Dear Sir/Madam,

I am objecting to the granting of application FS006566, “Application for a Foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” for the following reasons:

- Firstly I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and as a result I do not have the information I require to assess the impact this development will have on the community and the wellbeing of the local and visiting tourists. Therefore I request that an Environmental Impact Study is conducted and circulated to the community before a decision is made with regards to 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 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.

- Galway bay is known worldwide and with the Wild Atlantic Way bringing more tourists to the area which generates much needed jobs and income locally I am at a loss to understand why the impact on tourism has not been considered in this application. I am requesting that this is addressed before a decision is made with regards to this application.

- No consideration has been given to the fact that Galway (City and County) has been selected as the European Capital of Culture for 2020. This title is worth an estimated €170 million in terms of funding and tourism. It is also potentially worth several thousand new jobs and the expected number of tourists is estimated to be in the region of 500,000. One of the primary reasons why Galway was selected as European Capital of Culture for 2020 is that “the drama of its coastline from Salthill Prom to the wilds of Connemara is unmatched and always excites” and that the Aran Islands per the National Geographic are “One of the world’s top island destinations. That this feeling, this authenticity has survived the modern world, is nothing short of miraculous.” To date the coastline and bay has been unspoilt and the views of the Aran Islands, Clare Coast including the world famous Cliffs of Moher are a major attraction for tourists which visit...
from all over the world. Therefore I request that the impact on tourism is fully evaluated and taken into consideration before a decision is made with regards to this application.

Finally I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being requested / considered for this application. If granted it will destroy the beauty of Galway Bay forever, have a serious impact on tourism, employment and the life of the local residents who live in the area or tourists that visit or pass through the area. I have lived in this area all my life and am the 8th generation of my family to do so, I regularly fish from the rocks directly opposite where this development is planned for and am passing on the traditions that were handed down to me to my children therefore I request that this application is refused so that Galway bay is there for my children (and their children) to enjoy and treasure as I and my family have done down through the generations.

Therefore I am requesting that the Minister refuses granting of this application.

I am also requesting that you acknowledge receipt of this submission and keep me informed of progress / decision that are made in regards to this application.

Yours Sincerely,
The Marine Institute to apply for a new Foreshore Licence of Spiddal to upgrade its facility. This new 35 lease will allow for various devices including floating wind turbines to be established on this 30 Acre site

- This test site in question was first established for prototypes of wave energy devices only, and not for wind turbines as this new licence is sort for. The site was chosen because of its … scale wave energy and to test on this wave energy only. Now they are seeking a licence to test new devices which are not relevant to … wave power. (wind and under sea currents are not naturally … scale to out in Atlantic. So now the whole plan of its original use is been wide extended to devices not necessary related to the specific reason this site was chosen in such a ‘Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’

This is total abuse of our foreshore with out any respect to the coastline and our famous Galway Bay. Up to now the site was totally under used with only a few small devices ever been deployed there for in a short period of time

There was no proof of alternative sites looked at, not any EIS on this or alternative sites done.

The site does not comply with EU regulations or directives as set out (even back to when the first licence was granted in 2006

- This proposal will have a significant environmental effect on the area
- Galway Bay is designated as a Special Area of Conservation under the EU Habitats Directive and a Special Protection Area under the EU Birds Directive (Natura 2000 sites). Wind turbines at sea are striking and dynamic elements within a landscape setting with a high visual impact on the sea, while the background has no contours or hills to camouflage it
- Galway bay is too much an important natural bay to have such turbines highly visual to the public. It would cause a distraction to the uninterrupted view over to the Burren in Co. Clare and west to the Aran Islands which are two of our main tourism sites attraction in Ireland. This proposed new prototype wind turbines will be in full view for all on ‘The Wild Atlantic Way’ The coast road is an area of outstanding natural beauty for all to appreciate from walking, hiking, cycling, motor vehicles and visual delectation
- The proposed turbines will be located near an area of have special cultural significance, and of course tourism dependence. Tourism is one of the most important revenue and jobs generation section in Galway, this will only take away from it and make for another reason to lose it appeal to visitors

- Ireland’s national heritage as defined in the Heritage Act (Section 6) includes seascapes. Increasingly it is recognised that the assessment of landscape character should also encompass coastal and seascapes character, acknowledging the fact that the character of the coast and of marine areas affects the land and vice versa.
• This coastline is designated as “Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty” This underlines the high importance attached to coastal areas and their significance for local communities and economies. Any development proposed in Ireland’s inshore waters will have a major impact on the character and quality of AONBs and the coastal “views and prospects” listed for protection

• The future of Ireland’s coastal zone is a matter of great importance to many ordinary Irish people who have no voice on this issue because of the serious democratic deficit embodied in our outdated foreshore legislation.

Quote from GALWAY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

‘2.11 Area 9-Inveran to Galway City coastline. The coast is flat, comprising rocks and sand merging with natural grassland towards the R336. The coast line commands striking views of County Clare and the Aran Islands’

Additionally no wind farms are recommended for the immediate coastal zone i.e. at least 100m above the high tide mark, to maintain pedestrian access to the shoreline and to minimise intrusion upon the sea backdrop of the Galway coast from the coastal road

• It not clear what impacts, will all these devices on marine species.
• What happens if these devices break their moorings and drift across shipping and other sea going users or coming ashore (this has already happened on three occasions)
• Who is responsible for any impacts at sea/coastal and who will insure them

• Landscapes/seascapes and areas of high scenic amenity. The installation of energy devices located in all areas on landscapes/seascapes and areas of high scenic amenity value should also be assessed for visual impacts This foreshore application may be in breached Directive 2001/42/EC (the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive)

• The cumulative impacts of these developments have not been comprehensively assessed.

• This proposed foreshore licence is out of line with good practice with regard to size, scale and proximity to sensitive coastlines.

• There is a need for independent consultants were commissioned to carry out a Seascape Study

• The Environmental Report should also consider the effect of terrestrial infrastructure on views and landscape character. Cumulative visual impact and impact of night lighting should also be considered
• We should be trying to maintaining and restoring the regions natural, cultural and economic integrity.
• Galway has too much to lose for the sake of these prototype wind turbines, when this type of research is already being carried out elsewhere.
The process of Public engagement was not done correctly, as it did not contain all the required documents and not available when went seeking them as Gaeilge

We have not received any direct answers to some very important issues with the Galway Bay Test site which Marine Institute hold a foreshore licence for and SmartBay operate and manage.

There is a very high chance that the Marine Institute has broken the terms of the existing lease, this including operating an unauthorised device on the test site. This device 'SmartBay Subsea Observatory' is one on the devices been sort for in this new lease (if granted)
Yet it has been deployed and in operation.
The existing lease do not allow for such a device, so they would first need to have approval got for it.
The existing lease states in the Sixth Schedule (9.9) 'Shall insure that cable connection to shore is not permitted as part of any testing programme'
This is what they are doing right now and are breaking the lease. Its only in the new lease that will allow for this. Allot of the community has lost confidence on both The Marine Institute and Smart Bay in the manner of how the manage our natural resources.
Neither the existing lease or the cable project lease allow, its can only be done though a new lease
The above and many more questions put the the Marine Institute, which they have not/cant not answer.

I oppose to this development on the above grounds and the method (process) the information was given to the public
Foreshore Reference: FS 006566

Since the existing Site has been totally underutilised until now, with just two devices ever been tested for a short period of time. The remainder of time over the past 10 years nothing been in operational there except for the four small Cardinal Markers. There are questions over the selection of this site in the first place and its compliance with EIS’s and site selection process.

The proposed Test Site with such a poor history and most of the research to date is either self-composed EIS or farmed out to selective companies that may tailor the reporting to suit the client’s needs. Most of the reporting to date been desk based.

It’s only fair and practical (and legal under EU) that a proper full screening, EIS’s and compliance with EU Directives should be insisted on this site before assessing this application.

Reason for independent full EU EIS and compliance to Directives to be conducted first:

- Duration of lease (35 years, way too long)
- Public Health/Safety
- Location of Site in a highly visual and sensitive area
- Contamination of water
- Testing of unknown devices in the future
- Project Splitting (including Cable licence)
- Type of licence seeking (Offshore Electricity Generation Station)
- Proper consideration to Wildlife/Mammals
- Noise
- Visual Effects
- Care to Environment
- Overall proper plan for the management and care of Galway Bay
- Wild Atlantic Way

I recommend that the licence be refused until such proper Environment Impact Studies are carried out by independent European bodies

Also the Community should have a strong input on all studies and not just as last minute observation

It is community amenity
9th Sept 2016

Dear sir / Madam,

I am objecting to the granting of application FS006566, “Application for a Foreshore lease for the construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” for the following reasons;

- Firstly I have been deprived of an Environmental Impact Statement and as a result I do not have the information I require to assess the impact this development will have on the community and the wellbeing of the local and visiting tourists. Therefore I request that an Environmental Impact Study is conducted and circulated to the community before a decision is made with regards to 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 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.

- This project appears to be part of a larger development including Application FS005751, Application FS0066ll 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.

- Galway bay is known worldwide and with the Wild Atlantic Way bringing more tourists to the area which generates much needed jobs and income.
locally I am at a loss to understand why the impact on tourism has not been considered in this application. I am requesting that this is addressed before a decision is made with regards to this application.

- No consideration has been given to the fact that Galway (City and County) has been selected as the European Capital of Culture for 2020. This title is worth an estimated €170 million in terms of funding and tourism. It is also potentially worth several thousand new jobs and the expected number of tourists is estimated to be in the region of 500,000. One of the primary reasons why Galway was selected as European Capital of Culture for 2020 is that “the drama of its coastline from Salthill Prom to the wilds of Connemara is unmatched and always excites” and that the Aran Islands per the National Geographic are “One of the world’s top island destinations. That this feeling, this authenticity has survived the modern world, is nothing short of miraculous.” To date the coast line and bay has been unspoilt and the views of the Aran Islands, Clare Coast including the world famous Cliffs of Moher are a major attraction for tourists which visit from all over the world. Therefore I request that the impact on tourism is fully evaluated and taken into consideration before a decision is made with regards to this application.

- Finally I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being requested / considered for this application. If granted it will destroy the beauty of Galway Bay forever, have a serious impact on tourism, employment and the life of the local residents who live in the area or tourists that visit or pass through the area. I have lived in this area all my life and am the 8th generation of my family to do so, I regularly fish from the rocks directly opposite where this development is planned for and am passing on the traditions that were handed down to me to my children therefore I request that this application is refused so that Galway bay is there for my children (and their children) to enjoy and treasure as I and my family have done down through the generations.

