|---------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| vame | Address | Organisation | Concerns | Changes | List concerns | | Effects of extension | Information required | What approval | Other comments |
| ailie | 7.0010.55 | o (guinouton | Existing Landfill | to improve | | Ranking | Ziloolo oi oiloloit | in EIS | conditions | |
| lichael & Mary Nash | Carnagh, | Retired Farmers | Hardship on farming | Not Provided | Not Provided | | Devaluation of property | | | |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Wind blown plastic | | | | Will be nearer to home | | | |
| | | | Crows dropping objects | | | | | | | |
| | | | Foul smell | | | | | | | |
| ohn & Lile Copse | Carnagh, | Not Provided | Expansion of dump | Improved standards | Health | 1 | Neg effect on community | Measures re: | Require more info | Improvements need |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Health etc. | Take heed of complaints | Odour | 2 | People may have to leave | vermin control | | Heed of local concer |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | Destruction of community | 3 | Destruct beauty of area | odour control | | |
| | | | | | Physical appearance | 4 | Impact on health | pollution | | |
| | | | | | Depreciation of property | 5 | Depreciation of property | keep locals informed | | |
| | | | | | Pollution of noise, water | 6 | Empty homes | | | |
| | | | | | Vermin & Flies | 7 | | | | |
| armel Henry | Finnoe, | Not Provided | Increase in Vermin | Protection of water | Getting close to homes | 1 | | Why rubbish from | No extension | |
| | Ballyhahill, | | | Reduce pollution | People need to move away | 2 | | other locations | No outside rubbish | _ |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | | | | (Clare, Kerry, Lim city) | from other areas | |
| ary O'Brien | Finnoe, | Not Provided | Dreadful smell | Close it down | Contaminated water | 1 | Health issues | long term health risks | Close it | Consult people |
| <u> </u> | Ballyhahill, | | | | Overpowering smell | 2 | It is too big | | | Issue of contaminate |
| | Co. Limerick | | | ļ | Danger to wildlife | 3 | | | | water is concern |
| | | | | | Dead crows on land | 4 | .0) | | | |
| | | | | | Depopulation of area | 5 | , 3 56 | 1 | | |
| | | | <u></u> | | Devaluation of property | 6 | teet | | | + |
| . Kennelley | Duncaha, | Not Provided | Not Provided | Closure | Health hazard | 1 | O | | No extension | |
| | Shanagolden | | | | Population decline | 7730 | | | | |
| ot Provided | | Not Provided | Unacceptable smell | Closure or | Health | 01/04 | Very bad effects as per | Why West Limerick? | Extra resources needed | Close the dump! |
| | | | | part re-location | Devaluation of property | 2 | Q.6 | | e.g. grants to join | |
| | | | | | Children's lives - health | 3 | | | swimming clubs | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | | | | 1.01111111 | 5 | <u> </u> | - | for children | |
| | | | | | - XX - XX | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | | Need to move to city Lornes on quiet roads | 7 | | | | 1 |
| | | | <u> </u> | | Safety of children on roads | 8 | | | | |
| lot Provided | | Not Descrided | Innequeste questionnoire | Cover it and close | AU 455 | — <u> </u> | | | | |
| ot Provided | | Not Provided | Inaccurate questionnaire | Cover it and close | 1 CON 1 | | | | | |
| ot Provided | - | Not Provided | | | Past experience shows | 1 | <u> </u> | | | |
| ot Provided | | Not Provided | | <i>o</i> \$ | that closure required | | | | | |
| eter Nash | Carnagh, | Farming | Wind blown Plastic | | mat olocaro required | | Reduce size of landholding | Moving closer to house | | |
| etel Masii | Ballyhahill, | Canning | Willia DiOWITT leade | Colir | | | Treduce of a randroloning | THOYING GLOCAL TO THOUSE | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | | | | | | |
| tephen & Eliz. Woulfe | Finnoe, | Not Provided | Health of people | Too high | Loss of farming land | 1 | Devastating effect-people | address air and water | No wish for extension | |
| epiteri di Lilia. Prodite | Ballyhahill, | *************************************** | Troumit of Pooling | Obstructs view | Loss of farming income | 2 | Population decline | quality | Definite time scale | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | Unable to have heifers | 3 | Unsightly | | Guarantee that is | |
| | | | | | Health of community | 4 | Smells | | final extension | |
| | - | | | | Property devaluation | 5 | Rodent & fly infestation | | | |
| | | | | - | Job losses | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | | Loss of school numbers | 7 | | | | |
| ımes Brouder | Duncaha House, | Not Provided | Management has improved | New management - | Devaluation of property | 1 | | | | |
| | Shanagolden, | | | doing great job | Extension getting closer | 2 | | | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | (live within 1.5 miles) | | | | | |
| arilyn O'Connor | The Willows, | | Strong smell | Stop it | Close to home | 1 | Effect on people | Why bring outside rubbish? | Don't approve | Threat to Rare birds |
| | Moig, | | Flies attracted | Change to forestry | Smell | 2 | Disheartening | Would you like it? | | Destroy homes and |
| | Shanagolden, | | Heavy Traffic | Change to a park | Heavy traffic | 3 | Depressing | Would you put up with it? | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | Personal upset | | Eyesore | 4 | Upset | Move to remote area | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | | Environmental effects | 5 | Anger | | | |
