Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

Dept. of Environment, Local Government
2 SEP 2016
Wexford

I, [Name], am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, “Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an Independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The Impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed, [Signature]

Date 9/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

- Galway Bay is on one of the most scenic coastline in Ireland and it will be destroyed if such an development will be allowed to go ahead and fear the direct negative impac on the local tourism industry.

- I object to the above lease as it will have an effect on the landscape along this area which is renowned for its natural beauty and is of great importance to our tourism industry.

Best regards,
Hello Foreshore.

I am writing to voice my objection to the above Lease Application.
I have visited Galway regularly for 30 years and always recommend it as an outstanding place of natural beauty to all my friends and colleagues.

I am very concerned about the noise pollution/visual impact of the planned site on the Galway bay ecosystem. I am concerned that inadequate research has been performed to assess the full impacts. I believe the Marine Institute has submitted an environmental report. With this in mind I believe a detailed fully researched EIS should be provided with the Lease application.

Galway Bay is one of the most scenic coastlines in Ireland and the World. This beauty could be destroyed if such an development is allowed to go ahead.

I object to the above lease as there is a strong possibility it will have a detrimental effect on the landscape/environment along Galway area over the 35 years (why is it so long?). This environment is unique and renowned for its natural beauty and is of great importance to Ireland's tourism industry.

The long term effect could be disastrous for the wildlife and clean waters of Galway. Please consider my fears and objections and ensure full consideration is given to them.
Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends **9th September 2016** cannot be considered.

**Sender address:**

I, ....................................................., am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, “Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.

Date: 2nd Sept/2016
Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566   Applicant: The Marine Institute
Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”
(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?
   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for
2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

Public Consultation Process / Local Impact

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.
2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states:

   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.


There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be included in the report.

Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.
2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.
3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.
4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine 'blend' in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.
5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.
6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.
7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.
8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland's west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Question for the Minister

Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
to whom it may concern.
I wish to lodge an objection to the application for a 35 year Foreshore Lease to construct an electricity generating station on Galway Bay - application#: FS006566.
the consultation process is flawed ,it not impartial or fair it also has untruths ,it's dated , biased and misleading
information supplied to the public ,no stakeholders informed such as tourism,
The Burren -UNESCO world heritage site .Sli Chonamara , all on the wild atlantic way Where is the Galway development plan in all of this. No action on the site until everyone is sure no damage is done, such as mammals already identified in the report.
Could I please have a confirmation receipt to this mail.
Thank You
I wish to object to the granting of Application FS 006566 - the applicant for a Foreshore Lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generation Station - for the following reasons:

1. The Health & Safety has not been assessed on light & noise pollution.

2. Tourism has been excluded.

3. It is project splitting.

4. The Marine Institute has look

5. I call for an Oral Hearing.

6. There is no Environmental Impact Statement so I do not have the information I need to assess the impact on my quality of life.

7. I do not agree with a 35 year Lease

8. I will not have a say as to what goes in or on the bay.

I reserve the right to add to my submission should further concerns arise in light of improved information not presently available to me.

Signed:
Dear Sir/Madam,

Galway Bay Inshore Fishermen’s Association represents the 25 vessels which operate within Inner Galway Bay. Over 40 families depend on these vessels for their income. Throughout the years, we have collectively taken a series of management measures to secure the health of the crustacean fisheries within the Bay. Coming from this background of responsible management of the Bay’s fisheries we are somewhat concerned about the proposed development of a test and experimental site by the Marine Institute just off the Spiddal coastline.

Unfortunately, the history of removal of significant structures from the Bay, once they have failed operationally, is very poor. The most recent example is a large area near Galway Harbour where rows of moorings were placed at sea for the first Volvo Ocean race. These moorings are now breaking apart and are a serious liability to marine traffic. Previously a large rope-mussel growing site off Inverin was abandoned. As a consequence, the structure is breaking up and vessels have had their propellers fouled with heavy ropes, and on at least 2 occasions boats have been placed in very real jeopardy. Similarly, a large salmon farm was abandoned on the East side of Inis Orr and inshore scallop vessels have become dangerously entangled in the mooring chains which were left on the seabed. In all three instances the companies and individuals walked away from their responsibilities and the State failed to pursue the restoration of the environment.

We are somewhat baffled as to the purpose of the proposed installation of 3 X 60m tall wind turbines for experimental purposes at this site and fail to see what will be achieved through their installation other than the ruination of the natural integrity of Galway Bay. Our perception is that as this site had been designated for testing energy generating concepts something had to be identified by the Marine Institute which could be tested and they chose a technology (wind turbines) which is in fact already proven. We do not believe that this is in line with the original granting of permission for this site and consider it to be a considerable waste of tax payers’ funds. Wind turbines at sea are very expensive to install and maintain and given the severe storms of recent years the idea of floating turbines off this coast is extremely ill-conceived and doomed to failure.

