

INSPECTORS REPORT

WASTE LICENCE REGISTER NUMBER: 109-1

FACILITY: CENTRAL WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY, BALLYDUFF BEG, INAGH, COUNTY CLARE

APPLICANT: CLARE COUNTY COUNCIL

INSPECTORS RECOMMENDATION: The licence to be granted subject to conditions.

(1) Introduction

The application from Clare County Council, which was received on the 31st August 1999, is for the development of a new Central Waste Management Facility at Ballyduff Beg, Inagh, County Clare. An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted with the application. The EIS and additional information submitted complies with the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations. The proposed location is currently an existing coniferous forest approximately 1.5km to the south east of Inagh village. The entrance to the facility is located 13km from Ennis on the N85 Ennis to Ennistimon road. Realignment of the road in the vicinity of the entrance is proposed to facilitate traffic turning into the facility. The facility applied for consists of an engineered lined landfill of approximately 10ha with a void space for 1 million m³ of municipal solid waste. It also includes a civic waste facility, recovery / recycling facility and a composting area. The proposed waste intake ranges between 51,200 and 62,700 tonnes per annum. The anticipated lifespan is 20 years, which is expected to be extended if thermal treatment is introduced in the region.

The proposed facility covers a total area of 60.5ha and is located on a drumlin hill at a level between 58 and 95mOD. The trees on site are generally in the region of 7 to 10m tall. Excavation at the top of the drumlin is proposed to allow for the deposit of some 10 to 18m of waste into lined cells. The forestry is owned by the Irish Forestry Unit Trust. A 1.3ha parcel of land owned by a local farmer is to be purchased to facilitate road improvements but this land is not to be included as part of the proposed facility. Approximately 40ha of land surrounding the area to be filled (and within the site boundary) is to act as a buffer screen. This buffer zone is at least 110m wide and generally forested.

The facility lies within the catchment of the Inagh River which is approximately 800m from the site. The site is underlain by approximately 10 to 23m of gravely clay with a low permeability. The aquifer vulnerability has been classed as low to moderate. The on-site tests have classified the aquifer as poor, productive only in local zones. The surrounding land is agricultural with cattle rearing as one of the main farming activities.

The applicant has estimated that there will be approximately 230 vehicle movements to and from the site each day and has indicated that the average number of HGV vehicles per hour on the N85 will increase from 38 to 46.

There are no occupied dwellings within 250m of the area to be filled and the nearest occupied dwelling is located approximately 320m from the area to be filled (34m from the facility boundary). According to the applicant, nine dwellings lie within 250m of the facility boundary and 18 within 500m of the boundary. The location of the proposed facility was decided by Clare County Council following a site selection process details of which were submitted with the application. The Waste Management Plan for Limerick, Clare, Kerry Region envisages the development of the Central Waste Management Facility at Ballyduff Beg, Inagh.

A location plan showing the outline of the facility to which the application relates and the facility layout is provided in Appendix 1.

SITE VISITS:

DATE	PURPOSE	EPA PERSONNEL	OBSERVATIONS
24/9/99	Site Inspection	B.Wall	Site notice observed at the entrance.
8/12/99	Site Inspection	B.Wall	General walkover of the proposed facility and tour of surrounding area with Dave Timlin (Clare County Council) and Sean Lenahan (Clare County Council) .
9/8/00	Site Inspection	B.Wall, M.Keegan, T.O'Mahony and G.Carty.	General walkover of the proposed facility and tour of the surrounding area.
26/9/00	Site Inspection	B.Wall	General walkover of the proposed facility and tour of the surrounding area with local residents / Inagh Anti-Landfill Group.

(2) Facility Development

The installation of all infrastructure at the facility is controlled by *Condition 4*. The infrastructure at the landfill consists of 25 cells (80 x 50m) to be developed in 5 phases, landfill lining, leachate management systems, landfill gas management systems including a flare and two storm water settling ponds. Other site infrastructure identified on the attached proposed site layout plan includes administration and maintenance buildings, recycling and civic waste facility, composting area, construction and demolition waste storage area and chemical storage shed.

The development of the facility will require the felling of parts of the existing forestry. Two thirds of the existing forest within the site boundary will remain as a buffer zone around the facility (*Condition 4.5 and 4.16.1*). The felling of trees for cell development is planned in phases only as and when required (*Condition 4.5.2*).

The applicant has proposed realignment works to the N85 in the vicinity of the entrance. This is to accommodate the waste related traffic and improve sight lines and safety for traffic entering and emerging from the facility. The road improvement works are conditioned in the PD (*Condition 4.7*). These works must be carried out prior to any on site development works. In the longer term the applicant has indicated that the N85 between Inagh and Ennis is to be upgraded.

Liner System

Detailed drawings of the proposed lining systems were provided with the application. Excavations are planned for the development of an excavated void. The bulk of the waste is to be placed within the excavated void, with the remainder to be placed above the existing ground level and retained by embankments. All cells, the leachate lagoon and the two storm water settling ponds must be lined to meet BATNEEC standards (*Conditions 4.16 and 4.17*). The formation levels are controlled by *Condition 4.16.3*. The existing clay on site will be reworked to form the clay liner. *Condition 4.16.5* requires a leak detection test of the liner system.

Leachate Management

Leachate from the lined cells will be pumped to the leachate lagoon prior to transport to the waste water treatment plant at Ennis for treatment. A letter from Ennis UDC agreeing to accept leachate from the landfill was submitted as part of the application. The applicant has indicated that the installation of a holding tank at Ennis Waste Water Treatment Plant is required to facilitate the discharge of leachate into the plant balanced over a 24 hour period. The applicant have also indicated that the cost of this is to be financed by the landfill project. Prior to the acceptance of waste at the facility the Agency must receive confirmation from the applicant that the treatment plant at Ennis has been appropriately upgraded (*Condition 4.17.9*). *Condition 4.17.10* requires the applicant to submit an assessment of the feasibility of treating leachate on site. If the applicant proposes to discharge leachate to any nearby water- course then a review of the waste licence would be required since this issue was not covered in the application.

Condition 4.17 controls leachate management including the requirement to maintain the leachate head at less than 1m above the liner in each cell and enclosure of the leachate lagoon (an open lagoon was proposed) to minimise odour and aerosol production. The estimated quantity of leachate generated in Year 1 is 5,300m³ rising to 9,350m³ in Year 20. The applicant indicates that between 10 and 14 tanker loads of leachate will be taken off site per week (depending on the phase of filling and rainfall intensity).