Therefore I am requesting that the Minister refuses granting of this application.

I am also requesting that you acknowledge receipt of this submission and keep me informed of progress / decision that are made in regards to this application.

Yours Sincerely,
Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: APPLICATION NO: FS006566 – FORESHORE LEASE APPLICATION FOR THE TESTING OF PROTOTYPE WIND, WAVE AND TIDAL ENERGY DEVICES AT GALWAY BAY MARINE AND RENEWABLE ENERGY TEST SITE, SPIDDAL, COUNTY GALWAY

The have been retained by , to make a submission in relation to the proposed foreshore application. This submission highlights a number of concerns of our client with the principle of the proposal which may be supplemented / elaborated on in any further rounds (or extension) of public consultation that may arise, i.e. in terms of more specific concerns. These overall concerns of principle are:

- The proposal is premature pending completion of a national policy on energy / renewable energy, and wind energy in particular. For instance, we understand that the Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment is in the process of formulating the ‘Renewable Electricity Policy and Development Framework’. In the absence of the completion of this process, the current foreshore application could be significantly prejudicial to proper planning and sustainable development and future energy policy;

- Wind energy has a role to play however its usefulness and sustainability / environmental credential is significantly constrained by the absence of ‘instant’ or predictable supply which as a result leads to requirements for environmentally unfriendly spinning reserve. We understand the same limitations apply to wave and tidal energy, to varying degrees. Unless such constraints are addressed, the proposed project should not proceed;

- The proposed project would likely lead to material / significant visual impact, affecting the amenities of a wide area, including residential amenity and accordingly would likely devalue his property, a situation that would be entirely inappropriate; and,

- The visual impact of the proposal could also lead to discernible economic impact, given that Galway Bay, its views from and to, are a major factor in attracting tourism. Galway Bay is a major part of the Wild Atlantic Way, a major tourism initiative which has paid dividends in recent years. The proposed project would put that economic resource at significant risk.

We trust the above will be taken into consideration, however should you require further detail on any of the above, please do not hesitate to contact our office.
A chara,

Further and in addition to my submission of the 2 August 2016, I object to the granting of Application FS006566 on the following grounds:

* This proposed development, cannot be exempt from an EIA, under EU and Irish Law. The size, nature and location of the project must be considered in determining if an EIA is required under EU and Irish law, and this has not been done.

* This Proposed development 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.

* 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 the receiving environment, the sensitive area of Galway Bay, its legally protected species and habitats, the health and well being of the local inhabitants and has not been Appropriately Assessed as required by law.

* Due to the manner in which the public consultation was conducted and how information was disseminated, I have been excluded from the decision making process with regards this application as required under the Aarhus Convention.

* I am alarmed that Tourism has not been considered in this application. The impact this proposed development would have at National and Local levels in terms of revenue, employment and rural depopulation has not been considered.

* I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered here because if granted, it will shackle future Governments and subject the public and generations to follow with ill assessed and unimagined consequences.
Therefore, I ask the Minister to refuse to grant this application.
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)

Name: 
Seoladh/Address: ________________________________

Date: 9/9/2016

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 horrified that the Marine Institute is pushing through an agenda without giving the public full and frank disclosure or an opportunity for meaningful consultation and disclosure. Every time we research more into this project, we find other related projects and more information that is unexplained and not offered prior to this. Laws aren’t being followed. The final decision-maker is the same person who has propelled this project from the get-go. No other sites were considered. There has been no Environmental Impact Assessment.

1. **The Aarhus Convention** is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

   • There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.
   • None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
• The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.

• The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.

• Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.

• The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. Location and Environmental Impact. Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done
because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

• Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;

• Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:

  • The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site causing injury or death
  • No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
  • Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
  • The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
  • There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
  • Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
  • Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
  • The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
  • The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
  • The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.
  • Galway County Development Plan - the site is contrary to the plan. It is
clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSéibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "..not normally permissible."

- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.

- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.

- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.

- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.

- **National Heritage Areas** - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.

- **Noise Pollution** - this has not been adequately assessed. Public Input: the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

- **Project Splitting.** The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.

- **There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades**
and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed. 
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the application are deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.
• Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
• According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore- this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. Nature. There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.
• Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
• The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
• It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas. This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. Project Splitting. There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. Unexplained Points. There are many things in the application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.
• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints. Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices – again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question
• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. Exclusion Zones. The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for
them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
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)

Name: __________________________

Seoladh/Address: __________________________

Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email: __________________________ Date: 9/9/2016

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: F5006566 (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:

There was no meaningful public consultation on this project at any time. This is against the Aarhus Convention and we intend to follow through on this. The Marine Institute refuses to hold any public meetings and has consistently given inconsistent information or information that is inaccurate or has withheld information.

Galway Bay is a major part of the Wild Atlantic Way and every other cultural/tourist interest in and around Galway. The Bay is integral to Galway life. Yet, no major tourist group was asked for their submission on this project. Why is that? Also, nobody in Clare or Aran were notified.

The UN OSPAR Convention calls on governments to invoke the precautionary principle where there are reasonable grounds for concern of the activities that may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea; Since there has been no environmental impact assessment, we cannot even ascertain whether this is necessary at this point.

The project has been split into many parts which I believe is a way to circumvent the laws in place to truly evaluate a project of this scale. For example, if the project was viewed and treated as one whole project, an environmental impact assessment would have been required. This was not done and I believe that was on purpose.
There will be exclusion zones to local fishermen and users of the Bay and yet there is no mention of it or view on it by The Marine Institute as it is out of their remit. How can people truly evaluate the project when we don’t even know the extent of it.

No other sites were evaluated as to suitability. This is wrong on every level. A decision was made for Galway Bay without any consideration of alternative sites.

How can Minister Coveney be the final decision maker when he spearheaded this entire project from the beginning in his role at the Department of the Marine. He is not impartial.
Dear Sir/Madam,

Further to the above application I would like to strongly object to this proposed development.

My formal objection is based on:

this development been wholly out of character for the area and its environs and the visual impact this will have on the area and its high scenic amenity value situated on the wild atlantic way and tourism is of huge economic value to the area.

Pollution is of huge concern both of noise and to the physical environment.

There are a number of concerns regarding the impact this development could have on the wild life of the area including to endangered and protected species such as the grey heron, Common Tern, Cormorant, Curlew amongst others. These are merely species I have observed in the area. An Environmental Impact Study should be conducted to evaluate the populations in the area and potential impact to feeding grounds and flight paths.

Kind Regards,
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)

Name:

Seoladh/Address: 

Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email: Date: 9/9/2016

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:

This project is a disgrace to open commitment to the public you claim to represent. You don’t get to decide what’s right for our Bay. The people have a right to have a say in it. It’s a disgrace the way this whole process has gone on and the Marine institute themselves have acknowledged it’s a mess. By doing so, they have effectively acknowledged that the Aarhus Convention on meaningful public consultation has not been followed. Therefore, the only correct thing to do at this point is to start all over. And, this time, make it count. Stop selling off all of our resources to the highest bidder and start protecting what we have a right to protect. Do an environmental impact assessment for a start and make it mean something. Respect what we have been blessed with in this country and stop abusing the process for the sake of being the good boy in Europe. We are sick of this treatment.

There was no meaningful public consultation on this project at any time. This is against the Aarhus Convention and we intend to follow through on this. The Marine Institute refuses to hold any public meetings and has consistently given inconsistent information or information that is inaccurate or has withheld information.

Galway Bay is a major part of the Wild Atlantic Way and every other cultural/tourist interest in and around Galway. The Bay is integral to Galway life. Yet, no major tourist group was asked for their submission on this project. Why is that? Also, nobody in Clare or Aran were notified.

The UN OSPAR Convention calls on governments to invoke the precautionary principle where there are reasonable grounds for concern of the activities that may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea; Since there has been no environmental impact assessment, we cannot even ascertain whether this is necessary
The project has been split into many parts which I believe is a way to circumvent the laws in place to truly evaluate a project of this scale. For example, if the project was viewed and treated as one whole project, an environmental impact assessment would have been required. This was not done and I believe that was on purpose.

There will be exclusion zones to local fishermen and users of the Bay and yet there is no mention of it or view on it by The Marine Institute as it is out of their remit. How can people truly evaluate the project when we don’t even know the extent of it.

No other sites were evaluated as to suitability. This is wrong on every level. A decision was made for Galway Bay without any consideration of alternative sites.

How can Minister Coveney be the final decision maker when he spearheaded this entire project from the beginning in his role at the Department of the Marine. He is not impartial.
From:                            
Sent: 09 September 2016 16:51  
To: foreshore;                  

Subject: SUBMISSION REGARDING FORESHORE LEASE APPLICATION NO- 
          FS006566                        

SEPTEMBER 8 - 2016               

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

Re.: Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an offshore Electricity Generating Station,  
      (REF: FS006566)                                      

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

Please confirm by email, receipt of this individual submission referencing the name  
below.                                                              

Ainm:                                                               

Dear Sir/Madam,                                                          

I object to the proposed development mentioned in foreshore lease application no FS006566  
and ask the Minister not to grant the Lease sought in Application FS006566 on the grounds  
set out below.                                                            

The Application Process.                                                 

The application has been submitted using the incorrect application form.  
The application form submitted by the developer is a form used to apply for a lease to construct  
an offshore electricity generating station. As the developers have stated that no electricity will  
be generated at the proposed test site, why have they used this application form. Is this not an  
invalid application?
It is evident that the application contains misleading information and the full nature and extent of the proposed project is not clearly identified in the application.

Application FS006566 is part of a much bigger project that includes the following foreshore lease applications, FS006611, FS004904, FS005751, and Galway County Council Planning Application 13/947. All these individual developments including FS006566 should be assessed as one project. The developers appear to be using Project Splitting tactics to secure the above mentioned foreshore lease (FS006566). This practice of project splitting is in breach of European EIA Directive 2011/92/EU. Is the Minister satisfied to consider this application further after being made aware of this project splitting and breaches of European Directive 2011/92/EU?

Many stakeholders including myself have been excluded in the consultation process from the very start of this application process. Public notifications regarding the project were vague and lacked the ability to inform the public about the scale, location, size, nature, of the project. The proposed development is in the Gaeltacht Area which is an Irish Speaking Area of County Galway. Despite this fact, information regarding the proposed development was not available as Gaeilge either on line or at The Spiddal Library when I checked. I visited Salthill Garda Station and asked for the Irish version of the foreshore application and I was advised by the station Sergeant that this was not available, and has noted this fact in the station files. I consider this a serious breach of my rights as an Irish Citizen.