As this location is in proximity to a Natura site we are concerned that insufficient assessment of the consequences of the proposed installation has been undertaken. The threat to seabirds is an obvious concern but there may also be an effect on salmon and sea-trout which are believed to travel along the North shore of the bay. What effect will the on-going disturbance generated at this site have on these species? Our members have already been excluded from the shrimp and scallop
resources within the site. Will there be a further exclusion zone around the area if this installation proceeds? If this is the case how big will it be and can an assurance be granted that further permission will not be sought to expand the site again in the future?

Yours Sincerely,

Vincent Connell.
A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. As my mother was born and grew up in and I have a large and extended family there still, I am a regular visitor to the area. The Galway bay area is one of the most beautiful areas of Irish coastline and deserves to be protected and preserved. I feel strongly that the heritage value of this unique coastline should not be overlooked in the granting of development rights to individuals or organisations.

I object on the points outlined below:

- I am concerned about the visual and noise pollution impact of this development on an area of such natural beauty. I believe that the research carried out to date by the Marine Institute is inadequate and would respectfully suggest that their report should be expanded to include an EIS.

- I believe that the lease of 35 years is unreasonably long considering the rapid advances taking place in the area of electricity generation. This may allow the site to be developed in ways that we can not now foresee and which might have an even greater detrimental impact on the area.

Is mise le meas,
A chara is mian liom aigheacht a dheanamh ar an iarratas seo.
Aighneacht : Go mbeadh eisteacht poibli ar an iarratas seo.

Mise le meas,
Seán Ó Tuairisg
Comhairleoir Contae
Aille Thiar,
Indreabhan,
Co. na Gaillimhe.
Tel Baile (091) 593084
Tel Póca (086) 3864179

Is é Proofpoint, Arna Óstáil do Comhairle Contae na Gaillimhe, a rinne an teachtaireacht riomhphoist seo a scanadh agus a ghlanadh ó thaobh ábhair de. Tá míle fáilte roimh chomhfhreagras i nGaeilge nó i mBéarla. Tá eolais atá próbháideach agus rúnda sa riomhphost seo agus in aon iatáin a ghabhann leis agus is don seolaí amháin é. Mura seolaí thú, nil tú údaraithe an riomhphost nó aon iatáin a ghabhann leis a léama, a chóipe&aac ute;il ná a úsáid. Má tá an riomhphost seo faighte agat trí dhearmad, cuir an seoltóir ar an eolas tri riomhphost a sheoladh ar ais agus scrios ansin é le do thoil. Má tá an riomhphost seo ag teastáil uait i bhformáid eile téigh i dteagmháil leis an duine a sheol chugat é.

This e-mail message has been scanned for content and cleared by Proofpoint Hosted for Galway County Council. Correspondence is welcome in Irish or in English. This e-mail and any attachment contains information which is private and confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not an addressee, you are not authorised to read, copy or use the e-mail or any attachment. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by return e-mail and then destroy it. If you need this email in an alternative format please contact the sender.

Gaillimh - Phríomhchathair Chultúir na hEorpa 2020
Galway - European Capital of Culture 2020
Galway2020.ie
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of: ____________________ ________________________

Seoladh / Address:

Guth/Én / Tel / Riomhphost / Email

DÁÉta / Date: September 5, 2016 __________________________

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566  Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

    At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.
The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. The screening report was not assessed by the correct competent authority.

This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report.
3. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should have been completed for this project.

**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   **Application Title:** Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   **Other Titles:** Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states:

   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be included in the report.

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.
3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine 'blend' in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the Burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states 'In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland's west coast is'

   How is this a valid statement? Galway Bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Finally, Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.
The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. The screening report was nor assessed by the correct competent authority.

This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report.
3. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should have been completed for this project.

**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states:

   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be included in the report.

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.
3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the Burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Finally, Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Submissions can be made to Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 8th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address: 

I am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application F5006556, “Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application F5005751, Application F5006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of F5006556, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation Information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 31st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed, 

Date: 1/4/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submission: I am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, "Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station" on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The Intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development in the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimaginable consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed:...

Date: 04/07/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

I, [Name], am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006556, “Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006511 and Galway County Council Application 13/017. The Intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative Impacts of FS006556, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and well-being. This application does not provide any Environmental NGO Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural diapopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dail closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed

Date: 3/9/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

[Redacted]

I am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, "Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station" on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative Impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed. [Signature]

Date: [Handwritten date]

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submissions can be made to Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

I am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, "Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station" on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS006571, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation Information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed,

Date 17/9/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie (Closing Date: Seol roimh: 09/09/2016)

Seolta ar son: On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address

Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email: Data: 5/09/2016

Please treat this submission as an individual submission and confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

Submission regarding: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” – Application No: FS006566 (Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

I am concerned about the scale of this project, and the fact that the lease would be for 35 years. The open-ended nature of the application even allows for possible use of technology that has not been invented yet. This does not allow for adequate assessment by any government department of the possible environmental impact of such devices in advance of granting permission for their use.