Capping and Cover System

Daily covering of the waste with 150mm of cover or a suitable equivalent is required (*Condition 4.19.1 and 5.6*). The average depth of waste in cells will vary from approximately 10m to a maximum of 18m. The final capping of completed cells is as

specified in *Condition 4.19.2*. All filled cells are to be permanently capped within eighteen months of the cells being filled to the required level (*Condition 4.19.3*).

Restoration and Aftercare

The applicant has indicated that after settlement the maximum restored height of the proposed landfill will be 2.6m (97.6 metres OD) above the highest point of the existing ground profile. A visual assessment of the proposed facility was carried out as part of the EIS. The photomontages in the EIS (Volume 2, Section 9.7.1) show the predicted views of the landfill once it reaches the proposed final height (based on screening with trees at the current heights). The applicant has predicted that the landfill will cause a moderate impact on three residences to the north and north east and on the view from the crossroads at Maghera (1.75 km to the north east). The prediction for dwellings close to the facility is that visibility will be moderate to low for 10m trees and reducing to little or none when the trees reach 15m high. It is expected that in 3 years time the trees will have reached a height of 10 to 15m - and in 10 years a height of 17.5m. Therefore as development of the site progresses the screening will improve. The applicant has stated that the tallest building on site will be lower than existing tree heights.

I propose that the height of the final landfill be restricted to that proposed by the applicant (2.6m above the highest point of the existing ground level – 97.6m OD). Conditions designed to mitigate against the visual intrusion of the facility are the retention of a buffer zone of trees (*Condition 4.5.1*), screening of the fire breaks subject to a fire risk assessment (*Condition 4.6.3*), development of screening bunds (*Condition 4.6.4*) and restrictions on the design of the litter fence (*Condition 6.5.2*).

The applicant has proposed two options for restoring completed areas of the landfill. These are (1) seeding with a grass and shrub mix and (2) allowing natural re-vegetation. *Condition 8.2* specifies that a detailed landscaping programme must be put in place. In the longer term the environmental protection infrastructure (such as the landfill gas flare and leachate management system) will have to be maintained until such time as the Agency considers that the facility is not likely to cause environmental pollution. Long term environmental monitoring of surface water, groundwater, leachate and landfill gas will be required.

Nuisance Control

The nuisance controls for the proposed facility are specified mainly in *Conditions 5 and 6* of the recommended PD. These include litter fencing, litter picking, daily covering of waste, bird control measures such as netting of the waste and the use of birds of prey. Baiting for rodents and spraying for insect control is covered by *Condition 6.9*. Records will have to be maintained at the facility of the actions taken to control nuisances (*Conditions 6.3, 6.9.2 and 6.10.1*).

(3) Waste Management

Condition 5 controls waste management practices. The applicant has applied to dispose of 50,200 tonnes of waste to landfill in Year 1 of operation rising to a maximum of 58,900 tonnes in Year 9. The waste types applied for are as follows (Year 1) : household (22,900t), commercial (13,500t), sewage sludge (2,000t) and industrial non-hazardous waste (9,200t) and industrial non-hazardous sludges (2,600t).

In the recommended PD I recommend that the disposal of the 2,000 tonnes of sewage sludge is prohibited (*Condition 1.6*) in order to encourage it's recovery rather than disposal. The recommended PD (*Condition 1.4*) allows for the disposal of a maximum of 50,000 tonnes of waste per annum at the landfill. The limit of 50,000 tonnes will require the licensee to stabilise waste tonnages and address waste prevention, minimisation, recovery and recycling measures. This is generally in line with the Governments waste policy "*Changing Our Ways*" and the strategy specified in the *Waste Management Plan for Limerick, Clare and Kerry Region*.

The application referred to the conversion of the facility to accept mainly ash following the proposed installation of a regional thermal treatment plant. This will have a major impact on the operation of the facility, on the type and quantity of leachate and dust produced and on landfill gas generation, as well as on the types of mitigation required. Therefore I consider that the conversion of the facility from a solid municipal waste landfill to an ash depository will require a review of the licence and I recommend the prohibition on the acceptance of ash from thermal treatment plants (*Condition 1.6*). Additionally, the applicant has not submitted sufficient details on waste volumes, potential emissions, impacts and mitigation measures in order to demonstrate that the proposed conversion to an ash depository satisfies the requirements of section 40(4) of the Waste Management Act, 1996.

Treated non-hazardous industrial sludges can be accepted for disposal. However, the applicant is required to find ways of diverting this waste from landfill (*Condition 5.13(f)*). No hazardous waste is allowed to be accepted other than waste oils and separately collected fractions of household waste which must be separately collected and stored in a purposely designed chemical storage shed prior to disposal or recovery off-site. The applicant has stated that as a general rule they will not accept asbestos waste and therefore this waste is prohibited.

Construction and demolition waste can be recovered at the landfill for site works and daily cover. *Condition 1.5* restricts the disposal of certain wastes at the landfill where such waste can be easily recovered or recycled for example green waste, glass and metals. The operation of the Civic Waste Facility is covered by *Condition 5.17*.

The applicant is proposing to carry out open air windrow composting of green waste and source separated organic waste. The proposed composting operation is similar to that currently carried out successfully at the North Kerry Landfill. Specialist composting machinery is needed to ensure that the waste is shredded and the windrows properly turned to ensure aeration (*Condition 5.16*). The PD limits the amount of waste

composted to 2,000 tonnes per annum which is that applied for by the applicant. Standards for the finished compost are set in *Condition 5.16.8 and Schedule H*.

The operational hours in the draft PD are those applied for by the applicant (*Condition 1.7*). The hours of waste acceptance are less than the operational hours to allow for time to carry out daily operational works such as covering of the waste.

(4) Emissions to Air

Emissions to air from the facility include landfill gas, combustion products of landfill gas, dust and odours.

Landfill gas

An active landfill gas management system including an enclosed flare must be provided within six months of waste being accepted at the facility (*Condition 4.18*). Gas must be utilised for energy generation once sufficient quantities are generated (*Condition 4.18.6*).

Condition 7.1 and Schedule F.5 sets emission limits for emissions from the flare stack. Emission and trigger limits are also set for landfill gas in any enclosed buildings and areas outside of the filled cells to monitor and control any potential migration from the facility (*Condition 7.5*). Monitoring of emissions from the flare is covered by *Condition 9.1 and Schedule E.1.2*. Piezometers to allow monitoring of any potential landfill gas migration must be installed at 45m intervals around the cells. Air dispersion modelling was carried out by the applicant for both area emissions from the landfill and point emissions from the flare. The modelling predicts that off-site ground level concentrations will occur immediately to the north of the site and that these levels are predicted to be less than TA Luft Immission Standards and Danish C-Values.