| | | | <u></u> | | Windblown rubbish | 6 | Smells | | | |
| | | | | | Flies | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | Effect on mental health | 8 | ļ | | | |
| | 1 1 | | | | Upsetting | 9 | | 1 | | |

| | | | | Public Cor | sultation - Questionaire Sum | mary | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 2.1 | Q.2 | Q.3 | Q4 | Q5 | Q6 | Q6 | Q7 | Q8 | Q9 | Q10 |
| lame | Address | Organisation | Concerns | Changes | List concerns | | Effects of extension | Information required | What approval | Other comments |
| ianic | Address | Organisation | Existing Landfill | to improve | | Ranking | | in EIS | conditions | |
| | 14 | 11.15. 11.1 | | Landfill hill v.high | No wish for extension | 1 | Families affected | Quality of water | Monitoring of health | |
| mothy Neville | Moneymohill, | Not Provided | Health | Landin fill valigh | Loss of lands to landfill | 2 | Health risks | Air quality | Monitoring of water | |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Aged 89 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | All quality | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | Smell | | concerned re: water quality | 3 | Loss of farming land | | Boundaries defined | |
| | | | Flies | | Devaluation of property | 4 | | | Guarantee of final extension | |
| | | | | | Houses acquired by L.C.C. | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | | Loss of school numbers | 6 | | | | |
| ary & Elizabeth Moroncy | Moneymohill, | Not Provided | Smell on frosty nights | Not Provided | Health concerns | 1 1 | Incflies, rodents, birds | Health risks to public | Compensation of people | |
| | Ballyhahill, | | | . , . | Threat to wildlife | 2 | Increase in traffic | Risk to wildlife and animals | e.g. water scheme and jobs | <u> </u> |
| | Co. Limerick | | | | Threat to farmlife | 3 | Health risks | | | |
| | | | | | Water Pollution | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | | Close proximity to people | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | | Inc. flies and birds | 6 | | | | |
| ot Provided | Not Provided | Not Provided | No direct concerns | Recycling system | Health & Safety - residents | 1 | NIMBY but few options | How is waste treated | Keep public informed | Have system for |
| - | | | as live 5 miles away | | Pest Control | 2 | | e.g. aerosols & batteries | | occasional collection |
| | | | | | Road safety | 3 | | | | of electrical appliances |
| | - | | | | Road signage on routes | 4 | | | | |
| Villiam Duggan | Kerry Hill, | Not Provided | Devaluation of property | No Landfill | Devaluation of property | 1 | Devaluation of property | How will fumes be dealt with? | Don't want approval | Don't want landfill |
| illiam Duggan | | 1401 FTOVIOEG | Fumes | No Extension | Not Environmentally safe | 2 | Increase in fumes | How to control rodents? | | |
| | Shanagolden, | | | Tro Entered | Environmental hazard | 3 | Morecodents | | | |
| | Co. Limerick | | Rodents | | Infestation of rodents - land | 4 | Olfredenis | | - | |
| | | | | | | 23. 2 | * | | | |
| | | | | | Increasing fumes | | | 1 | | |
| O'Brien | Carnagh, | Not Provided | Rodents and flies | Closure | Effect of spray on health | 0,50 | Closer to homes | As previous | Do not approve | Land too wet |
| | Ballyhahill, | | Smell | Get rid of smells | Mental and Physical health | <u></u> | Effect on water | | Relocate | Landfill too close |
| | Co. Limerick | | Birds | | Rodents | 3 | | | | We have enough |
| | | | Water | | Flies | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | | Birds O o | 5 | | | | |
| • | | | | | Community Community | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | | School. | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | Loss of families | 8 | | | | |
| every Family (5) | Ballyanne, | Not Provided | Smell | More screening by trees | No end in sight | 1 | Not enough info to answer | Smell | Smell controls | Like an end date |
| , , (-/ | Shanagolden, | | | Immediate cover of waste | Greater demand of waste | 2 | | Volume of material | Monitoring | |
| | Co. Limerick | | | Vermin and bird control | Will not be capped | 3 | | Type of Material | Ground Water Testing | |
| | OO. LIMETICK | <u> </u> | | | Smell | 4 | | Economic Input | Screening | |
| | - | | | COLL | Vermin | 5 | | | Content of waste material | |
| * | | | - | | V Grinner | | | | accepted by landfill | |
| | | | | Terminate landfilling | Ignoring decisions | 1 | Effects on water | People | Not suitable site | Frustration as LCC |
| aymond Brouder | Gortadroma | Not Provided | Primitive manner | - | not to expand landfill | ' | | | | should have consulted |
| | 1 | | Poor early management | when current cells full | | | due to leachate leakage | Need chance to live in peace | should not take place | 10 yrs ago. |
| | | | | | | | Effect on house | with naighbourk dd | | |
| | | | | | Trouble and anxiety | 3 | Effect on house | with neighbourhood and | Re-locate to more app. | |
| | | | | | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area | 4 | Effect of gas | with neighbourhood and environment | Re-locate to more app. location | Being ignored - very |
| | | | | | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area | 4 5 | | | | Being ignored - very annoyed |
| | | | | | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area | 4 | Effect of gas | | | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now be |
| | | | | | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools | 4 5 | Effect of gas Worry | environment | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now be annoyed with LCC |
| Mulvihill | Gortadroma, | Not Provided | Smells (gas and rubbish) | Closing | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area | 4 5 | Effect of gas | | | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b |
| Mulvihill | Gortadroma, Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Smells (gas and rubbish) | | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell | 5 6 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden | environment | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC |
| Mulvihill | | Not Provided | | Closing | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) | 4 5 6 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life | environment | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen |
| Mulvihill | Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies Noise of trucks | Closing Screening off dump | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell | 4 5 6 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden | environment | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen |
| Mulvihill | Ballyhahill, | Not Provided | Flies | Closing Screening off dump | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Flies | 4 5 6 1 2 3 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies | environment | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now be annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick | | Flies Noise of trucks Loss of view | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Flies Noise Devaluation of property | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates | environment Close the dump | location | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, | Not Provided Not Provided | Files Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) | Closing Screening off dump | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Files Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build hornes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, | environment | Should not be approved Extension should go not | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, Ballyhahill, | | Files Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) Rodents | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Files Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) Loss of community life | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, Smells and gas | environment Close the dump | Should not be approved | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people LCC should look at other ways to deal |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, | | Files Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) Rodents Noise | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Flies Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) Loss of community life Amount of rubbish | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, Smells and gas Decaying rubbish | environment Close the dump | Should not be approved Extension should go not | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people |
| Mulvihill tephen Kennelley | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, Ballyhahill, | | Flies Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) Rodents Noise Birds | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Flies Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) Loss of community life Amount of rubbish Devaluation of homes | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, Smells and gas Decaying rubbish Spraying of flies | environment Close the dump | Should not be approved Extension should go not | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now be annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, Ballyhahill, | | Files Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) Rodents Noise | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Files Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) Loss of community life Amount of rubbish Devaluation of homes Air quality, odour, dust, noise | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 5 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, Smells and gas Decaying rubbish | environment Close the dump | Should not be approved Extension should go not | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now be annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people LCC should look at other ways to deal |
| | Ballyhahill, Co. Limerick Moneymohill, Ballyhahill, | | Flies Noise of trucks Loss of view Smells (gas and rubbish) Rodents Noise Birds | Closing Screening off dump using high wall | Trouble and anxiety Devaluation of whole area People leaving area Effect in schools Proximity (only 210m away) Smell Flies Noise Devaluation of property Health (Physical and mental) Loss of community life Amount of rubbish Devaluation of homes | 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 | Effect of gas Worry Effect on day to day life Cant use back garden Smells, noise and flies Children - wont build homes Quality of life deteriorates Life affected by noise, Smells and gas Decaying rubbish Spraying of flies | environment Close the dump | Should not be approved Extension should go not | Being ignored - very annoyed Respect efforts now b annoyed with LCC Shouldn't happen near people LCC should look at other ways to deal |