I would also especially object to the possible research on fish-farming in this location.
From:
Sent: 05 September 2016 20:25
To: foreshore
Subject: Galway Bay

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:  
Seoladh/Address  

Data:6 – 09 2016  

Please treat this submission as an individual submission and confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.  
Submission regarding: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” – Application No: FS006566 (Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission) 
A chara,  
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:  
Application and consultation process not followed as required by law. 
The lease for 35 years of the foreshore and part of the bay.
To whom it concerns,

I strongly object to this proposed development.
Galway Bay is known far and wide for its outstanding beauty with songs composed about it. It is on one of the most scenic coastlines in Ireland and it will be destroyed if such an development will be allowed to go ahead.
I object to the above lease as it will have an effect on the landscape along this area which is renowned for its natural unspoiled beauty and is of great importance to our tourism industry.
I find it hard to believe that this site is even being considered for such development. It has no aesthetic nor environmental benefits!

Sincerely,
SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN
Marine Planning and Foreshore Section,
Department of the Environment
Community and Local Government,
Newtown Road,
Wexford.

Date: 5th September 2016.

REF: Objection to the Granting of Application No. FS006566 ‘Application for a foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station’

Dear Mr. O’Neill,

I am writing to object to the granting of the above application for the following reasons:

➢ Serious lack of information provided and dialogue by the Marine Institute or Smart Bay Limited with Residents, Businesses, wider community and other Governmental bodies with regard to the proposed Foreshore lease and construction of the ‘Offshore Electricity Generating Station’.

➢ I believe that the proposed Electricity Generating Station would destroy the beautiful panoramic view of Galway Bay from both the County Galway and County Clare coastlines.

➢ Galway bay is an area of high scenic amenity and therefore both domestic and international tourism will be affected as a result.

➢ No Independent Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out.

➢ Serious concerns of the potential water and noise pollution, in addition to the negative impact on the marine and wild life.

I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of my letter of objection to the ‘Application for a foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station’ by your Department.

Yours Sincerely,

Name
Address
Marine Planning and Foreshore Section,
Department of the Environment
Community and Local Government,
Newtown Road,
Wexford.

Date: 3rd September 2016.

REF: Objection to the Granting of Application No. FS006566 ‘Application for a foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station’

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to object to the granting of the above application for the following reasons:

➢ Serious lack of information provided and dialogue by the Marine Institute or Smart Bay Limited with Residents, Businesses, wider community and other Governmental bodies with regard to the proposed Foreshore lease and construction of the ‘Offshore Electricity Generating Station’.

➢ I believe that the proposed Electricity Generating Station would destroy the beautiful panoramic view of Galway Bay from both the County Galway and County Clare coastlines

➢ Galway bay is an area of high scenic amenity and therefore both domestic and international tourism will be affected as a result.

➢ No Independent Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out.

➢ Serious concerns of the potential water and noise pollution, in addition to the negative impact on the marine and wild life.

I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of my letter of objection to the ‘Application for a foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station’ by your Department.

Yours Sincerely.
Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

I am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, “Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.
- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.
- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.
- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess the impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.
- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.
- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.
- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.
- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on.
- Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.
- I do not understand why a 35 year Lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shacke future Governments, and subject the public and generations to follow with unassessed and unimagined consequences.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed,

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submissions can be made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford, Co. Wexford or foreshore@housing.gov.ie

Submissions received outside of the public consultation period which ends 9th September 2016 cannot be considered.

Sender address:

I, [Name], am making the following objection on my own behalf.

I object to the granting of Application FS006566, "Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station" on the following grounds:

- EU and Irish Law sets out a process whereby any development likely to have significant effects on the environment cannot be exempt from an EIA, unless a comprehensive screening of the project with regard to its potential impacts on the receiving environment rules out the need for an EIA. This proposed development has not been adequately screened, as required by law. The size, nature, and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required and this has not been done.

- This project is part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS006611 and Galway County Council Application 13/947. The intention of the EIA Directive is that no project likely to have significant effects on the environment should be exempt and project splitting cannot be used to circumvent the intention of the Directive.

- The cumulative impacts of FS006566, together with the above applications and other developments on the receiving environment of Galway Bay have not been included at the screening stage and therefore have not been assessed as required by law.

- I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and therefore do not have the information I need to assess this impact this development will have on my quality of life, my health and wellbeing. This application does not provide any External Bodies Consultation information from an independent Environmental NGO to inform me or the Minister deciding on this application.

- The impacts of the proposed development on the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and Habitats, have not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.

- I do not understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has implications at National and Local level in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation.