Incorrect information on the application form --

European protected sites in the vicinity of the proposed project have been omitted including the following

1. Special Areas of Conservation areas.
   - Black Head - Poulsallagh Complex - SAC site code IE 0000020
   - Connemara Bog Complex - SAC site code 0002034
   - Galway Bay Complex - SAC site code 0002068
   - Lough Corrib - SAC site code 0002976
   - Inishmaan Island - SAC site code 000212
   - Inishmore Island - SAC site code 000213
   - Inisheer Island - SAC site code IE 0001275

2. Special Protection Areas – SPAs

   Because birds migrate long distances, it is not sufficient to protect them over just part of their range. A network of sites is required to protect wild birds at their breeding, feeding, roosting and wintering areas. The EU Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) addresses the conservation of all wild birds throughout the European Union, including marine areas, and covers their protection, management, control and exploitation. It places a broad requirement on countries to take necessary measures to maintain the populations of all wild birds at levels determined by ecological, scientific and cultural needs.

   The following Special Protection Areas are in the vicinity of the proposed project.

   IE0004005 Cliffs of Moher, IE0004031 Inner Galway Bay, IE 0004042 Lough Corrib, IE 0004062 Lough Mask, IE 0004070 Mutton Island.
3. Natural Heritage Areas,

Prior to statutory designation, proposed NHAs are subject to limited protection in the form of: • Rural Environment Protection Scheme (REPS) plans which require conservation of NHAs and operate for a period of 5 years • Ineligibility of NHA lands for certain grants, in particular for Forestry grants • Recognition of ecological value of NHAs by Planning and Licencing Authorities. • Under the Wildlife (Amendment) Act, 2000 NHAs will be legally protected from damage from the date they are formally proposed. The process of formal designation of NHAs commenced in December 2002. To date 148 raised and blanket bog sites have been designated. The following Natural Heritage Areas are in the Vicinity of the proposed project.
IE002364 Moycullen Bogs NHA, IE 002431 Oughterard District Bog NHA.

The following information is contained on page 29 of the environment report submitted by the developers,
"The proposed project comes within the WFD designated coastal water body of Outer Galway Bay, within the Western River Basin District River Basin Management Plan management area."

The proposed project is located within an area of Galway Bay that is protected under the European Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EU, and the River Basin Districts Protected Areas Plan which is coordinated by Galway County Council.

How can a project of this nature, that includes the testing of antifouling coating chemicals, and Aquaculture, be permitted in a European Protected Area of Water, without even an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) been prepared as required by the European EIA Directive 2011/92/EU? Is the Minister satisfied that this application is compliant with ALL European Directives? If not this application should be rejected.

In August 2011 and August 2012 the Sea Mammal Research Unit (SMRU) of the University of St. Andrews carried out aerial surveys of seal populations in the north and north-west of Ireland. SMRU was previously involved in a similar survey in August 2003. Comparison of harbour seal numbers between the 2003 and 2011/12 surveys showed increases in population numbers for Galway Bay North (2003 – 49, 2011 – 55), Inner Galway Bay (2003 – 200, 2012 – 221), and Aran Islands (2003 – 39, 2012 – 53). This report is included as Appendix 4.

7.2.2. Seabed contaminants-- There are no licensed marine waste disposal sites at sea within the project area.

The developers state on page 134 of the environmental report that there are no licensed marine waste disposal site within the protected area. This is untrue. Spiddal sewerage system marine outfall pipe stretches a few hundred meters into galway bay and releases million of gallons of untreated sewerage into galway bay every day, despite this being in breach of European Directives. Will the minister investigate this?
5. There are 3 Beaches in the vicinity of the proposed Development which are protected by the European Bathing Water Directive, to protect the quality of the water. These beaches have been awarded the blue flag in recognition of water quality. How can the environmental effect that will be caused to these beaches by the proposed development be assessed, considering the aquaculture/chemical testing/and pollution risk associated with it, when there is no EIA, on the project and its surrounding environment. Is the Minister willing to gamble the future of our beaches on a project that lacks the very basic information needed to assess its negative effects on the environment?

=================================================================

External Bodies Consultations - -

(1) 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 The Dept of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government in relation to this application, are now totally flawed.

(2) Tourism bodies were not consulted, therefore it is unknown what the implications of this development will have on tourism. This proposed project will be visible while traveling along the Wild Atlantic Way, traveling along the R336 coast road, traveling along the Co Clare coastline, and from every location along the coastline. The fact that tourism has been excluded from the external consultation process makes the whole process flawed, and gives the Minister insufficient information to provide a basis for a decision.

(3) Galway County Council appear to have been bypassed in the whole application process, and it appears that they have failed in their statutory duties regarding this application FS006566, thus making the application flawed.

=================================================================

Cumulative effects.
The following projects have not been included in the assessment of the cumulative effects of all projects on the receiving environment.

(1) Galway Port Development, A 150 million development within 15 km of the proposed development which includes the reclaiming of over 25 acres of foreshore, of Galway Bay. How can such a massive project be omitted from the cumulative effects in application FS006566, even though it has passed through the planning stage with an bord plannala, and Galway County Council. (this was denied by smartbay ireland and The Marine Institute at the public meetings)

and on page 247 of the environmental report, see below,
The above projects are in the development phase and will require either planning permission or a foreshore lease/licence from the statutory authorities if they are to proceed; for that reason no assessment of potential cumulative impacts can be made at this time. This is untrue. This Galway Port Development should have been included in the cumulative impact study. This has serious implications for the environmental report, and its omission renders the report flawed. How can the cumulative impacts/effects be assessed with this flawed document/report.

(2) Spiddal Sewerage scheme is pumping millions of gallons of untreated raw sewerage into Galway Bay every day, through a marine outfall pipe at spiddal beach. This outfall pipe extends a few hundred meters into Galway bay and is a major concern regarding pollution. This sewerage outfall pipe and its polluting consequences have been omitted from the assessment of cumulative effects for this project.
(3) Rossaveal Harbour and Marine Development - omitted from application assessment. (Foreshore licence granted, but not assessed for cumulative impacts?

(4) Major Road building project between Galway City and South Conamara -- omitted from assessment.

(5) Although the developer has used project splitting to try and circumvent the Habitats Directive, applications FS006611, FS004904, FS005751 and Galway County Council planning permission ref/ 13947 should be assessed for the cumulative effects aspect of this application. Why have these projects been assessed? The omission of the above projects renders the cumulative effects assessment flawed and so this application should be rejected.

(6) Multiple windfarms have been received planning permission in the area, why have they not been included in the cumulative effect assessment.

(7) Hundreds of private houses have received planning permission along the coastline, why have they been included in the cumulative effect assessment.

(8) West Wave Project, Killard, Co Clare. Why has this project no been included in cumulative effect assessment?

(9) Atlantic Marine Energy, Test Site, AMETS, Belmullet, Co Mayo. Why has this project no been included in cumulative effect assessment?

How can the Minister approve the application when all these projects have not been assessed, as required by Irish and European Law.

==========================================================================

Photos of the proposed project.
Photos of the development are all taken at sea level. This does not give a true reading of the visual damage this project will inflict on the landscape and seascape around Galway Bay and the Burren Coastline. The photographs fall short of the international standards required when photographs are been presented as factual evidence on environmental issues. No photos have been taken from the Spiddal to Moycullen Road, which overlooks Galway Bay from a much higher vantage point, and thus the negative visual effects will be magnified from this vantage point.

The photographic evidence presented in this application does not meet international standards and should not be relied on for accurate information in regards to this application.

Where are the photos taken from the Burren and Co Clare?

Where are the photos taken from An Pairc, Baile an tseibhte, coilleach, sheannan, Baile an tsagairt, Baile an Domhlain, Baile Liam, Lippa, Doire Lochain, Na Forbacha, Bearna, etc, all townlands in the vicinity of the proposed project?

Visual Landscape and Seascape Assessment has not been included for some inexplicable reason; Galway Bay’s Unesco heritage site, the Burren and Cliffs of Moher, excluded, why? This development will be seen 10km away, according to the Environmental Report submitted, thus it will be a blot on the seascape from the Galway and Clare coastline. This aspect needs to be assessed according to EIA and SEA directives I believe.

==========================================================================

Grid connection.
Is the project grid connected?
The Minister states that the Project is grid connected, and the Marine Institute say it is not (stated at July 21 meeting).
Who is telling the truth? With so much confusion and misleading information how can the impact of the grid connection be assessed?

==========================================================================

BIRDS

The Environmental Report submitted by the Developers states the following on page 14 and page 15.

"There is also a risk of birds colliding with the single 25m high scaled wind turbine that may be erected at the site. The greatest risk is collision with the rotating blades as opposed to the tower.
It is highly unlikely that a single, temporary, scaled wind turbine will have any impact on bird populations in Galway Bay. Given the scaled size of the devices, the slow speed of any turbines blades, the low number of devices likely to be in operation at any one time and the short-term intermittent nature of the installation/service vessels the likelihood of a collision occurring is unlikely."

This clearly states that there is a risk to Birds, many of which are protected by European Laws and Directives, as explained below.

Special Protection Areas – SPAs Because birds migrate long distances, it is not sufficient to protect them over just part of their range. A network of sites is required to protect wild birds at their breeding, feeding, roosting and wintering areas. The EU Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) addresses the conservation of all wild birds throughout the European Union, including marine areas, and covers their protection, management, control and exploitation. It places a broad requirement on countries to take necessary measures to maintain the populations of all wild birds at levels determined by ecological, scientific and cultural needs.

The Connemara Bog Complex SAC is a large site encompassing the majority of the south Connemara lowlands in Co. Galway. The site is bounded to the north by the Galway–Clifden road and stretches as far east as the Moycullen–Spiddal road. The site supports a wide range of habitats, including extensive tracts of western blanket bog, which form the core interest, as well as areas of heath, fen, woodlands, lakes, rivers and coastal habitats.

The Connemara Bog Complex SAC - site code 002034 is only 3 km from the proposed project. This site is populated by many rare and protected birds including Golden Plover, a species listed on Annex I of the E.U. Birds Directive, nests at up to four locations in the site, with a maximum of two pairs noted at any one location. Another Annex I species known to be present in the site is Merlin. Lough Naskanniva is an important inland breeding site for Common Terns (up to 60 pairs in 1977 and 1992) and Choughs, both of which are also Annex I species under the E.U. Birds Directive. The site is of national importance for wintering populations of Greenland Whitefronted Goose. The site is internationally important for the protection of these birds. How can the Minister guarantee the protection of these birds under the EU Birds Directive, when no assessment has been carried out on the effect this project will have on them, even after the risk of colliding with the wind turbine is mentioned in the Environmental Report as mentioned above. Considering that BirdWatch Ireland have not commented on the development, and the lack of regard shown by the developers for the bird population in the Connemara Bog Complex SAC, it would be remiss of the Minister to Grant this Foreshore Lease Application.