Dust

Dust generation is to be controlled by maintaining an adequate road infrastructure, the use of a wheelcleaner, speed limits for vehicles using the access road and the use of a mobile water bowser and water spray. Baseline dust monitoring has been carried out around the existing site. An ELV of 350mg/m²/day is specified in *Schedule F.3* for dust monitoring locations along the facility boundary.

Odour

A number of conditions control odours from the facility and *Condition 6.2* requires the licensee to ensure that odours do not give rise to nuisance at the facility or in the immediate area of the facility. Odour modelling carried out by the applicant predicts that odours will not cause a nuisance off-site. This of course depends on the adherence to the various conditions designed to control odours especially the application of daily cover (*Conditions 5.5 and 5.6*).

(5) Emissions to Groundwater

The application indicates that the bedrock underlying the sites consists of Namurian shales and sandstone series and Millstone Grits. Boreholes drilled to the bedrock indicate that the rock consists mainly of black mudstone. The on site drilling of 13 boreholes indicates that the overburden thickness ranges from 9.7m to 23.6m. The overburden is mainly gravelly clay with a low permeability of less than 1×10^{-9} m/sec. This corresponds to moderate to low groundwater vulnerability based on the guidance in the GSI/EPA/DOE publication *Groundwater Protection Schemes*.

The groundwater flow direction is generally to the south and south-west discharging to the adjacent streams, the Inagh River and Lough Acorraun. The majority of houses in the area are connected to the group water scheme which is supplied from a source 10km to the south of the site. The applicant has indicated that as of June 2000 four houses were not connected to the group scheme – two upgradient and two downgradient. The applicant has also indicated that the owners of the two new houses downgradient of the facility plan to connect to the group scheme. The submissions received indicate that despite the existence of the group scheme several dwellings in the area still use their own well water supplies for drinking water and livestock watering. *Condition 9.3* requires monitoring of all wells 100m upgradient and 500m downgradient of the facility. Baseline monitoring has been carried out and this will allow for comparison of future monitoring results.

(6) Emissions to Surface Water

The facility lies within the catchment of the Inagh River. A number of unnamed small streams flow around the boundary of the facility and drain to the Inagh River which is approximately 800m from the site. The Inagh River is considered by the Fisheries Board to be an important salmonid river and the tributary streams are considered to be important as potential spawning sites. According to the EPA publication “*Water Quality in Ireland 1995 to 1997*” the Inagh River like many of the rivers in County Clare is throughout its 24km length classified as unpolluted (Class A).

Condition 4.20 specifies the surface water management system for the facility which includes swales, silt fences and two lined surface water retention ponds. The only emissions from the facility allowed to enter surface water will be the clean surface water discharges from two lined stormwater retention ponds (*Conditions 4.20.10 and 7.6.1*). All clean surface water at the facility being diverted to the lined ponds must be continuously monitored (*Condition 9.5 & 9.8*). The ponds must be fitted with an outlet penstock to control discharges in the event that monitoring should indicate surface water contamination (*Condition 4.20.6*).

The applicants baseline monitoring on the perimeter streams indicates that the water quality of the streams is satisfactory and unpolluted (Q value ranging from 4 to 5). Regular monitoring must be carried out on the perimeter streams, Inagh River and a nearby spring fed lake called Lough Acorraun (*Condition 9.1, 9.15 and Schedule E.5*).

(7) Noise Emissions

The background noise monitoring carried out showed that the southern part of the site is impacted by traffic noise from the N85. To the north away from road there is very low rural ambient noise levels. The applicant has predicted that noise levels at noise sensitive locations will be elevated from its very low 34 dBA to 38 / 39 dBA. Operations will be audible during background periods at noise sensitive locations and because of the existing very low ambient noise levels the compactor noise will be particularly evident at two residences. *Condition 7.4.2* requires the applicant to specify low sound level plant for use at the site. *Condition 4.6.4* requires the construction of bunds around the working area. As proposed by the applicant all heavy machinery used on site must be fitted with exhaust silencers and acoustic panels in the engine bays (*Condition 7.4.2(d)*).

(8) Other Issues

Ecology

The main habitat within the facility boundary is the existing Sitka Spruce plantation. In the absence of the proposed development the forestry would be felled once it reaches commercial maturity. The applicant has reported that Fallow Deer and Pine Martens amongst other wildlife are present. Locals have reported that Hen Harriers (Species Listed in Annex 1 of the Birds Directive 79/409/EEC) use the forestry. A survey carried out by the applicant at the request of the Agency did not find any evidence of Hen Harriers using the site for foraging or breeding. The applicant notes that in any case the existing forestry is generally no longer suitable for this species because of the height of the trees.

The survey did however find that the Long Eared Owl, a conservationally important species, is breeding in the forestry. Approximately 70% of the existing forestry is to remain intact as a buffer zone around the waste management facility ensuring that forestry habitat will remain for the local wildlife population. The recommended PD includes a number of Conditions to mitigate against any impact on local wildlife. These include the felling of trees outside the breeding season and the protection of nest sites (*Condition 4.5.2*), the management of the buffer zone as a wildlife refuge (*Condition 4.5.1*) and a mitigation plan to ensure protection of wildlife against rodenticides (*Condition 6.9.1(d)*). Ecological monitoring is required by *Condition 9.15*.

The applicant proposes to fence the entire boundary of the facility. However, the recommended PD requires the applicant to only fence around the waste infrastructure on site (*Condition 4.4.1*). This will leave an unfenced buffer zone of forestry available for wildlife access. This fencing arrangement would also be less visually intrusive. The outside boundary of the facility must be marked with markers or poles and appropriate warning notices.

Archaeology

An archaeological report was submitted as part of the application/EIS. The report identifies one archaeological site of interest within 500m of the site - a ringfort located 0.5km from the site. Archaeological excavations were carried out by the applicant to investigate reports that a children's burial ground was located in the north east of the proposed facility. These excavations showed no evidence of an archaeological nature in the area investigated. Duchas attended the excavations and have confirmed that the location examined does not constitute an antiquity.

Waste Policy and Compensation for Local Communities

The applicant has stated in their application that they intend to reserve £1 for each tonne of waste accepted at the facility for community environmental improvement projects. This is generally in line with Government Policy as published in the Waste Management Policy document "*Changing Our Ways*". Details of the funding of community environmental improvement projects must be included in the Environmental Management Programme required under *Condition 2.1.2(ii)*. As part of the Annual Environmental Report the applicant must submit a report on the amount of income generated and details of the community projects funded. The recommended PD also requires the applicant to work towards meeting the targets in the Government waste policy document on "*Changing Our Ways*" and report on progress as part of the AER.