- I have not been properly informed and I have not been consulted and included in the decision making process with regard to this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.

- Due to the manner in which the public consultation process has been conducted, I have been deprived of my democratic right to representation by my elected public representatives during a large part of the consultation period. Questions not answered at a public meeting on the 21st of July regarding this application, the day the Dáil closed, remain unanswered. My public representatives are largely unavailable and are in any case without a forum in which to raise my questions and receive answers I can rely on. Requests by my representatives to remedy this situation have not been granted by the Minister responsible.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.

Signed, [Name]...

Date: 5/9/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Submission on behalf of Re Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station. Lease Application. REF: FS006566

are objecting to the Marine Institute (MI) Lease Application on the following grounds.

(1) We object to the fact that Minister Simon Coveney who has already voiced his support for this application/development, will also be the Judge, Jury and final decision maker in relation to this application. While this may not be legally wrong, it is morally wrong and may leave the Minister open to accusations of bias as happened in the process of BIMs application for a licence for a massive salmon farm also in Galway Bay.

(2) There was a lack of communication and transparency by the MI in relation to this application, very few stakeholders had been notified, and very little information was provided. At a public consultation meeting which took place in Spiddal on the 21st July regarding this application, the MI either refused or were unable to answer questions put to them by the general public. This is outrageous, if the MI don’t know what the full facts are, or are hiding certain facts about the application than it should not be granted.

(3) In number (2) above, I mentioned the hiding of certain facts about the application, and I refer you to an advertisement on the SmartBay website (check link attached) under the heading entitled, Marine Institute Smartbay National Infrastructure Access Programme (NIAP) 2016, which calls for applications for Higher education institutions, Small & Medium Enterprises (SME’s) and Multinational Companies (MNC’s) to apply for a 25k euro grant ”to enable researchers to access the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test site.”

were shocked to learn from the information provided on their website, that Smartbay Ireland Limited which is a subsidiary of the Marine Institute, plan to allow the testing of salmon farms and antifouling agents at the Spiddal site. This fact has been kept quiet by the MI and only a number of weeks ago, in a statement to the local media, they state and I quote, ”Under the lease application only one floating wind device could be tested on the site at any one time, with a maximum of three unique renewable marine energy devices on site at any one time.” No mention of the following items which, according to the Smartbay website can be tested at the Spiddal site.
RESEARCH THEMES:
Oceanography & Related Bio-chemistry
Research focused on harmful algae blooms, optical and acoustic properties of seawater, ocean currents, waves, local and regional circulation and other basic marine research.
FISHERIES & AQUACULTURE
Fisheries: Monitoring of fish stocks, environmental conditions and developing methods of observing fish stocks.
Aquaculture: Monitoring fish health, environmental conditions, harmful algal blooms and decision support tools.
NOVEL MARINE TECHNOLOGIES
Research focused on progressing novel sensors up the Technology Readiness Level (TRL) scale, intelligent systems and sensor platforms, marine technologies such as antifouling coating technologies and the application of information and communication technologies to the marine sector.
TESTING AND DEMONSTRATING
Testing and demonstrating of environmental sensors, marine sensors and prototype Wave Energy Converters (WEC) and components for WEC.

believe that the MI are been economical with the truth in relation to their foreshore application for the Spiddal test site. We also believe that the MI are using the test site as a Trojan horse to get salmon farms into Galway Bay after the massive BIM Galway Bay salmon farm application was withdrawn last December. The call by the MI for applications to avail of the 25k euro grant (closing date for applications 17th June 2016) to enable researchers to access the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site, smacks of sheer arrogance as the 35 year lease has not yet been granted or even adjudicated on by the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government. On these grounds alone the application must be rejected.

(4) In light of the above information in (3) I believe that the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government (DECLG) either knew or were not informed by the MI of the fact that Aquaculture and other aspects of it, are going to be allowed tested at the Spiddal Site, either way an Environmental Assessment (EA) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must, according to the Habitats Directive, be carried out in relation to all Plans and Programmes that may have a harmful effect on the Environment. I believe that the DECLG erred in judgment by informing the MI that they didn’t need to carry out an EA or EIS in relation to this application, therefore breaking EU law.

(5) The fact that no EA or EIS have been carried out in relation to this application, puts all stake holders, who are compiling submissions, at a disadvantage as no scientific research has been carried out to determine what affect the planned industrialization of this site in Galway Bay, will have on migrating wild salmon and sea trout smolts from the rivers flowing into Galway Bay, what affect will it have on Shrimp, Prawn, Lobster and Crab if harmful toxic chemicals are to be used, what affects will harmful noise, generated on the Test site have, on Whales, Dolphins and other marine animals who rely on sonar to communicate and find food. According to marine acoustic scientists. ”Sound travels in water, 5 times faster, and many times farther then it does in air.” (SonicSea.org).
I do not believe the MI when they say in their application, that they will release all test site noise
emission information on a regular basis. Over the last 4 years, and other Environmental NGOs have been denied access to information on the Environment by the MI, this information was in relation to fish diseases and the use of toxic pesticides and other hazardous chemicals being used to kill sea lice on salmon farms. The public have a right to this information yet we had to appeal their refusal all the way to the Commissioner of Environmental Information. I believe that the MI will use the Commercial Sensitivity clause to also refuse information on noise emissions generated from this site. As no EA or EIS has been carried in relation to this site, the application must be rejected.