====================================================================

Protected Animals
Otter -- The Otter have been recorded as occurring in the Connemara Bog Complex, code 002034 and is protected by Irish and European Laws and Directives. Given the fact that the Connemara Bog Complex is only 3km from the proposed development, why has it not featured in the environmental report produced by the developers? It appears the Connemara Bog Complex code 002034, and the protected Otter have been excluded from the Environmental Report! This makes the Environmental Report flawed, and invalid and the Minister should not grant this lease application.

===================================================================

Marine Species

The protection afforded to marine mammals in Ireland is summarised below:

Ireland also has two species of seals, the Common Seal (or Harbour Seal) and the Grey Seal. Whilst both species haul out on land for key stages of their life history, the majority of their time is spent in the marine environment.

In Ireland, the 1992 EC Habitats Directive as transposed by the EC (Natural Habitats) Regulations requires that both seal species and all cetaceans occurring in Ireland are maintained at favourable conservation status. Under Article 12 of the Directive, all cetaceans should receive strict protection within the Exclusive Economic Zone. Under Article 4 of the Directive, Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) must be proposed for the following species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Annexes and Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harbour Porpoise         | Annex II of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Annex IV of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Protected species of Wildlife (Amendment) Act  
                           | OSPAR List of Threatened and Declining Species and Habitats |
| Bottlenose Dolphin       | Annex II of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Annex IV of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Protected species of Wildlife (Amendment) Act |
| All Cetacea              | Annex IV of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Protected species of Wildlife (Amendment) Act |
| Grey Seal/Harbour Seal   | Annex II of EC Habitats Directive  
                           | Protected species of Wildlife (Amendment) Act |
The location of the proposed site has not been surveyed or any study carried out in regards to the seal population.

**Common Seal**

The Common Seal (*Phoca vitulina*) is one of two seal species that occur in Ireland. It has a very wide distribution being found in temperate, sub-arctic and arctic coastal areas throughout both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. In Ireland, the greatest numbers of common seals are found along the western seaboard predominantly in relatively sheltered areas (often estuaries and sand or mudflats) that are not subject to much human disturbance in the area. The seal study mentioned in the environmental report is flawed because in excluded large parts of the coastline to the east and west of the proposed site location. This has the result of an Annex II, Protected species being completely omitted from the environmental report. This has serious effects for the foreshore lease application.

Will the Minister take note of this serious omission and act accordingly by declaring this application flawed, incomplete, and refuse to grant this lease application.

The common seal is alive and well along the spiddal coastline, and is visible at the proposed test site location, in large numbers.

The Seals survey claim no seals on this side of the bay – but the survey did not cover this side of the Bay

How did the developer ascertain that the site had “negligible impact on the marine environment since its inception”?

Page 98 of the environmental report states the following:

In August 2011 and August 2012 the Sea Mammal Research Unit (SMRU) of the University of St. Andrews carried out aerial surveys of seal populations in the north and north-west of Ireland. SMRU was previously involved in a similar survey in August 2003. Comparison of harbour seal numbers between the 2003 and 2011/12 surveys showed increases in population numbers for Galway Bay North (2003 – 49, 2011 – 55), Inner Galway Bay (2003 – 200, 2012 – 221), and Aran Islands (2003 – 39, 2012 – 53). This report is included as Appendix 4. This Survey report did not include the area surrounding the test site, along the north shore of Galway BAY. It should not be included in the supporting documents, as it is misleading.

**Grey Seal**

The Grey Seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) is one of two seal species found in Ireland. It is found on both sides of the North Atlantic Ocean although the greatest proportion of the population is found in UK waters. It occurs in greatest numbers on the western seaboard of Ireland although significant numbers also occur on the east and southeast coasts.

Why has this mammal been screened out of the application environmental report despite being visible at the proposed development location on a daily basis?

Wild Salmon
The fact that aquaculture with its implications for wild salmon and sea trout may be allowed to be tested at the site should in itself require an AA and an EIS. Wild salmon are a protected species under the Habitats Directive. The Marine Institute SmartBay Infrastructure Access Programme (2016) will bring an aquaculture element to the site. The Wild Salmon appears to have been screened out of the screening process and environmental report without any acceptable reason except that the distance for salmon is ‘too great and no pathway for interaction’, this is totally misleading and inaccurate information.

The Connemara Bog Complex, code 002034 is only 3 km from the proposed development.

The main river systems within the site are the Owenmore (Ballynahinch) river, the Glashanasmearany and Derrygauna rivers (to the south of Lough Bofin), the Cashla river (which flows out of Glenicumurrin Lough), the Glengawbeg river (which connects Lough Agraffard and Lettercraffoe Lough) and the Owenboliska river and its tributaries (north of Spiddal).

Atlantic Salmon, a species listed under Annex II of the E.U. Habitats Directive, occurs in many of the rivers within the site, including The Spiddal River(Owenboliska) which is famous for its salmon Fishing. Atlantic Salmon swim through the proposed test site to make their way up the Spiddal river(Owenboliska) and through the Connemara Bog Complex SAC 002034. Yet again the omission of this SAC area from the environmental report has the effect of yet another protected species not being afforded the protection it is guaranteed under European law and Directives. Is the Minister going to allow this to happen or will he reject this flawed lease application?

Environmental Impact Statement / Natura 2000 sites / stage 2. Appropriate assessment

I wish to bring to the Ministers attention the following:

The Natura screening document states;

4.3. Mitigation and Monitoring
A number of mitigation / best practice measures are recommended to ensure minimal impact from the test site with marine mammals.

5. Summary
The impacts from the proposed test site will not have any significant effects on the nearby Natura 2000 sites, their qualifying interests/special conservation interests, or conservation objectives. The Screening Assessment has concluded that Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not required.

The Marine Mammal Risk Assessment has identified that the proposed test site will have a low risk to marine mammals. Mitigation and monitoring are proposed to ensure a low risk.

Finlay Geoghegan J. in Kelly -v- An Bord Pleanála 2013/802 JR States;
26. There is a dispute between the parties as to the precise obligations imposed on the Board in relation to the stage 1 screening by s.1777U but its resolution is not strictly necessary in these proceedings. There is agreement on the nature and purpose of the screening process which is well explained by Advocate General Sharpston in Case C-258/11 Sweetman at paras 47-49:

"47. It follows that the possibility of there being a significant effect on the site will generate the need for an appropriate assessment for the purposes of Article 6(3). The requirement at this stage that the plan or project be likely to have a
significant effect is thus a trigger for the obligation to carry out an appropriate assessment. There is no need to establish such an effect; it is, as Ireland observes, merely necessary to determine that there may be such an effect.

48. The requirement that the effect in question be ‘significant’ exists in order to lay down a de minimis threshold. Plans or projects that have no appreciable effect on the site are thereby excluded. If all plans or projects capable of having any effect whatsoever on the site were to be caught by Article 6(3), activities on or near the site would risk being impossible by reason of legislative overkill.

49. The threshold at the first stage of Article 6(3) is thus a very low one. It operates merely as a trigger, in order to determine whether an appropriate assessment must be undertaken on the implications of the plan or project for the conservation objectives of the site [. . . ]”

As Ireland observed in the case CJEU 258/11 it is merely necessary to determine that there may be such an effect.

If mitigation measures are necessary there may be an effect a full NIS is required.

As (i) Installations for the harnessing of wind power for energy production (wind farms); are an ANNEX II development of the Environmental Impact Assessment directive and the development may have an effect of Natura Habitats and/or Species an Environmental Impact Statement is required to be submitted.

After reading the above information is the Minister still satisfied to adjudicate on this lease application, even though it appears to be in breach of the European EIA Directive 2011/92/EU. OR will the Minister Reject the application as a flawed, incomplete, invalid application?

=======================================================================

Connemara Bog Complex SAC - code 002034 -- FLORA (protection) order 2015.

Nine species protected under the Flora (Protection) Order, 2015, occur within this site: Forked Spleenwort (Asplenium septentrionale), Parsley Fern (Cryptogramma crispa), Bog Hair-grass (Deschampsia setacea), Slender Cottongrass, Bog Orchid (Hammarbya paludosa), Slender Naiad, Heath Cudweed (Omalotheca sylvatica), Pillwort and Pale Dog-violet (Viola lactea). Rare and threatened species such as Dorset Heath (Erica ciliaris), Mackay’s Heath (Erica mackaiana) and Green-winged Orchid (Orchis morio) also occur within this site. All of the above species are listed in the Irish Red Data Book, and Slender Naiad is listed on Annex II of the E.U. Habitats Directive.

Is the Minister able to assure me that the above mentioned protected Flora will not be negatively affected by the proposed project, even though the project has no EIS to scientifically prove this fact?

In summary, the Connemara Bog Complex encompasses a large area of relatively undamaged lowland Atlantic blanket bog of high conservation significance both in Ireland and at a European level. The site also contains good examples of at least 13 other habitats listed on Annex I of the E.U. Habitats Directive, as well as four species listed in Annex II. Further, the site supports a number of threatened and protected plant species. The site is internationally important for Cormorant and nationally important for Greenland White-fronted Goose, and contains nesting sites for Golden Plover.

========================================================================
OSPAR Sites

Under the OSPAR Convention to Protect the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic, Ireland committed to establishing marine protected areas to protect biodiversity (i.e., OSPAR MPAs). No legislation is currently used in Ireland to legally underpin protected areas established to fulfil commitments under international conventions. Therefore, since the creation of OSPAR MPAs would not afford any legal protection to the relevant areas on their own, Ireland (like other OSPAR contracting Parties) established a number of its SACs as OSPAR MPAs for marine habitats.

OSPAR sites in the vicinity of the proposed development include the following,

Galway Bay Complex MPA - CODE O-IE0002969
Kilkerrin Bay and Islands MPA - CODE o-IE0002979.

Is the Minister satisfied that these protected sites will not be negatively affected by the granting of this foreshore lease application, which is not supported by an EIS?

==============================================================

RAMSAR SITE NO. 838. === LOCATION GALWAY BAY. = IRELAND.

Inner Galway Bay. 11/06/96; 11,905 ha; 53°12'N 009°10'W. The shallow sheltered part of a large sea bay with numerous intertidal inlets and small low islands composed of glacial deposits. The area provides important habitat for marine life along Ireland's west coast. The site supports the richest seaweed flora on the Irish Coast (500+ species) and 65% of the Irish marine algal flora occur in the area. The site supports internationally and nationally important numbers of numerous species of waterbirds. There is a large cormorant colony on Teer Island. Human activities include aquaculture. Ramsar site no. 838. Most recent RIS information: 1995.