(9) Waste Management, Air Quality and Water Quality Management Plans

The Draft Waste Management Plan for the Limerick / Clare / Kerry Region was adopted by Clare County Council with some amendments. The Plan envisages the development of a Central Waste Management Facility at Ballyduff Beg as part of the regions overall waste management plan. The plan notes that *in any interim period between the closure of Doora and the opening of Inagh (subject to licensing) residual waste from Clare can be transferred after recycling to other authorised landfills in the Region*. The information in the Waste Management Strategy for Clare County Council was also considered. No relevant air quality or water quality management plans exist.

(10) Submissions

146 valid submissions were received in relation to the facility. A list of the submissions received are given on the attached report from the Waste Licence Application Administration system. I have had regard to the submissions in making my recommendation to the Board. [Below is a summary of the main concerns raised in the submissions. The specific details in some submissions are highlighted to give an overview of the concerns raised.](#)

ALL SUBMISSIONS BY GENERAL TOPIC HEADING

1. Environmental Nuisances

Despite the measures proposed concern was expressed about flies and birds. Birds dropping rubbish, risk of farm animals eating litter, increase in rat numbers, the increased risk of weils disease and flies carrying disease were common fears expressed. Residents are concerned that crows and gulls scavenging on the dump will carry waste and deposit it on fields and drains. Concerns were expressed that due to the sites location on the highest point in the area it will be impossible to control wind blown litter. Residents note that these nuisances are virtually impossible to control. Concerns were also expressed about rubbish falling from trailers and traffic using the landfill. One submission from the Mid-Western Health Board notes that in relation to odours there are nine houses within 250m of the site boundary. They also outline the risks posed by rodents and insects if not properly controlled. Concern was also expressed that waste would be dumped at the entrance to the site.

Response

Condition 6 deals with the control of nuisances from the facility and in particular Conditions 6.1 and 6.2 requires the council to ensure that the facility is operated such that it does not give rise to nuisances. Condition 6.5 deals with litter control measures and Condition 6.10 covers bird control measures - both of these issues are of particular concern to local farmers. Rodent and insect control is covered by Condition 6.9. All vehicles using the facility must be covered (Condition 6.7). Any waste dumped at the facility other than in accordance with the licence must be removed (Condition 6.6).

2. Water Pollution

Concern was expressed that the two streams which flow around the facility would be polluted. These streams are the primary source of drinking water for livestock on farms adjoining them and well as being within a trout spawning area. Concern was expressed that a spring fed lake 500m from the boundary and the Inagh River will be polluted. Views were expressed that the site would be a threat to fisheries, wildlife, local farmers animals and the children and community who live alongside the river. The local play-school outline concerns about pollution of the local river. Concern was expressed that the unpolluted nature of the Inagh River (Q4-Q5) would be destroyed. Submitters note that the river is popular with foreign pike angler, is renowned for salmon and has an eel weir. It was also argued that the proposed landfill would threaten the estuary of the Inagh River which is an SAC. Lahinch Community Council expressed concern that the blue flag beach would be placed in jeopardy because of pollution of the Inagh River. The Ennistymon and District Development Association outline concerns that source of the Cullenagh River which flows through the town would be polluted

Concern was expressed that the site is located at an elevated position, that the rainfall is the highest in Clare and the resulting threat of pollution of surface waters. The estimates of rainfall in the application were considered to be an underestimate and the volume of run-off which will require management will be too much for any system to cope with. Concern was expressed about soil being washed into local streams. Concern was expressed that the low lying areas at the foot of the hill close to the site floods regularly after medium to heavy rain. Residents feared that this flood water would be contaminated. One submission included photographs showing the extent of flooding at the foot of the hill and the extent of mud at the site.

The question was asked whether the Ennis Sewage Treatment Plant is able to cope with the leachate from the facility, and what alternative arrangements have been put in place. The

issue of ensuring that industrial waste and sludges are properly controlled was also raised with the view to ensuring that discharges to waters are controlled.

Concerns were expressed about pollution of nearby wells and springs some of which are 180m from the site. Fears were expressed about the impact on water in these wells and its use for domestic drinking water supply and farm use. The question was asked whether landfill liners are in existence long enough to prove that there are no leaks. They state that research all over the world has shown that landfills leak and contaminate surface and ground water. One submitter points out that two houses listed as being on the group water scheme are not on it and forwarded copies of correspondence with the council. Some residents state their intention to get the water in their wells analysed and use the results as a baseline prior to any development. They state that the EPA and local authority would be responsible and negligent for any pollution. The Mid-Western Health Board submitted a list of local residents who still use wells in the area and outlines concerns about leachate pollution of groundwater and local streams. Submissions states that the council have not received permission to use the local group water scheme and if they do use it they have concerns that the pressure will be affected.

Response

The concerns about risks to groundwater and surface water from leachate are addressed by requiring the landfill to be lined to the BATNEEC standards (*Condition 4.16*). All leachate generated at the facility must be collected on site for disposal off site at Ennis Water Treatment Plant (*Condition 4.17*). In relation to the fears about contamination of drinking water supplies this is addressed in several ways including *Conditions 4.14.1, 4.16 and 4.17* and the requirement to carry out regular monitoring of private wells (*Condition 9.3*).

In relation to the concerns expressed about the contamination of surface water and the Inagh River, again this is addressed by the lining of the landfill and the collection of leachate. In addition a surface water management system has to be installed to ensure that only clean water is discharged to the perimeter streams (*Condition 4.20*). Continuous monitoring of surface water flowing to the surface water settling ponds is required and all discharges must be stopped in the event the monitoring indicates contamination (*Condition 9.5*). In relation to rain fall the applicant has indicated that the annual average rainfall at Mount Callan is 1,615mm. Because of lower rainfall the applicant has predicted that the amount of leachate generated at Ballyduff Beg will be less than that at North Kerry Landfill. The surface water management system must be designed to cope with surface water accumulating at the site (*Condition 4.20*). Both chemical and biological monitoring of the adjacent streams and the Inagh River must be carried out to determine whether the site is having any impacts on local water quality (*Conditions 9.1, 9.15 and Table E.5*).

I do not agree with the views expressed in submissions that the facility will threaten the SAC and the beach at Lehinch. These locations are remote from the facility. Under *Condition 3.3* the Shannon Fisheries Board must be notified in the event of any incident relating to discharges to surface waters. Industrial sludges are controlled under *Condition 5.8*. Under *Condition 4.17.9* the Agency must be notified when Ennis water treatment plant has been upgraded to treat the leachate, and no waste shall be disposed at the facility until such notification is received.