(6) The fact that project splitting has been carried out at this Test site by the MI to try and circumvent the Habitats Directive and to hoodwink the general public and stakeholders is appalling and should not be allowed in a Democratic society where truth and transparency are taken for granted. There is no truth and no transparency in this application, therefore it must be rejected.

(7) The combined negative visual affect of this Development, will far outweigh the positive and economic affect generated by the Wild Atlantic Way project. Anyone in the MI or DECLG would be totally deluded if they think that this development would bring ”Turbine Tourists” to the Spiddal area. Far from it, tourists come to Ireland to view our relatively unspoilt and natural environment. If the MI are granted this lease, we will have to change the wording on the Wild Atlantic Way signs in Spiddal to the Spoiled Atlantic Way.

(8) We object to a 35 year lease (or any other lease) being granted to the MI at this site, because if granted, I or any one else will be unable, in the future, to object to the installation of devices, which haven’t yet been invented, and which could have a detrimental affect on the marine environment in Galway Bay. As this whole application processes smacks of ”Ocean Grabbing” by the MI, and will be governed by their secretive approach to all information requested, now and in the future, this application must be rejected.

(9) In light of the fact that the testing of Aquaculture and other aspects of it, are to be carried out at this site, and that this fact was omitted from the application, I believe that the observations/submissions already sent in by the Statutory Bodies to DECLG in relation to this application, are now totally flawed.

Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse application REF: NO FS006566.

Signed on behalf of

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566  Applicant: The Marine Institute
Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”
(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process
1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?
At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

Public Consultation Process / Local Impact
1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.
Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station
Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site
This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states.. ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’. There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and should be supported with data, e.g. number of jobs and approximate salaries, duration of these jobs. Will local be employed or contractors brought in from outside the area?

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:
It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

It then goes on to state:

‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc. While the stretch of coastline from Galway city west past Spiddal has been subject to a multitude of poor planning approvals over the years that does not mean that we should continue to repeat the mistakes of the past.

**Question for the Minister**

Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Submission Letter:

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of: __ __________

________________________________________

Seoladh / Address: ________________

GuthÆn / Tel / Riomhphost / Email:

______________________________

DÆta / Date: __ __ ____________

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:
**Process**

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.

   The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable.

   This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states..

   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

   There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be in included in the report
Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine 'blend' in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report :

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Irelands west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Finally, Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate , complete and objective?
Regards
Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. I am concerned and object to the length of the lease being applied for as it is far too long to provide sufficient guarantees against developments which may have negative impacts on my home, on my children and grandchildren. No one can predict what devices will be tested in the future.

2. It is stated on the foreshore lease application that the proposed development is expected to generate 50dB(A) of noise. This presents a serious concern to me as I live so close to the proposed development.

3. I object to the above lease as it will have an effect on the landscape along this area which is renowned for its natural beauty and is of great importance to our tourism industry.

4. On the application an environment report was submitted and I question why an environment impact statement what not submitted with application. I believe an EIS should be provided before any decision is made on the lease application.

Is mise,
From: 
Sent: 07 September 2016 08:52 
To: foreshore 
Subject: letter of objection to test site An Spideal 

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Application / Iarratas “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

I live in Dublin but I’m originally from An Spideál and visit regularly as my parents and family live there. I am greatly concerned about the application for a foreshore lease and I object to the development.

The proposed location is on a scenic route west of Galway city. It is part of the Wild Atlantic way and to have a development like this so close to An Spidéal would have negative impact on this stunning coast line. As a family we enjoy visiting this location on a regular basis. If this development goes ahead we are greatly concerned that our children will not have the same experiences we did as children to play in the sea and I think other families would feel the same.

Yours sincerely,
A chara,
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I visit Galway a lot and I think it Galway Bay is on one of the most scenic coastline in Ireland and it will be destroyed if such an development will be allowed to go ahead. I am concerned about the noise pollution and visual impact of this site. I believe the lease of 35 years is too long an inadequate research has been done Regards ent from my iPhone
- I have serious reservations about the environmental impact of the proposed Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station on Galway Bay. The proposed development will be an eyesore and the proposed development is on the wild Atlantic route. There is also potential noise pollution and the damage to marine life in the vicinity.
From:  
Sent: 07 September 2016 11:09  
To: foreshore  
Subject: Foreshore lease Application number FS006566

A Chara,

In reference to the Foreshore lease application for Galway Bay, reference number above. I am strongly opposed to this as I believe that inadequate research has been done as the Marine Institute has submitted an environmental report; I believe an EIS should be provided with their application. I believe that the lease of 35 years is not reasonable as no one can predict what devices would be tested on the site so far in future. A lease of such long duration is not acceptable.