Has this site been included in any screening exercise to ensure it is not negatively affected by the proposed development, ? If not then the application is flawed, invalid and the foreshore lease application should be rejected by the Minister.

==============================================================

Black Head-Poulsallagh Complex SAC

Site code 000020

Designation Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
Features of Interest
Reefs [1170]
Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]
Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]
Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation [3260]
Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060]
Juniperus communis formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130]
Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210]
Lowland hay meadows (Alopecurus pratensis, Sanguisorba officinalis) [6510]
Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220]
Limestone pavements [8240]
Submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330]
Petalophyllum ralfsii (Petalwort) [1395]

The above SAC site is within 7 km of the proposed site. Can the Minister explain why this site has been screened out of the Application? How can the protected interests including the reefs be screened out? considering its proximity to the proposed development?

Clochar na gCon/Bealacooan Bog Nature Reserve

Location:
Situated in South Connemara, approximately two miles north of Inverin.

GPS:
Latitude: 52.044
Longitude: -8.384

Area (ha.):
1,247

This bog forms part of the greater Connemara Bog Complex. It is a classic and intact example of atlantic or oceanic blanket bog, with a diverse flora which includes a number of scarce plant species and a blanket bog fauna which includes many of Ireland’s and Europe’s more important and threatened species. Actively growing bog is a priority EU habitat. This nature reserve has also been omitted from any environmental reports why?
MAPS

Maps show no humans living in the area,

The maps used in the supporting documents lodged with the application are outdated and obsolete. Map used in the application do not show the current true state of the site location. Private dwellings that have existed for over 30 years are not shown on these maps. Walkways along the coastline are not shown on these maps, Hotels, and other infrastructure are not shown on these maps. Is the Minister satisfied to allow these outdated maps to be used as supporting documents in this application?

LEGAL ISSUES.

• The Galway Bay Cable Project (licence awarded 16th March 2015) was deployed from Spiddal Pier and terminates at the test site. The safe operation of the cable end equipment is dependent on installation of infrastructure under this proposal. This information is included on page 44 of the environmental report submitted by the developer. This clearly demonstrates project splitting. The developer clearly states that the Cable Project end equipment cannot be operated safely, without the installation of infrastructure under this application FS006566. The cable project is interlinked with application FS006566. and is part of the same development. What action does the Minister intend to take regarding this clear case of project splitting, and misinformation. Project Splitting is in breach of the European EIA Directive.

No information is available anywhere in the application regarding the sea station element of this development. The fact that it will contain a diesel generator with diesel storage tanks, Large Industrial Batteries and control panels, should require it to be included in the screening and environmental report, but it is not even mentioned in the report. Why? Is The Minister satisfied to allow this (un screened) sea station with all its diesel fuel, and other pollutants into an area of Galway bay that is protected by the European Water frame work Directive, without knowing the negative environmental effects it might cause? The lack of concern for the environment is unbelievable.

There are many questions the developer has still not answered for us – the day before the consultation period closes. The lack of transparency and levels of 'conflict of interest' in this application are of concern.

The application has many other elements of testing (aquaculture, antifouling agents, Marine Institute Smartbay National Infrastructure Access Programme, etc,) not declared in the application form. This is not transparent and not acceptable. EU money granted before licencing?

MinisterCoveney states in the Dáil the he would like to see Galway Bay continue as a Test Site, this raises serious issues regarding impartiality?

No information is available in the environmental report, or the application form regarding Maximum noise levels expected at the proposed site. The applicant provides details of land based, full scale wind farms and their estimated noise levels. This information is useless with regards to assessing the noise levels of a floating wind mill, located off shore. This land based noise level information should not be admissible as supporting documentation.

I believe this renewable energy site selection is in fact both a project within the meaning of the EIA Directive and a plan/programme within the meaning of the SEA Directive and should therefore be subject to assessment which Complies with the requirements of both Directives.
I call for the SEA Directive to be applied to this ‘development’ as it is part of a national ‘plan’, and not simply a ‘project’ in itself. Consideration of alternative plans need to be presented to the public.

I have been unable to locate the SEA related to this plan/programme and it has not been presented to the public. Is there an SEA with this plan? If so, why is it not available to the public, and if not, why does this national testing plan/programme not comply with the SEA Directive? If an SEA does not exist, this application will need to be refused until it complies with the SEA Directive.

Contrary to the SEA Directive no alternative locations for this Test Site have been assessed or considered for this application. Considering alternatives scenarios is a directive requirement of the SEA process, and not simply a recommended guideline, as stated in the Environmental Report. (pg. 12)

I am calling for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention. I believe that there are reasonable grounds for concern that the nature of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea. I object to this development and I deny consent and ask that no development takes place until all proper environmental assessment are carried out, as per current law, to establish that no possible harm is done to human health or the sensitive marine ecosystem in galway bay.

EIA screening. --Screening information or how the decision made not available to the public, Pollution not declared! Noise and light, Waste not declared, the chemical smartbay testing – aquaculture and antifouling agents not declared. Is the Minister satisfied that this screening meets the Legal Standards required Under Irish and European Law. The EIA screening for an Environmental Impact Statement was carried out by the applicant and not the competent authority, as required by Article 1.(2) of the codified EIA Directive 2011/92/EU.

The applicant has failed to comply with European case law concerning the appropriate tiering relationships between SEA and EIA Directives.


The applicant has failed to consider the Aarhus Convention or sustainable development or comply with the codified EIA Directive 2011/92/EU and the European Union (Environment Impact Assessment ) (planning and Development Act 2000) Regulations 2012 (S.I. 419 OF 2012 both transposed into Irish Law to implement the European Court of justice (ECJ) judgement in case C-50/09.

This proposed Development will industrialise the seascape of Galway Bay and along the entire Galway coastline, It will radically alter the character of the coast and have a significant adverse visual impact on the coastal views and prospects listed for protection in the Galway County Development Plan.

Finally I ask the Minister to give careful consideration to my submission and the serious irregularities I have exposed in application FS006566. I believe that European Laws and Directives have been breached, Irish Laws and Regulations have been breached, that the application is not in compliance with the ECJ judgement in Case C-50/90. European protected sites including (SAC, SPA,NHA ) areas have been omitted from the application and environmental reports which makes the whole application flawed, invalid, and the Legality of the whole application is in doubt !!.
Minister, I do not give my consent to this Foreshore Lease Application (FS006566).

Is mise,

Roinnphost:

I reserve the right to add further information to this submission before 23-59 P.M. on 9/September/ 2016.
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)

Name:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email: Date: 9/9/2016

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 live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. **The Aarhus Convention** is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

- There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.

• None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.

• The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.

• The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.

• Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.

• The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. Location and Environmental Impact. Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!
• Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;
• Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:
• The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- **Galway County Development Plan** - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "..not normally permissible..

- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.

- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.

- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.

- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input:
the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.

- Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
- According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore- this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. **Nature**. There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.

- Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
- The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
- It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. Project Splitting. There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. Unexplained Points. There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.
• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints.
  Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices – again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question
• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. Exclusion Zones. The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. Other Potential Locations. No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application. Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
To: Foreshore Unit, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Road, Wexford

ref: FS 006566
08 September 2016;

Dear Sir or Madam,
I would hereby like to register my objection about this application for the construction of various assortment of machines above and below the water a few hundred meters off the coast at An Spideal.

As a resident in the area I feel so betrayed that the Marine institute are now breaking their commitment to us 10 years ago when they promised that their underwater research would not in any way lead to the construction of significant above water structures - then or in the future. 10 years on we are now looking at this application; the natural progression of the previous project due to all the now installed infrastructure. I have been made a fool of and I feel absolutely disenfranchised by the lack of control we have over our local foreshore.

The application mentions some specific windmill constructions but its also open-ended; allowing for future designs. It’s a bit like getting permission for an 8 storey building in Galway without submitting the plan to the Corporation. It just wouldn’t happen and this application should be judged no differently.

Tra Na Forbacha (Furbo beach) is a special place in South Connemara (or Cois Fharraige as we like to call it). It’s the spot most tourists decide to stop to get their first smell of Connemara air. This is simply because of the convenient situation where the beach car park runs along the main road. If they are on the way to the Aran Islands its their chance to get their first glimpse of the islands. If the proposed assortment of cathedral-high constructions goes ahead it will be directly in line the view of Inis Mean; the central Aran Island and the most visible. I don't think they'll get to focus beyond the metal monster.

I hope a simply objective consideration is possible in this situation by the minister with due consideration for the residents and visitors.

Mise le meas,
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)

Name:  
Seoladh/Address:  
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email:  
Date: 9/9/2016

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 don’t agree with this project because it has violated the public process requirement under the Aarhus Convention, there has been no environmental impact assessment done, Minister Coveney is not impartial as the person who began this whole project, the precautionary principle needs to be invoked according to the UN OSPAR, no other sites were considered, no reference to connecting to the grid was related to us although there was already a grant for same in other applications. We demand openness and fairness.
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 )

Name:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email: Date: 9/9/2016

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 live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. The Aarhus Convention is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

• There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.

- None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
- The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.
- The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.
- Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.
- The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. **Location and Environmental Impact.** Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

- Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;
- Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:
  - The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- **Galway County Development Plan** - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "...not normally permissible."
- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.
- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.
- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.
- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input:
the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.
• Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
• According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore- this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. **Nature.** There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.
• Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
• The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
• It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. **Project Splitting.** There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. **Unexplained Points.** There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.

• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints. Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.

• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.

• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices – again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question

• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. **Exclusion Zones.** The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this
development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as
the final decision-maker?
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: 09/09/2016)

Name:  
Seoladh/Address:  
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email:  
ate: 9/9/2016

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 live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. The Aarhus Convention is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

• There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.

- None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
- The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.
- The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.
- Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.
- The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. **Location and Environmental Impact.** Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

- Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;
- Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:
- The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- **Galway County Development Plan** - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "..not normally permissible..

- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape

- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.

- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.

- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input: the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.

- Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
- According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore- this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. Nature. There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.
- Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
- The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
- It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
- no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
- The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
- Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
- Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. **Project Splitting.** There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) - thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. **Unexplained Points.** There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.

- These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we
don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints.
Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
- Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
- Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices - again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question?
- The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. **Exclusion Zones.** The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
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: 09/09/2016)

Name:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email: Date: 9/9/2016

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 live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. **The Aarhus Convention** is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

   • There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.
• None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
• The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.
• The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.
• Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.
• The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. **Location and Environmental Impact.** Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

- Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;
- Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:
  - The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- **Galway County Development Plan** - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "...not normally permissible.."
- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.
- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.
- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.
- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input:
the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.

- Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
- According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore - this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. **Nature.** There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.

- Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
- The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
- It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. **Project Splitting.** There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. **Unexplained Points.** There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.
• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we
don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints. Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices – again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question
• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. **Exclusion Zones.** The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
To:
Foreshore Unit,
Department of the Environment,
Community and Local Government,
Newtown Road,
Wexford

Concerning: ref:FS 006566

Dear Sirs,
I have to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to upgrade the Marine Institutes research base in Spiddal.

I cannot understand why all the green energy folk descend on the adjoining parishes of Furbo, Spiddal and Inverin. Apparently there are only 6 windfarms in County Galway; 3 of them are in these 3 communities. Furbo has 10 of the largest size windmills in Ireland. So large and domineering that the government has banned such extremely large sizes since. In general we were apprehensive about allowing them into the community but we understood the cause and how each community should do its bit. Now it looks like the people of Furbo and Spiddal are seen as a soft touch and are been taken advantage of. Its just not fair that so many such unsightly green energy projects should be based here.

If the planned Windmill in the sea goes ahead my home will have views of windmills out the front door, out the side door and now out the back door! Where am I supposed to look; I will surely be seeing Windmills in my dreams.

The proposed construction of a 7 storey high windmill in the water is a very sinister development. It endangers our tourist industry. Nobody comes to Connemara seeking heavy industry. But that’s exactly what they'll inevitably be looking at; because everybody who visits the area looks out over the water. This site will become known for its hideous construction in the water. How are we supposed to get tourists to return?

And while I'm talking about tourists I cannot find any opinion by any tourist authority on this matter. Also no assessment of the implications for our wildlife. What about our precious winter migratory birds. The windmill on the water is planned to be directly on the landing path of wintering birds that inhabit Furbo and Rusheen Bay (a designated bird sanctuary). Has anyone considered the implication for our Brent Geese, Redshanks, Greenshanks, Terns, Great Northern Divers, Shags, Cormorants, and Gannets. I can't find the Environment Impact Assessment in the application bundle. But I hope the minister will find it and read it carefully.

I'm all for "green". I am concerned about rising sea levels in particular. I could even tolerate windmills on the water for short periods (e.g. 3 winter months every 2nd year). But if the lease is granted I fear it will take all control out of local peoples hands and possibly out of the ministers hands as private enterprise roles in and sets up their concoctions on the water.
Anything set up on our foreshore needs to be considered for what it is before we can accept it. How can I accept something that hasn't even been dream't up yet?

Don't sign away our future and our rights.

Yours faithfully,
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: 09/09/2016)

Name:  
Seoladh/Address:  
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email:  
Date: 9/9/2016

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 live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. The Aarhus Convention is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

   • There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.
• None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
• The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.
• The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.
• Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.
• The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. **Location and Environmental Impact.** Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

- Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;
- Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:
  - The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- Galway County Development Plan - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "..not normally permissible."
- Wild Atlantic Way - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doonies, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.
- Special Areas of Conservation - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.
- Special Protection Areas - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.
- National Parks - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input:
the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are
deeptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.
• Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
• According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore- this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. **Nature.** There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.
• Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
• The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
• It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper environmental assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and contains inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible significant effects on the environment cannot have been SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE & LIGHT are but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be ‘localised’ on WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. Project Splitting. There are three planning applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project that includes the cable and shore station?

6. Unexplained Points. There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.
• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we
don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints. Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices - again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question
• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. **Exclusion Zones.** The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
I live on the beautiful Galway Bay Coast. I am sickened the more information that we discover about this project. How dare the Marine Institute try to pull the wool over our eyes. Wake up and serve the people and country you are meant to.

1. **The Aarhus Convention** is a law that requires the government to encourage meaningful public participation in decision-making for environmental development such as that being proposed for Galway Bay. In this case, we believe this burden has not been met for many reasons, including the following:

   • There was no meaningful notification of the public meetings. The notifications that were given were vague as to what was involved. Locals that live beside the development were not directly notified. Tourism and environmental groups were not notified, nor were they asked to make an observation.
regarding the development. Not all of the stakeholders, for example, Bird Watch Ireland have made their submissions to date so we do not know what their opinions are.

- None of the information was initially available in the Irish language despite the development being located in the Gaeltacht.
- The locations where information was available is not normally accessed by interested parties - the Garda Station in Salthill, the Spiddal and Galway Public Library. At no time were there posters, leaflets, flyers, etc. distributed to local homes, schools, shops, restaurants, GAA clubs, etc. The Spiddal Library is only open part-time and the other 2 locations are located in Galway which require transport.
- The Convention requires public participation in decision-making regarding such issues but at no point in this process were the public asked to participate, rather they were simply fed particular information that did not give the whole picture of what was involved. The government has not been straightforward and has misled the public at the meetings that they did hold, implying that there was only going to be one wind turbine in the bay when, in fact, there will be up to four varying devices on the bay at any time.
- Photomontages are misleading and inaccurate – they do not show the extent of the development for the public to consider – one mere wind turbine was shown in the Bay from a distance on a misty day with no clear view out the Bay - no vision of what the sea station or other potential devices may look like.
- The application was submitted on February 11th, 2016. Yet, the first newspaper notice wasn't until the middle of May, 2016, over 3 months later, with just about a month to make a submission. The applications involved in this process are
extremely lengthy and technical and the timeline was unfair and harsh. After the first public meeting in June that the public were aware of, the deadline was extended to July 1st, 2016 and later extended to August, 2016. It took until July 21st, 2016 for another meeting where a significant number of people attended. The meeting was cut short before people were finished asking questions and the Marine Institute refused to hold another public meeting. The deadline was extended to September 9th, 2016. The Marine Institute only allowed people to come to their location to have a meeting and only in groups of 3 people thereafter. This is not open, meaningful public consultation. The screening report was only uploaded on August 22nd, 2016, yet we are supposed to review this within 2 weeks!

2. **Location and Environmental Impact.** Galway Bay is located within several significant environmental and tourist regions that should be carefully used and not spoiled by development. The Marine Institute was not required to get an independent environmental impact statement done because the government stated it was not required. Therefore, they did not do it!

• Call for The Precautionary Principle to be invoked, as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention: there are reasonable grounds for concern that the activities of this project may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities and interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea;

• Possible risks mentioned in the environmental study done for this application:

• The risk to seals and other mammals colliding with devices on site
causing injury or death
• No assessment of turbines and other devices under water.
• Is the Minister satisfied that the impact of ‘yet to be invented’ devices can be assessed.
• The test site surrounded by natural areas of special conservation; areas not declared in application (PG 22), how could the effects on the environment have been assessed.
• There is no mention of the impact the turbines & base trellises will have on the birds – Annex 1 Merlin is on this flightpath.
• Is the Grid connected? Conflicting information from the Minister and the developer. The Minister says the project is to be grid-connected, but the Marine Institute say it is not. The application before this for underwater cables also said it would be grid-connected.
• Failure to declare and to assess other developments in the Bay, as required by law – port development in Galway City has gone through planning stage – but this wasn’t acknowledged in the application documents. Other harbour developments were excluded – for example, Rossaveal. By law, the cumulative effects of ALL projects need to be assessed.
• The project involves a generator, therefore, how can the development produce ‘no waste’ (pg21 screening report)
• The Burren - this is a UNESCO Geopark and is located approximately 6 miles from the potential Galway Bay testing site.
• The Connemara landscape is one of the principal tourism assets in
County Galway. As you look across Galway Bay, you will now see many different devices and a permanent sea station and markers. And from County Clare, you will also see it as you look out towards Galway.

- **Galway County Development Plan** - the site is contrary to the plan. It is clearly visible on the Galway County Scenic Route from Barna to Baile an tSléibhe and the Galway County Protected Focal Points and Views. The site is located in an area of high sensitivity where development is curtailed and where wind farm development is "..not normally permissible..

- **Wild Atlantic Way** - this area is advertised as the "Coast Road into the Heart of the Gaeltacht" and contains 14 major Discovery Points along the route including Carraroe, Ros a Mhíl, Spiddal, Barna, Salthill, Inis Mór, Inis Siar, Inis Meain and Renville Park in Galway and Doorus, Flaggy Shore, Ballyvaughan, Murrooghtoohy and Doolin. The Beaches to explore on the Wild Atlantic Way include Carraroe, Inverin, Barna, Salthill, Kinvara, Inis Siar and Inis Mór. The three Aran Islands in the Bay are recommended to visit. Of course, one of the biggest natural landscapes in Ireland is located in Clare in the Burren which is a UNESCO Geopark, affording it international status as a valuable natural landscape.

- **Special Areas of Conservation** - the site is located next to several designated areas of conservation including in Galway Bay itself, many within the Burren and, of course, the Aran Islands.

- **Special Protection Areas** - the site is located next to several designated special protection areas including inner Galway Bay, Connemara Bog Complex, Inis Mór and the Cliffs of Moher.

- **National Parks** - the site is within 6 miles of the Burren National Park.
• National Heritage Areas - the site is near designated national heritage areas including Moycullen Bogs and Cregganna Marsh.
• Noise Pollution - this has not been adequately assessed.

Public Input:
the public have never been meaningfully consulted with regards the development of the Galway Bay site in the past or for the future.

3. **Size.** The project size is not being truly portrayed in its totality

• Project Splitting. The project has been split into many elements. There was a separate cable installation, separate site application, separate onshore application, thereby appearing somewhat less relevant to stakeholders. A larger project may have required a more serious environmental assessment. What is the potential environmental damage? We will not know since an independent environmental assessment was not required.
• There are many suggestions of future expansion in the current and past applications which we have not had time to investigate. The upgrades and expansion referred to suggest a much larger sized project which has not been disclosed.
• The site application refers to possible pile-driving into the sea bed.
• Some of the devices in the application are only possible as nearshore devices suggesting the expansion into the nearshore.
• The application has a catch-all clause that allows future devices that have not been invented yet.
• The photo montage and other photos used in the
application are
deceptive and do not show all of the possible infrastructure. The photo montage does not even show County Clare in the frame. The public cannot visualise the actual project.
• Incorrect and dated maps – looks like no humans or animals live near the site!
• According to Sustainable Energy, there should be no generating devices allowed within a 5km distance from the shore – this proposed test site is 1.2km from shore - this is NOT a suitable location for this development.