3. Air Pollution

Concern was expressed that the clear air in the area would be polluted and foul smelling. Residents in the path of the prevailing wind expressed concern about odour and dust. Concern was expressed that dust coming from the site would damage grasslands and meadows. Concern was expressed about the possibility of toxins and other dangerous substances in the air including asbestos. Local residents do not want to have the fresh Atlantic air taken away from them. The open air composting was also seen as threat to air quality. Concerns were also expressed about the impact of landfill gas and the mixing of this gas with the high concentrations of radon in the area. One submission notes that in Kildare local property was purchased by Kildare CC due to the excessive odours from gases from their landfill site. One submission outlines the risks from gaseous emissions from the site.

Response

Condition 6.2 requires that activities shall be carried out such that odours do not cause a nuisance or result in significant impairment of or interference with amenities or the environment beyond the boundary. Conditions 4.19.1, 5.5 and 5.6 of the PD requires that waste is covered on a daily basis. This will mitigate against the generation of odours from the deposited waste. Condition 4.18 requires an active landfill gas management system to be installed which will deal with odours associated with the generation of landfill gas. The composting facility is similar in size to that successfully carried out at the North Kerry Landfill. Controls under Condition 5.16 such as the covering of the compost windrows and the regular turning of the compost are designed to prevent odour problems. Asbestos is prohibited under Condition 1.6.

4. Noise

Local residents on the Maghera Road (to the north) express concerns that noise will be greatest to the north of the site as indicated in the application. Residents point out that during the on-site drilling and site investigations the noise could be heard in nearby houses. Because of the open hilly land they consider that noise will be horrendous. Concerns were also expressed about traffic and machinery noise. The Mid-Western Health Board recommends that the use of heavy vehicles should be controlled to prevent noise nuisances at night.

Response

No activities are to be carried out at night and the operational hours are controlled by Condition 1.7. Condition 7.4 deals with the control of noise from the facility and requires that low sound plant is specified and that the machinery used is kept maintained and fitted with acoustic panels and mufflers. A bund must be installed around the working area to minimise noise impacts (Condition 4.6.4).

5. Health Concerns

Residents voice concerns about the adverse affects of waste disposal on the health and safety of people living in close proximity. The health risks posed by rats was expressed in a number of submissions. Many submissions outlined concerns about the health of families and children in the area from aspects such as flies. Concerns were also expressed that flooded land would be a health risk due to runoff from the landfill including concerns about typhoid. Submissions also outline concerns about the disposal of asbestos waste at the site.

Submissions notes that they are extremely concerned as to the effect toxins from the proposed site would have on children's health. They note that they have seen documentation from a community in England which stated that babies, whose mothers lived close to a particular landfill site, were born with birth defects.

A resident who lives a half mile from the site outlines concern about the impact of emissions on the health of her child with Down Syndrome who suffers from breathing problems and a collapsed lung. A local resident who farms land adjacent to the site outlines concerns for his own health and states that he is allergic to dust particles. He considers that the close proximity of the site would mean that he may have no option but to sell out and live elsewhere. He considers that if his health is jeopardised his rights under the constitution will be infringed. A submission from this resident's doctor states the resident suffers from chronic allergic rhinitis and that his concerns are valid. Another local resident has written in stating that his daughter has cystic fibrosis and has concerns about the impact of air pollution on her health. He also forwarded an information sheet on the disease. The Mid-Western Health Board in their submission refer to a report on "Impact of Municipal and Industrial Non-Hazardous Waste Landfills on Public Health and the Environment. An Overview".

Response

The various conditions of this PD will require the council to operate the landfill in accordance with the BATNEEC principle. Conditions of the proposed PD requires the council to control all emissions from the landfill facility including landfill gas, leachate, dust and odours in order that these emissions will not cause environmental pollution. Ongoing monitoring of emissions is required by *Condition 9.1* and Schedule E: Monitoring. The concerns about the health risk from rats and flies is covered under *Condition 6*. Research on the health impacts of landfills is currently under way within Europe. An overview of this research was presented at an international waste management and landfill symposium and concludes that *where studies have been carried out on populations living near controlled landfills no causal links have been established and no exposure pathways identified (The Health Effects of Controlled Landfill Sites – An Overview by L. Heasman. Proceedings Sardinia 1999. Seventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium)*. The World Health Organisation in one of their publications states that *properly constructed and operated landfill sites offer a completely safe disposal route for municipal solid waste (Landfill: Local Authorities, Health and Environment briefing pamphlet series; 9, World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe, 1995)*.

6. Social and community issues

Several submissions expressed concerns that the landfill would have an effect on the local community, prevent development, prevent emigrants and young couples moving back to the area and totally change the way and quality of life. The impact of the proposed landfill on the lives of elderly residents was outlined in several submissions. Residents in their seventies and eighties are absolutely devastated with the thought of this dump. One farmer adjacent to the site writes that because of the proximity of the landfill he won't now be able to use an old farmhouse for either a holiday home or a family dwelling. Others expressed concern that if the landfill goes ahead their son and daughter in the US won't return to build homes locally.

Kilmonona Parish Council, which is situated to the east, outlines a number of concerns including environmental nuisances and health concerns. One local resident outlines how the village of Inagh has grown into a modern village since the mid 1970's because of the work of the local development committee, and that this growth was without the help of the County Council. A local County Councillor in a submission states that the local community had genuine fears about the proposal because of the operation of the dump at Doora. Another local resident submitted a poem which opposes the location of the dump. The overall feeling of residents is that families in the area want to bring up their children in a noise and

pollution free environment. They fear that their village of Inagh will be called the Inagh Dump.

Many residents expressed the view that there were too many homes and farmers in close proximity to the site. They consider that local community already has it environmental burden in the form of the high voltage electricity cables and dust from quarries along the Inagh Road. Inagh school was the first school in Munster to win the green flag environmental award. Cumann Ionana Eidhneach as a local sporting organisation feel it is unconscionable to contemplate locating such an afflicted monstrosity in the midst of our Community.

Response

The proposed site was identified after a site selection process carried out by the County Council. The proposed facility is to be a modern landfill facility and the conditions of the recommended PD requires the facility to be operated according to BATNEEC. The disruption of the local way of life and impact on the local community are real fears for local residents and the council will have to ensure that the facility is operated in such a way as to ensure that these fears are not realised. *Condition 2.1.2* requires the development of a communications programme and community liaison committee which will enable communication between representatives of the local residents and the licensee.