Regards

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it concerns
I object to the above lease as it will have an effect on the landscape along this area which is
renowned for its natural beauty and is of great importance to our tourism industry. I do not
understand why Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact on tourism has
implications at National and local levels in terms of revenue and employment. An Spidéal draws
a lot of families to the area and I think this would have an influence their decision to making a
return trip, I know I wouldn’t feel comfortable letting my children play in the sea with this so
close and I also wouldn’t feel comfortable eating in local restaurants that may perhaps be serving
fish caught near by.
>
> Regards
>
>
Submission Letter:

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of: ____________________________
Seoladh / Address: _______________________________________________________________________________________

Guthán / Tel / Riomhphost / Email: _______________________________________________________________________________________
Dáta / Date: 07-09-16 _______________________________________________________________________________________

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” (Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.

   The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable.

   This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report
General – Public Consultation

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station
   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states.

   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and mis-leading and should not be in included in the report

Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.
8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’
   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.
   It then goes on to state: ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’
   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored. Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

   Finally, Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Submission Letter:

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford.  Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of: __

Seoladh / Address: ______  

Guthán / Tel / Riomhphost / Email: 

Dáta / Date:____ 07-09-16

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566  Applicant: The Marine Institute
Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”
(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and **strongly object** to the proposed development.  I object on the points outlined below:

**Process**

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.

   The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable.

   This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report
**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.
   - **Application Title:** Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station
   - **Other Titles:** Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site
   - This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states:
   
   ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and mis-leading and should not be in included in the report.

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:
   - It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’.
   - How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.
   - It then goes on to state:
     - ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’
   - The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.
   - Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Sliabh Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Finally, Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective
Regards
Aighneacht maidir le larratas FS006566

A chara,

Is mian le Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige aighneacht a chur faoi do bhhr/Eid maidir le larratas ar lOas Òrthr/E
FS006566, chun “fearais fréamhsamhla fuinneamh gaoithe, toinne agus taoide a thástáil ag Láithreán Tástála Fùinnmhn Mhuirí agus in Athnuaithe Bhá na Gaillimhe” amach n Spíd/Oal.

Nor mhiste na pointe seo a leanas a chur san Ùireamh agus an thárratas Ù mheas:

1. Go bhf/Oadadh Òifeacht dhobh/éIach a bheith ag a bhfuil beartaithe ar an suimh don timpeallacht mara, do Òiilleacht an chsta, don turasireacht sa gceantar mura gfuirtear srianta, leis an mOad fearais a thE/st/Eitear ag an aon agus agus le aerde na bhfearas.

2. Sa gc/Æs go gceadaitear an lOasa Òrthr/E seo, tÆ stÆ riachtanach go bhf/Oadfa scróide do dh/Oanamh ar an Òifeacht at/Æ ag an lÆ/éithre/Æn ar an gceantar agus ar shaol an phobail.

3. TÆ stÆ Òabhachtacht chomh maith nach bhf/Oadfa in aon bhealach an cead/danas a dhol n a chur i seilbh aon dream eile seachas Foras na Mara.

Ar an gc/aoi sin molann Cumann Forbartha Chois Fharraige coinnollacha docht a chur leis an gcead/danas den cineÆl seo a leanas:

A. Nach mbeadh cead ag aon amhÆin nos m nÆ tuirbh gaoithe amhÆin a bheith Æ thÆ/stÆ/éil, ar mhaithte leis an Òifeacht dhobh/éIach ar an radharc trasna an chuain Bthair Chois Fharraige, an R336, a choinne/Æl seal agus nach bhf/Oadadh airde an tuirbhte a bheith nos m nÆ 25 m., os cionn leibh/Æil na farraige.

B. Nach dtabhara/ fa an lOas ach ar feadh trÆimhse 10 mbL ar a mh/Óad agus go mbeadh ar Foras na Mara tuarascÆIl neamhspl/ trách timpeallacht a choimisi/Æine faoin Òifeacht dhobh/éIeach, a Òin as an lÆ/éithre/Æn TÆ/stÆ/éla ar an dtimpeallacht mara, ar Òiilleacht an cheantair, ar an dturasireacht, agus ar an bpo/bal Òit/Æil agus molta a dh/Oanamh faoin Òifeacht dhobh/éIeach a laghdre, mar chuid de aon leathan/Æ/En ar an gcead/danas.