4. **Nature.** There is a need to call for the Precautionary Principle to be invoked as set down by the UN OSPAR Convention.
• Ireland is a signatory to the UN OSPAR Convention which is a grouping of many concerned countries to environmentally protect the Atlantic Ocean.
• The precautionary principle states that "...preventive measures are to be taken when there are reasonable grounds for concern that human activities may bring about hazards to human health, harm living resources and marine ecosystems, damage amenities or interfere with other legitimate uses of the sea, even when there is no conclusive evidence of a causal relationship. A lack of full scientific evidence must not postpone action to protect the marine environment. The principle anticipates that delaying action would in the longer term prove more costly to society and nature and would compromise the needs of future generations."
• It is vital that the government stop and consider the potential damage from this site into Galway Bay and the surrounding areas.
This is their obligation according to international law.
• no development should take place until all the proper
  environmental
  assessments are carried out, as per current law, to establish
  that NO possible harm is done to human health or to the
  sensitive marine ecosystem in Galway Bay.
• The screening application for the EIA is incomplete and
  contains
  inaccurate and misleading information, thus, possible
  significant effects on the environment cannot have been
  SCREENED properly.
• Pg. 21 states that no pollutants will be generated – NOISE
  & LIGHT are
  but some examples of pollutants produced at site that have
  not been screened at the site and have SIGNIFICANT
  effects on health & safety
• Could the Minister explain how ‘accidents’ could be
  ‘localised’ on
  WATER in a marine environment; e.g. oil/chemical spill?

5. Project Splitting. There are three planning
applications for this one site (Foreshore Cable License
FS005751 / Onshore Station Galway County Council Planning
Ref 13/947 and the current application)

Split applications means that the size of the project is not
apparent to stakeholders and has serious implications in
terms of the environmental assessments necessary (larger
projects entail more rigorous assessment which was not
done for this application) – thus the environment is at risk of
potential damage. Shouldn't this be assessed as one project
that includes the cable and shore station?

6. Unexplained Points. There are many things in the
application that are broadly defined meaning we cannot possibly understand what is involved.
• These include suggestions of expansion in various reports which we don’t have time to investigate, due to time constraints. Upgrading and expansion references suggest a larger size than that disclosed.
• Suggestions in application to "piling into the seabed" suggest further expansion; piling has not assessed.
• Some devices included in the application are nearshore devices – again suggesting size expansion; how do these relate to the site in question
• The Application includes every possible device, even devices “to be invented yet” (Environmental Report) - currently there is only one device at 4m allowed).

7. **Exclusion Zones.** The Marine Institute stated they are not looking for an exclusion zone around the site, however, at a later meeting, they confirmed that they actually have no control over this area as it is not for them to decide. So, they have simply not checked whether there will be an exclusion zone because they don't have to!

8. **Other Potential Locations.** No other locations were considered anywhere in Ireland for this project, as confirmed by the Marine Institute.

9. **Impartiality of Minister Coveney to Make A Final Decision on this Application.** Minister Coveney initialised this entire plan with the EU and various Irish entities and
has repeatedly publicly declared his full support for this development. How can the Minister claim he is impartial as the final decision-maker?
Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and I wish to raise the following observations:

Noise - It appears that noise has not been assessed adequately in this application. In particular there is no reference to noise generated by wind turbines which will be tested on site. Wind turbines generate low frequency noise and infrasound, both of which are proving controversial in the wind turbine industry. There is an abundance of research on such noise as the wind generation industry matures, and much of the research points to the negative impact that this noise has on residents who live close to wind turbines, i.e. within a couple of kilometres.

Visual - Whilst there is much detail in the available documentation I am of the view that the proposed development will have a more significant visual impact. The photomontages presented do not accurately portray the visual impact of the test equipment on site. The current markers setting out the site are clearly visible at numerous locations on the R336 road and when larger and higher elevation equipment is in situ this will be clearly visible, thereby visually polluting the natural view that is currently available of Galway bay, the Clare hills and the Aran Islands.

The public consultation process - Despite there being much information available on the proposed site and several public meetings with the Marine Institute there remains significant mistrust amongst some of the local community on this matter. It appears that many are still not clear on what the proposal entails, the environmental impact and how it will affect their community and tourism. The information available is incomplete in some aspects, has proven unwieldy when trying to navigate same and as much of it is on-line this may not be available to all.

I would ask that prior to any decision being made on this proposal that a more complete impact assessment be carried out and that a more concise, accurate and reader friendly consultation document be published. In doing so the public will have a clearer picture of what the proposal entails and then can make informed decisions on the matter. I believe that the development of a test site is important nationally and internationally from an environmental and economic perspective. However such a test site needs the upmost care when considering its location so that it does not negatively impact local citizens and the environment.

You might acknowledge my submission.

Best regards,
Marine Institute – Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Energy Test Site
Assessment of Application for Foreshore Lease

Introduction

Coastal Concern Alliance (CCA) is an independent citizens’ group set up in 2006 to campaign for reform of the Foreshore Act 1933 and the introduction of a democratic system of planning for our marine and coastal areas to ensure that our coastal environment is protected for future generations. CCA is a community group with no political affiliations. The impetus for the setting up of our group was the inappropriate manner in which developers were awarded valuable foreshore leases for construction of the biggest offshore wind farms in the world close to the East coast under outdated legislation during the Celtic Tiger era without any public tender, policy for offshore wind, proper environmental assessment, stakeholder engagement or cost/benefit analysis.

We have been calling on government to review and update coastal zone management since our foundation and have made detailed submissions to over a dozen pertinent public consultations over the past ten years. These submissions are available on our website at www.coastaconcern.ie. In the ten years since our foundation the concerns we have raised about the impact of inappropriately sited offshore wind farms on marine wildlife and landscapes have become mainstream. Throughout the EU, Governments are addressing this issue and have reformed legislation and regulation to take account of public concerns.

Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Test Site

It is clear from the current controversy over the Galway Bay test site that an outdated and undemocratic permitting system is still being used to permit developments offshore which could have damaging consequences for our coastal zone. While the Marine Institute’s proposed test site in Galway Bay is of a different scale to the large scale offshore wind developments permitted and progressed off the East coast, the concerns expressed by our group relating to inappropriate governance in our coastal zone apply equally to this case.

We object to the awarding of a Foreshore lease for the Galway Bay Marine and Renewable Test Site due to Ireland’s inadequate marine governance and consent process. Specifically:

- The outdated and undemocratic nature of the legislation governing the awarding of foreshore leases in Irish waters (The Foreshore Act 1933) which confers sole authority on the Minister to award foreshore leases for construction in Irish waters with no statutory involvement of local authorities and no right of appeal against the Ministers decision.
The absence of an affordable public right of appeal contrary to the Aarhus Convention.

The fact that large tracts of our sensitive inshore zone (including the test site in Galway Bay) have been leased to developers for construction in the absence of any marine spatial planning or integrated coastal zone management.

The lack of importance and value attached to the conservation and protection of the coastal landscape and seascape of Galway Bay, a vital part of Ireland’s natural heritage. The test site development is to be located 2km off the Galway coast. This is much closer to shore than the other EU funded FORSEA test site for floating wind turbines i.e. Sem Rev in Nantes, France which is over 12km from shore.

The lack of independent, professional assessment of visual impact of the proposed development (which includes the introduction of wind turbines 2km off the Galway coast). Galway County Council has no statutory role in assessing the visual impact of the proposed development on shoreline views and prospects listed for protection in the County Development Plan. Their submitted comments relate solely to water quality.

The application will be assessed by the Marine License Vetting Committee which is chaired by the Marine Institute and has no independent landscape professional as a member.

The absence of a democratically agreed Marine Policy Statement setting out policy for the marine which could provide the context for coastal conservation and development.

The Offshore Renewable Development Plan drafted in 2010 and adopted in 2014 is clearly developer-led and is due for review in 2017. It cannot be viewed as providing a democratic rationale for this development.

Coastal Concern Alliance
9 September 2016

93 Georges Street Lower,
Dun Laoghaire
Co. Dublin

costalconcern@gmail.com
To whom it may concern,
I wish to object to the above mentioned application. Galway bay and in particular the coastal area around Spiddal is an area of great natural beauty and one of the highlights of the Wild Atlantic Way. I do not think the beautiful scenery in should be marred by the proposed development.

Yours,
From: 
Sent: 09 September 2016 17:59 
To: foreshore; foreshore@housing.ie 
Subject: FORESHORE LEASE APPLICATION FS 0006566 

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: 

Guth/En /Tel/rómhphost /email Data: 9/9/2016

Please confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

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:

Not available on line as Gaeilge as requested on June 23th - until the 30th

The Connemara landscape is one of the principal assets for tourism in County Galway. The proposed Site location would be a blot on Galway Bay’s ICONIC Landscape – The Burren (idyllic – Auginish Island and castle / Black Head Lighthouse) across the bay; this proposed development on this SITE is COMPELEATLY out of character for the area;

APPLICATION is incomplete – information not available to public – still awaiting replies from those to comment on the project … misleading information on the application (exclusion zone and connection to the grid questions remain unclear to the public – conflicting information given at meetings).

The application does not include a report on the effect such a project would have on the Tourist industry, or the Peoples Health.

Local people have not been consulted

The project will damage our iconic landscape, and our Heritage.

No EIS Report available to assess the negative aspects of the project , which is totally unacceptable in 2016. How can i assess the project without the information that would be contained in the EIS report that is unavailable.

I refuse my consent for this application and ask the Minister to reject it for the reasons mentioned above.

What about my rights as a European Citizen under the Aarhus Convention?
From:
Sent: 09 September 2016 18:16
To: foreshore
Subject: FORESHORE LEASE NO . FS006566

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: ____________________________
Guth/En /Tel/romhphost /email __________ Data: 9/9/2016

Please confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

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:

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Why is the current application split into three smaller projects? I believe this puts the protected environment at risk and that the cumulative effects of this development has not been assessed as required by law. Furthermore, the cumulative effects of other development in Galway Bay (e.g. Docks Development, Rossaveal Harbour Development and others) have not been considered.

The issue of grid connection is still unclear

Is the Minister satisfied that the ‘whole development’ – Galway Bay Test Site / Cable Project – has been appropriately assessed according to various current environmental laws relating to a grid connected development?

I call for the SEA Directive to be applied to this ‘development’ as it is part of a national ‘plan’, and not simply a ‘project’ in itself. Consideration of alternative plans need to be presented to the public.

The application has many other elements of testing (aquaculture, antifouling agents, Marine Institute Smartbay National Infrastructure Access Programme, etc.) not declared in the application form. This is not transparent and not acceptable

I refuse my consent for this application and ask the Minister to reject it for the reasons mentioned above.

What about my rights as a European Citizen under the Aarhus Convention?
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.