7. Farming Concerns

Concern was expressed by local farmers that their livelihoods are at stake and express concerns about the environment becoming polluted and thereby effecting their businesses. Many feel that farming may not be able to continue alongside the landfill. Environmental consultants hired on behalf of the Inagh Anti-Landfill Group submitted a map showing the farming activities carried out in the vicinity of the site and the location of individual farms in the area. Farming practices in the area includes traditional farming, REPS, beef fattening, pedigree cattle breeders, registered organic farms, horse breeding and dairy farming.

Concerns expressed include birds damaging silage bales, birds dropping litter, difficulties in meeting the dairy hygiene regulations, difficulties in fulfilling the condition of REP's plans and concerns about animals choking on litter, getting poisoned or dying mysteriously. One organic farmer, with fields within half a kilometre of the site, expresses concern that they may not be able to continue if the landfill goes ahead. Another local organic and REPS farmer outlines concerns about litter and his livelihood.

Farmers consider the development to be totally out of place in an agricultural area. The farmer who lives and farms beside the proposed landfill states that farming is his only means of making a living and his only way of life. Concerns are also expressed that the value of his holding and quality of life will be ruined. He states that the council intend to compulsory purchase his best field and this is a field which he needs to construct a dwelling house for one of his family.

Several farmers outline concerns about pollution of the streams used by animals for drinking. Particular concerns were raised about the impact on pure-bred and pedigree cattle since the farmers point out that these are sensitive to the slightest change in surrounding and the risks from the landfill. Concerns were also expressed about the local equine business.

Concerns were also expressed that a viable forestry is to be cut down for a landfill. Other farmers expressed concern that the traffic increase would make driving cattle along the road more hazardous. One farmer states that they will be holding the EPA responsible for any loss, damage or ill health which the dump will cause to blood stock on his farm which is situated a quarter of a mile from the proposed site. Another farmer points out that they will sue the EPA, Council and the Department of the Environment if any damage comes to his farm water supply. He notes that he now has a leading Barrister working on his behalf.

Response

Conditions 4.5 and 4.16.1 of the recommended PD requires a buffer zone to be maintained between the facility boundary and the area to be landfilled. Most of this buffer zone is already established forestry with coniferous trees between 7m and 10m tall. I consider that this buffer zone will act as an effective barrier between the landfill and the surrounding agricultural land including the nearby REPS and organic farms. Concerns about nuisances and water quality are covered in the responses to items 1 and 2 above.

8. Tourism Concerns

Several submissions note the main tourist road to North Clare and areas such as the Cliffs of Moher and the Burren passes the site. Several others consider that the proposed landfill would have a detrimental effect on local tourism. Kilnomona Parish Council express concern that the development of the walking route called the Mid Clare Way will be affected and state that the route passes within yards of the proposed site and walkers will have full view of the landfill. One submission notes that the facility will be visible from the Mid Clare Way Walking Tour and that the map supplied by the applicant is incorrect as it does not show the part of the tour close to the site called Sli na Mona. Lahinch Community Council are concerned that the dump would be located in the heart of a developing tourist area and traffic congestion on the main tourist route to West and North Clare would be unacceptable.

Response

The proposed location was chosen by Clare County Council following a site selection process carried out by the consultants Fehily Timoney & Co. The proposed facility fills a need for landfill space as identified in the Waste Management Plan. The facility will be developed as a modern landfill to cater for waste from the County Clare residents and business as well as the tourist population. I note that the map supplied does not identify the walking route but consider that the proposed facility if operated in accordance with the conditions of the licence will be well screened and not adversely impact the walkers.

9. Business and Property Value Concerns

One submission states the sale of one of his properties near the site was put on hold because of the landfill. His auctioneers letter notes that the proposed new dump seems to be having an adverse effect on the sale. Some submissions ask who is going to compensate for property devaluation. The licensed public house in Inagh expressed concern about the landfill impacting on local businesses. The owners of the Biddy Early Brewery in Inagh outlines concerns about increased level of pests, loss of pure and natural image and resulting business and financial implications, loss of employment and decline in tourism. Another submission notes that the forestry which was planted in 1984 should not be cut for another 10 years. Some residents do not want the councils compensation but would rather keep their healthy community.

Response

The facility to be developed is a modern landfill. *Condition 6* deals with nuisance control issues and it is noted that Inagh village is over 1.5km from the proposed facility. In relation to compensation, the Council have stated in the Article 14 reply of March 2000 that they will reserve £1 for each tonne of waste accepted at the facility for local environmental improvement projects. Details of these projects must be submitted to the Agency as part of the Environmental Management Programme and a report on expenditure on the selected projects submitted annually as part of the Annual Environmental Report

10. Site Selection

Concerns were expressed about the site selection procedure used and the lack of criteria for short listing landfill sites. One submission expressed concern about rumours that the EPA have been pressurised by local authorities to delay introducing regulations for site selection. A local Councillor considers that the site selection criteria are largely based on engineering and infrastructure concerns. One submission states that the consultants did not follow the site selection criteria in the Site Selection Manual with regards to the exclusion of houses within 250m of the site boundary - and not the landfill footprint boundary.

It is argued in submissions that there are far more suitable remote locations. The view is that the site in Lisseycasey is more suitable. Concern was expressed that the only reason why Ballybuff Beg was chosen was the existing forestry. They consider that if this forestry hadn't been planted 10 –14 years ago the site would not be suitable. One person expressed the opinion that there should be smaller sites at four locations separate in the county.

Fears were expressed that this site would become the main site for the west of Ireland. Local residents point out that a number of new houses have been built in the vicinity over the past two years. Concerns were expressed that Clare County Council didn't notify the local residents of the proposed landfill when they applied for planning permission to build their new houses. A local farmer states that the councils compulsory order will allow a continuation of waste management practices that do not accord with EC Directives. The practices being adopted are open to legal challenge because there is no move towards sustainable waste management and reduction of waste going to landfill without prior treatment. He also states that the compulsory purchase order should not be granted until a decision is made on the application and to do so would be both irresponsible and contrary to natural justice. The Mid-Western Health Board point out that while landfills are low on the list of preferred options there will still be a necessity to provide a landfill for waste that cannot be otherwise disposed.