C. Go mbeadh s/Ó mar choinnoll daingeann in aon lOas ÒrthrÆa a cheadfa nach bhf/Oadadh Foras na Mara an lOas a th/A/hair ar lÆ/é/ha do eagraocht n dhuine ar bith, nach bhfuil smacht iomlÆen Òir/Óireachta agus bainistocht ag Foras na Mara ar aghaidh.

D. Nach dtabhara/ aon chead aon chineÆl trealamh a ÒesÆir ar an lÆ/é/hair tÆ/stÆ/éla seo, a bheadh ag coth/che gilleacht le linn na h-Óiche, sin soilse lonnchra, no torann í rith am ar bith de lá n dÓiche.

Sínithe: ___________________________ Dáta: ___________________________
Submission Letter:

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh / Address:

Guthán / Tel / Riomhphost / Email:

Dáta / Date:06-09-2015

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed.

At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

Public Consultation Process / Local Impact

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station
Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released. As a member of a family involved in fishing for over 40 years I have no knowledge of this local fisherman who spoke on my behalf.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states...

‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

How?

Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine 'blend' in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.
6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland's west coast is’

How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

It then goes on to state:

‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Question for the Minister

Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?

Is mise le meas
Submission Letter:

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh / Address:

Guthán / Tel / Riomhphost / Email:

Dáta / Date: 06-09-2015

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

Process

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed.

At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

Public Consultation Process / Local Impact

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station
This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states:

‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

How?

Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.
6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Question for the Minister

Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?

Is mise le meas
We are worried about the plan to put wind turbines in Galway Bay. We think it will spoil our lovely bay.

Muidne le meas,
A chara
We are worried about the plan to put wind turbines in Galway Bay. We think it will spoil our lovely bay.

Muidne le meas,
A chara
We are worried about the plan to put wind turbines in Galway Bay. We think it will spoil our lovely bay.

Muidne le meas,
A chara
We are worried about the plan to put wind turbines in Galway Bay. We think it will spoil our lovely bay.

Muidne le meas,
From: foreshore
Sent: 07 September 2016 17:44
To: foreshore
Subject: Foreshore Lease application to Construct an offshore Electricity generating station - FS006566

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. I am concerned and object to the length of the lease being applied for as it is far too long to provide sufficient guarantees against developments which may have negative impacts on my home, on my children and grandchildren. No one can predict what devices will be tested in the future.

2. It is stated on the foreshore lease application that the proposed development is expected to generate 50dB(A) of noise. This presents a serious concern to me as I live so close to the proposed development.

3. I object to the above lease as it will have an effect on the landscape along this area which is renowned for its natural beauty and is of great importance to our tourism industry.

4. On the application an environment report was submitted and I question why an environment impact statement what not submitted with application. I believe an EIS should be provided before any decision is made on the lease application.

Is mise,
To whom it concerns

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development.

I believe that the lease of 35 years is not reasonable as no one can predict what devices would be tested on the site so far in future. I am also concerned about the noise pollution and visual impact of this site and I believe that inadequate research has been done, I believe an EIS should be provided before any decision be made.

Regards
Submission Letter:

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh / Address: ______

________________________

Guthán / Tel / Riomhphost / Email:

_________________________________________________

Dáta / Date: 02-09-16

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and **strongly object** to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

**Process**

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.

   The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable.

   This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states..
‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be included in the report.

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,
Finally, is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Submission Letter:

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh / Address: ______    ______
__________________________

GuthÁn / Tel / Riomhphost / Email:

DÁta / Date: 07-09-16

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number **FS006566**  Applicant: The Marine Institute

Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

(Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)

A chara,
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

**Process**

1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed?

   At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected.

   The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable.

   This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report.

**General – Public Consultation**

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

   Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

   Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

   This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states..
‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and misleading and should not be included in the report.

**Visual**

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the Burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.

8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

   It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

   How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

   It then goes on to state:

   ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

   The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

   Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,
Finally, is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?

Regards
Submission Letter:
>
> Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
>
> Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute
>
> Application: “Foreshore Lease application to an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”
>
> (Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)
>
> A chara,
>
> I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:
>
> Process
>
> 1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed.
>
> At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for.

> 2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report.

> Public Consultation Process / Local Impact

> 1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

> 2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

> Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

> Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

> This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

> 3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

> 4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states..

> ‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the
vitality of the local community’.
>
>
> There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and mis-leading and should not be in included in the report
>
>
> Visual
>
>
> 1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.)
>
>
> 2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.
>
>
> 3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report
>
>
> 4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine 'blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.
>
>
> 5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.
>
>
> 6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.
>
>
> 7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.
>
>
> 8. I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report :
> It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’
>
> How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.
>
> It then goes on to state:
>
> ‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’
>
> The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.
>
> Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,
>
> Question for the Minister
>
> Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Submission Letter:

> 

> > Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
> 
> > Seoladh / Address:
> > 
> > GuthÆn / Tel / Riomhphost / Email
> > 
> > DÆta / Date:0709-16
> > 
> > > Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
> > > 
> > > Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number FS006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute
> > > 
> > > Application: “Foreshore Lease application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”
> > > 
> > > (Should an extension to the closing date be granted I reserve the right to add further information to this submission)
> > > 
> > > A chara,
> > > 
> > > I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:
> > > 
> > > Process
> > > 
> > > 1. Why has the project been split into 3 smaller projects and the cumulative effect not properly assessed.
> > >
At the public consultation members of the public were advised that they are 3 independent projects and that at some stage, they may all be connected. The screening report specifically states that the test site will be connected to the cable. This is evidence of the poor consultation process and why it is difficult for the general public to fully understand what the real scope of the test site is for

2. Health & Safety in terms of light and noise pollution and visual assessments have been excluded in the screening report

Public Consultation Process / Local Impact

1. There was no genuine effort to consult with the general public, and it is only through local community activity that the general public have been notified. Evidence of this can be confirmed by the several extensions given to the public consultation process.

2. The title of the application is very misleading and not consistent with the documents to support the application.

Application Title: Application for lease to construct an off shore electricity generating station

Other Titles: Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site

This is very misleading and difficult for the general public to understand what is actually included in the lease application.

3. In the environmental report, it stated ‘Local Fisherman’ was consulted with, in relation to this application. The identity of the ‘Local Fisherman’ has not been disclosed. If this person was speaking on behalf of the fishing community, this consultation should have been official and the name(s) released.

4. The environmental report states that this development would bring employment and economic benefits to the local Spiddal community, specifically it states...
‘the ocean energy test site is expected to stimulate the local economy and contribute to the vitality of the local community’.

There is no evidence to suggest that the test site will benefit the local Spiddal economy. The statement is vague and mis-leading and should not be included in the report.

Visual

1. There was no realistic representation of all long-term and temporary infrastructures which could be on site - i.e. the three devices, during daylight and night-time in good weather conditions.

2. There was no maximum size (in 3 dimensions) / colour / lighting details for all devices and infrastructure that will be located on the test site.

3. I do not believe light pollution has been adequately addressed in the screening report.

4. Most of the photo montages look like they have been deliberately manipulated to make the wind turbine ‘blend’ in with the sea / view. The time / date for the photo montage was on a misty November Sunday morning, looking into the low rising sun. In some of the montages, it is difficult to even see the burren landscape, which can be seen clearly from Spiddal.

5. The Photo montage only included a single turbine, did not include the cardinal markers (at their correct size), the permanent sea station or any of the other devices that are likely to be co-located in the test site.

6. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult for the local community to truly understand the impact of the test site.

7. Based on the quality of the visualisation / montage provided, it is difficult / near impossible for any people / bodies who have not visited the site, and are reliant on the documentation provided to make a true assessment of the visual impact of the proposed site.
I disagree with the following assessments made in the environmental report:

It states ‘In this regard, it is considered that the section of coastline in question is not synonymous with the wild Atlantic to the degree that much of Ireland’s west coast is’

How is this a valid statement? Galway bay is one of the most iconic sections of coastlines in Ireland.

It then goes on to state:

‘This coastline therefore has an anthropogenic character and the continuing use of the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site is not considered to significantly conflict with the seascape values associated with the northern portion of Galway Bay.’

The MI did not consider the southern portion of Galway Bay, and the Burren, and the impact to these views. In my opinion, this assessment loses all credibility when it totally ignores that this site will be in close proximity and within the views of the Burren and the Aran Islands. Instead of assessing these properly, they were ignored.

Even more alarming, when the visual assessments are discussed in detail, the report seems to focus on the Slieve Aughty mountains, approx. 40km away in the distance, as much as it does on the view of the immediate / close Burren and Aran Islands etc.,

Question for the Minister

Is the minister satisfied that the application and approval is fair, unbiased, accurate, complete and objective?
Seolta ar son:

Email: 

Dáta: 07/09/2016

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.

Application / Iarratas “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

I am greatly concerned about the application for a foreshore lease and I object to the development.

1. On the application an environment report that was submitted and I query why an environment impact statement what not provided with application. I believe an EIS should be provided before any decision is made on the lease application. I am very concerned about the noise pollution/ visual impact of the planned site on Galway bay I am concerned that inadequate research has been performed to assess the full impacts.
2. I have serious reservations about the environmental impact of the proposed Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station on Galway Bay. The proposed development will be an eyesore and the proposed development is on the wild Atlantic route. There is also potential noise pollution and the damage to marine life in the vicinity.

3. The request for a 35 year lease is too long as no one knows what devices will be tested over the next 35 years. Once lease is approved the marine will have full control on what devices that can be tested.

Please consider my fears and objections and ensure full consideration is given to them.

Yours sincerely,