Response

Details of the site selection process including copies of the consultants reports were submitted as part of the application process. The draft EPA Manual on Site Selection (2nd Draft, September 1996) was available and has been widely used during the selection process. The draft manual (page 10) specifies that “*in general a minimum distance of 250 metres should be maintained between the area to be landfilled and any occupied new dwelling at new landfills*”. In this case the nearest occupied dwelling is 320m from the area being filled. The concerns expressed about planning permission are a matter between the house/land owners and the local authority. *Condition 5.13* requires the council to examine measures to increase waste recovery and reduce the amount of waste landfilled.

11. Ecology, Flora and Fauna

Concerns are expressed about the impact the site will have on wildlife as well as the attraction of vermin. One submission noted that there are pine martens, badgers and squirrels at the site. Inagh is popular for hunting and a landfill would not be conducive to birds like pheasants, grouse and woodcock. A submission received from consultants on behalf of the Inagh Anti-Landfill Group includes an ecological assessment of the site habitats. The distinctive flora and fauna of five habitats are listed (main forest, firebreak and access roads, hedgerows, streams and surrounding fields). The consultants conclude that the site has a rich diversity. Impacts of the proposed landfill are listed. They note that the Inagh River is a proposed Special Area of Conservation, a salmonid resource and that possibly pearl mussels (which are listed in the Irish Red Book of Endangered Species) live in the river. Adverse impacts identified include the silting of the river due to construction works and damage to fish and extinction of the pearl mussel. They also state that in the operational stage leachate contamination, stormwater runoff of sediment laden and enriched water will adversely affect the local environment.

Impacts on terrestrial ecology identified by the consultants during construction and operation include removal of species during clear felling, habitat loss, traffic fatalities, disturbance, dust & litter and increased presence of scavenging birds. They state that the presence of large numbers of scavenging birds has elsewhere resulted in serious decline in certain vulnerable birds such as terns. Concerns were expressed that the long eared owl and hen harrier will be affected - in particular hen harriers because they are ground nesting. They note that the habitat is suitable for harriers in the general area. They state that the use of rodenticides will lead to the direct and indirect killing and extinction of key predator species including pine martens, foxes, owls and hen harriers. They argue that mitigation measures cannot properly address these risks to wildlife and as such should indicate the unsuitable nature of the proposed site.

Response

The concerns in relation to water pollution are addressed in the responses to item 2 above. The survey carried out as part of the application did not show the presence of pearl mussel in the river. Bird surveys were carried out at the request of the Agency. These surveys did not find any evidence of Hen Harriers in the area and found that the bird species present were typical species associated with conifer plantations. Duchas were consulted as part of the waste licensing process. The existing habitat is commercial forestry and as such is not a rare or endangered habitat. The consultants note that the current forestry is probably unsuitable habitat for Hen Harriers as the majority of the trees are too high for this species. *Condition 4.5* and *4.6* deals with the protection of the buffer zone around the facility. This buffer zone must be maintained and managed to maximise biodiversity. The protection of surface water quality is covered by *Conditions 4.17* and *4.20* of the recommended PD. An annual ecological and biological survey of the adjoining habitats must be carried out under *Condition 9.15*. *Condition 6.9* requires that rodenticide usage follows international practice with regards to the protection of owls. Birds control measures are covered by *Condition 6.10*.

12. Environmental Impact Statement

One local resident considers that the EIS is biased and misleading and should be rejected as inadequate. Another submission notes that the EIS is shoddy. The secretary of the Inagh Anti-Dump Group considers that the council have ignored the recommendations given in the scoping letters (from Duchas, The Irish Peatland Council, Teagasc) included in an appendix to the application. She considers that the cillin (children's burial ground) was never properly investigated, that agriculture was not adequately covered and that the survey for pearl

mussel was lacking. She also asks why aerial photographs weren't included as part of the EIS.

A submission from consultants on behalf of the Inagh Anti-Landfill Group lists inadequacies in the EIS as follows;

- Failure to look at alternatives to landfilling;*
- Failure to fully consider the social implications of locating in an unspoilt area;*
- Failure to fully consider the full value of the forestry;*
- Failure to consider the increased vulnerability of the remaining forest to windthrow factors;*
- Undue haste at looking at options because of short term pressure to access more landfill space;*
- Failure to consider the psychological and physical disturbance of the landfill on the local community;*
- Accuracy of the mapping since the EIS does not include a substantial number of houses (9) on the map provided;*
- Failure to take into account changing farming practices;*
- Failure to consider the implications for a proposed Special Area of Conservation (Inagh River) and absence of criteria used in choosing sampling points for fresh water mussels;*
- Failure to consider the likelihood of the occurrence of certain species, and assuming the in the case of hen harriers and pine martens, that habitat or disturbance could be mitigated, Failure to consider that hen harriers and pine marten may not be seen at the site because of they are wide ranging and secretive habitats respectively;*
- Failure to explain the logistics of denying access to rodenticides to national and internationally important wildlife; and,*
- Failure to consider the threat of scavenger birds to endangered species and the impact of the mitigation measures used to control birds.*

One submission outlines concerns about the drilling survey carried out and states that no security was provided and sample boxes were thrown about giving the impression that they cared less (photographs submitted). They also express concern that the samples were from another site labelled "Enigh".

One submission points out the some of the photographs in Section 9 of the EIS in relation to visual aspects contain many discrepancies when compared with the photographs taken by Jack O'Sullivan and Gerry Tobin. They note that the photographs in the EIS look artificial and some have been tampered with such as the flower pot in photograph 3, a missing telegraph pole in photograph 7/8, deceptive views from photograph 5, and missing houses in photograph 13. They also express concern that a letter on file at the council offices stating that the photographs were taken with a normal camera and not tampered with had vanished from the file.

Response

In assessing the waste licence I considered that the EIS and additional information submitted complies with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. The information submitted was satisfactory to allow a decision to be made on the proposed facility. All the items in the above submission were considered when making my recommendation. Many of the items were either covered in the EIS submitted as part of the application or in the additional information requested by the Agency. Several conditions in the recommended PD address the specific

concerns raised. In relation to the ecological and forestry concerns these are dealt with under the response to item 11 above. The proposed SAC referred to in the submission is for the Inagh River Estuary which is several miles from the proposed facility. Farming concerns are dealt with under the response items 7 above. Alternatives to landfilling were considered as part of the waste management plan for the region. The concerns about security during drilling are noted. In relation to the concerns about the photographs, I agree with the points raised that there are some discrepancies with the photographs in the EIS. These discrepancies, as well as the presence of some new houses in the area, were also pointed out to me by local residents during a visit to the site on the 29/9/00. I have taken these discrepancies into consideration when making my recommendation and the visual aspects are dealt with under the response to item 16.

13. Waste Policy and Alternatives

Residents question the need for such a large landfill and argue that recycling should be considered further. The local school in Inagh has been awarded the Green Flag and are an example of what should be done in terms of education. One submission considers that the proposed development is contrary to Government policy "Changing our Ways" and that an alternative to landfill should be used. It was considered that super dumps remove the responsibilities of waste management from the producers of waste and dump them on unsuspecting communities. The view was expressed that we should be looking to incinerate our waste. A local County Councillor has a objection to the concept of landfill as a means of disposing of household waste and says that this is an easy option compared to increasing reuse, recycling and composting. Residents argue that the proposed facility can not be compared with the Kerry Landfill and in any case residents in Kerry consider that the facility is a blight on the community with nuisances evident. Landfill penalises one area, while letting the waste producers off the hook. Concern was expressed that the site would be used for waste from areas other than waste produced in County Clare.

Response

The proposed Central Waste Management Facility at Ballybuff Beg is part of the regions waste management infrastructure as outlined in the Waste Management Plan for the region. *Condition 5.13* requires the council to examine ways of increasing waste recovery and reducing the amount of waste landfilled. The annual quantity of waste allowed to be accepted at the landfill is limited to 50,000 tonnes per annum, and this means that the council will have to introduce ways to stabilise the amount of waste landfilled.

14. Traffic

Traffic was one of the most common concerns raised in submissions. Concern was expressed about increases in traffic on the narrow Maghera Road. One submission outlined concerns about safety of children when the road becomes over burdened with traffic. Many considered that the smaller roads in the area including the Maghera Road will become short cuts for traffic wanting to avoid congestion on the main N85. Concern was outlined in many submissions that the main N85 is unsuitable and won't be able to cope with the increased traffic. One submission noted that they cannot comprehend how the road could cope with the volume of traffic generated while others noted that it will become dangerous and unsafe to walk along. Concern was expressed that the main road (N85) already has had its share of fatalities with two fatal accidents at each side of the site entrance.

The main road has no slow lanes and is already overburdened with traffic especially in the summer. A residents living opposite the entrance to the landfill states that traffic would create a serious hazard. One submission notes that a refuse tanker will be on the road every 15 minutes and views this type of council planning as sheer madness. A high risk of accidents was commented on. The view was expressed that no waste licence should be approved until the road has been improved. Concerns was expressed at the way the council were compulsory purchasing land that is not needed for road widening and promises of road improvements is the councils way of trying to buy over local people.

Response

Traffic is covered in *Condition 4.7* which requires road improvement works to be carried out to facilitate waste vehicles using the facility prior to any works at the site. Improved signage must also be installed. *Condition 4.7.3* specifies that no construction or waste disposal vehicles shall use the Maghera Road.

15. History and Archaeology

A local resident points out that when the area was being ploughed for forestry they were told on no account to interfere with a small plot of land as it was a children's graveyard. They express concern that this will be covered by the landfill. One former local resident outlines the history of the area and memories of growing up in the area. She mentions that older people often spoke about a cillin or graveyard to the east of the townland. The local members of a political party note they are concerned that the development would interfere with unmarked graves and state that no archaeologist has examined this thoroughly yet. A local county councillor also points out that local opinion is that a cillin existed at the site and that only feeble attempts were made to locate this.

Response

An archaeological investigation of a reported Children's burial ground was carried out as part of the waste licence application but no evidence of such a site was found. *Condition 9.7* requires that all excavations for development of the facility be monitored by an archaeologist and that Duchas be informed and consulted on any discoveries of an archaeological nature.

16. Visual Aspects

Residents expressed concern the proposed site will be seen from the road and dwelling and farms to the north and north west – and particularly in the area around Maghera Crossroad. Concern was expressed that properties that overlook the site would be devalued and the visual impact is totally unacceptable. The local view is that screening will not effectively hide the development. The current views in the area are scenic and unspoilt. One resident notes that a landfill cannot be "hidden on a hill". Many residents object to be looked down on or overlooked.

Response

Operations at the facility will generally be screened by the existing forestry and this screening will improve as the height of the trees increases. The proposal is to excavate the subsoil and construct cells which would then be filled to approximately 2 to 3 meters above the highest point of the existing ground profile. *Condition 8.1* restricts the height of the landfill to 2.6m above the highest existing ground profile of the hill. The existing hedgerows and forestry as well as the firebreaks must be managed to minimise views of the facility (*Condition 4.6.2 and 4.6.3*). Other conditions designed to minimise the visual intrusion of the facility are the construction of screening bunds around the working face (*Condition 4.6.4*), minimising the

height of the litter nets (*Condition 6.5.2*) and the installation of fencing around the waste activities rather than the facility boundary (*Condition 4.4.1*).

17. People not considered

Concerns were expressed that people were ignored when it came to selecting the site. The presence of eighteen houses within 500m of the boundary of the facility should have ruled out the site. Concerns were also expressed that the landfill was being forced on a living growing community and that the council have unfairly treated residents and totally disregarded their presence close to the site and note that the constitution and the rights to cherish all our citizens equally must come first. "People MUST come first" was a statement in one submission and this view was shared in many others. Elderly residents in Inagh and the neighbouring townlands noted that Inagh was now becoming a growing community and outlined their concerns about the location of a dump in the parish where they have lived all their lives. Concerns were expressed that the council do not care for the people and just want their landfill.

One local resident states she recently built a new house 100m from the site and expressed disgust and annoyance that when she applied for planning permission Clare County Council omitted to inform her of the proposed landfill. Others consider that it is astounding that people are way down the list in the site selection process criteria and are critical of Fehily, Timoney & Co for not ruling out the Ballyduff Beg site because of the number of houses in the townland. She also questions the consultants work in mapping the houses and asks did anybody visit the residents and ascertain the true facts. The EPA Site Selection Manual is also criticised since it does not adequately refer to people. Several residents requested that the EPA meet with local residents on site. An article from the Independent was submitted tilted "Incompetence sees the nation's health dumped".

Response

All the submission received were considered as part of the waste licensing process. The nearest occupied dwelling is located approximately 320m from the area to be filled (34m from the boundary of the facility). As the Inspector dealing with the waste licence application I met with local residents on site and listened to their concerns. I appreciate that no community wants to have a landfill site located in their area and note the fears expressed by local residents. However, at present landfills are a necessary part of the waste management infrastructure and the recommended PD allows for the development of a modern landfill to meet the needs of waste management in the county as identified in the waste management plan. The conditions in the recommended PD if adhered to should ensure that the operation of the landfill does not cause environmental pollution.

Signed _____

Dated:

Name Brendan Wall