Please confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

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:

. Is the Minister satisfied that the ‘project’ has been appropriately assessed as required by various EU legislation?

  I was never contacted to be informed of the application or its implications for the local environment, either by telephone, letter, email, etc.
  There is no support for this development in the local area.

  I strongly object to this application on the grounds stated above
From: 
Sent: 09 September 2016 21:58 
To: foreshore

A chara,

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application FS006566 and I strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

-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.

- Galway Bay is on one of the most scenic coastline in Ireland and it will be destroyed if such a development will be allowed to go ahead.

Mise le Meas,

Sent from my iPhone
To: foreshore

Subject: Foreshore Lease Application – FS006566

Tag/Re: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” – FS006566


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

Cinntigh le riomh phost go bhfuarthas mo aighneacht aonair, ag dOanamhagairt don ainm thios le do thoil.

Please confirm by email, receipt of this individual submission referencing the name below.

Aimn:

A chara,

Tagram d on iarratas lOasthuas, Foreshore Lease Application FS006566 agus tAE m@o l/Eidiria choinne. TÆ m@ agid ar na point a lOirtar thos:

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application FS006566 and I strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. The application includes a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). In the VIA there are references to the rules for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of which VIA is normally a part. These references are misleading because in this case no EIA has been conducted. Furthermore the actual VIA carried is deeply flawed in a number of ways:
   1.1. A key part of the VIA is the analysis of visual receptor sensitivity which is summarised in table 11-5 on p. 178. This values presented in this table do not make any sense and are not plausible.
1.1.1. For viewpoint 3 the primary views from residences is given a low score, lower than the score from viewpoints 2, 4, and 5. This makes no sense. Our residence is at VP3, as are several others in Pairc Thiar, and the impact on our view of this structure is very high much higher than in other parts of Spiddal because we are closest to the proposed structures and at the most similar level. Therefore this row of the matrix is nonsensical.

1.1.2. The matrix also includes a row “Presence of striking or noteworthy features” and is all scored “Moderate”, with one “Low” score. This makes no sense. The dominating feature of this seascape is the opposite shore, the Burren. This is a UNESCO designated area and is unique in Ireland (possibly Europe) for its natural, uninhabitated, bluestone based visual impact. The correct designation across this entire row is the highest, “Strong”.

1.1.3. Another row is “Degree of perceived naturalness”. The main feature of the entire view (the Burren hillside) is that it is so uninhabited, so natural, particularly in comparison to the position of the viewer, on the Connemara shore which is densely populated. Striking feature of the evening view is the complete absence of manmade light. The proposed structure will severely impact into this view as it is entirely artificial and will be continuously lit up especially at night. In the VIA this row is scored four “Mild” and one “Moderate” an overall low score.

The proper score for the entire row is “Strong”, the highest score.

This entire summary table (11-5, p.178) is completely implausible and looks as if scores were kept as low as possible so as to ensure the proposed structures are allowed.

1.2. The VIA consists of five chosen shore-points looking on to the proposed development. The shore-point closest to the proposed structure is VP3. This viewpoint is also closest to our residence and the centre of our village, Páirc Thiar. Thus we are very familiar with this particular view. At this viewpoint the main view is of the empty Galway Bay and the uninhabited Burren hillside on the other side. The proposed structures will insert a large square of metal structures and occasionally a wind turbine directly into the middle of this view, actually blocking out the Black head lighthouse. The VIA of this viewpoint concludes (p.182) that the magnitude of the seascape impact of the proposed structures at this viewpoint is “Low”, the fourth lowest of five impacts on the impact scale. But looking at the scale of impacts provided (p. 173) the proposed structures clearly matches the descriptors used for a ‘Medium’ impact. If the VIA applied this Medium impact (as it should) the final conclusion would be totally changed: the overall significance of the proposed structures would be “Substantial” and not “Moderate-Slight” (in accordance with the Seascape Impact Significance Matrix on p.174. This result would lead a reader of the VIA to reject the proposed structures. There is no clear justification in the VIA explaining why the authors chose the ‘Low’ instead of the ‘Medium’ classification. It seems to be that the classification were chosen simply to arrive at a desired result.

In summary, the Visual Impact Assessment is not plausible. The low scores assigned have no rationale provided and higher score would result in the entire proposed structure being rejected as having a very high visual impact. For these reasons I do not consent to the application.

2. The proposed structure contravenes the Galway County Council development plan:
2.1. No windmills are allowed in this area in the GCC plan
2.2. The structures would be seen from a ‘protected view’
2.3. The structures would be seen from a designated scenic route

3. Noise and Light are pollutants. The test site will generate noise and light (particularly at night). My residence is one of the closest to the test site and the map provided in the application showing nearby residence does not even include my house so I am certain that the impact on nearby residences has not been accurately assessed. Furthermore the application does not include an assessment of the health impacts of any noise and light pollution on nearby residences. On that basis I object to the application.

4. I have not been presented with information on what the project will actually look or sound like, day or night. Visual Data presented in this regard was misleading and has not yet been corrected by the developer, who cannot, to date, identify a local ‘coastal track’ from where the visual data was collected. I have lived in the area for 10 years, and have no knowledge of this track.

Minister, I do not give my consent to this Foreshore Lease Application (FS006566).

Is mise,

Rhost:
From: foreshore
Sent: 09 September 2016 22:30
To: foreshore
Subject: Foreshore Lease Application – FS006566

Tag/Re: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station” – FS006566


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

Cinntigh le riomh phost go bhfuarthas mo aighneacht aonair, ag dOanamhtagairt don ainm thios le do thoil.

Please confirm by email, receipt of this individual submission referencing the name below.

Ainm:

A chara,

Tagram d on iarratas lOaisthuas, Foreshore Lease Application FS006566 agus t/E mO l/Eidir a choinne. T/E mO aggh ar na point a lOirtear thos:

I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application FS006566 and I strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. I have not been presented with information on what the project will actually look or sound like, day or night. Visual Data presented in this regard was misleading and has not yet been corrected by the developer, who cannot, to date, identify a local ‘coastal track’ from where the visual data was collected. I have lived in the area for 10 years, and have no knowledge of this track.

2. The application includes a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). In the VIA there are references to the rules for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of which VIA is
normally a part. These references are misleading because in this case no EIA has been conducted. Furthermore the actual VIA carried is deeply flawed in a number of ways:

2.1. The VIA consists of five chosen shore-points looking on to the proposed development. The shore-point closest to the proposed structure is VP3. This viewpoint is also closest to our residence and the centre of our village, Páirc Thiar. Thus we are very familiar with this particular view. At this viewpoint the main view is of the empty Galway Bay and the uninhabited Burren hillside on the other side. The proposed structures will insert a large square of metal structures and occasionally a wind turbine directly into the middle of this view, actually blocking out the Black head lighthouse. The VIA of this viewpoint concludes (p.182) that the magnitude of the seascape impact of the proposed structures at this viewpoint is “Low”, the fourth lowest of five impacts on the impact scale. But looking at the scale of impacts provided (p. 173) the proposed structures clearly matches the descriptors used for a ‘Medium’ impact. If the VIA applied this Medium impact (as it should) the final conclusion would be totally changed: the overall significance of the proposed structures would be “Substantial” and not “Moderate-Slight” (in accordance with the Seascape Impact Significance Matrix on p.174. This result would lead a reader of the VIA to reject the proposed structures. There is no clear justification in the VIA explaining why the authors chose the ‘Low’ instead of the ‘Medium’ classification. It seems to be that the classification were chosen simply to arrive at a desired result.

2.2. A key part of the VIA is the analysis of visual receptor sensitivity which is summarised in table 11-5 on p. 178. This values presented in this table do not make any sense and are not plausible.

2.2.1. For viewpoint 3 the primary views from residences is given a low score, lower than the score from viewpoints 2, 4, and 5. This makes no sense. Our residence is at VP3, as are several others in Pairc Thiar, and the impact on our view of this structure is very high much higher than in other parts of Spiddal because we are closest to the proposed structures and at the most similar level. Therefor this row of the matrix is nonsenseical.

2.2.2. The matrix also includes a row “Presence of striking or noteworthy features” and is all scored “Moderate”, with one “Low” score. This makes no sense. The dominating feature of this seascape is the opposite shore, the Burren. This is a UNESCO designated area and is unique in Ireland (possibly Europe) for its natural, uninhabitated, bluestone based visual impact. The correct designation across this entire row is the highest, “Strong”.

2.2.3. Another row is “Degree of perceived naturalness”. The main feature of the entire view (the Burren hillside) is that it is so uninhabited, so natural, particularly in comparison to the position of the viewer, on the Connemara shore which is densely populated. Striking feature of the evening view is the complete absence of manmade light. The proposed structure will severely impact into this view as it is entirely artificial and will be continuously lit up especially at night. In the VIA this row is scored four “Mild” and one “Moderate” an overall low score. The proper score for the entire row is “Strong”, the highest score.

This entire summary table (11-5, p.178) is completely implausible and looks as if scores were kept as low as possible so as to ensure the proposed structures are allowed.
In summary, the Visual Impact Assessment is not plausible. The low scores assigned have no rationale provided and higher score would result in the entire proposed structure being rejected as having a very high visual impact. For these reasons I do not consent to the application.

3. The proposed structure contravenes the Galway County Council development plan:
   3.1. No windmills are allowed in this area in the GCC plan
   3.2. The structures would be seen from a ‘protected view’
   3.3. The structures would be seen from a designated scenic route

4. The application is to extend/renew the lease of an existing test site. The status of the Test Site at its present location is questionable – the process by which the original lease for the site was obtained in 2006 was much less rigorous than the current inadequate process. Can the Minister explain why there was no environmental impact assessment for the original lease and how this impacts on the current application for an extension?

5. Noise and Light are pollutants. The test site will generate noise and light (particularly at night). My residence is one of the closest to the test site and the map provided in the application showing nearby residence does not even include my house so I am certain that the impact on nearby residences has not been accurately assessed. Furthermore the application does not include an assessment of the health impacts of any noise and light pollution on nearby residences. On that basis I object to the application.

Minister, I do not give my consent to this Foreshore Lease Application (FS006566).

Is mise,
Re: Submission FS006566: "Application for a Foreshore Lease for the Construction of an Offshore Electricity Generating Station"

From:
Riomhphost/email:

Introduction

FS006566 is an application for a thirty five year Foreshore Lease for testing wind, wave and tidal ocean energy devices on Galway Bay. The Marine institute was granted a Lease in 2006 for “the purpose of testing wave energy devices and no other purpose whatsoever”. FS006611 extended this lease to March 2017, under the same conditions, without any public consultation whatsoever. Not included in the application is the intended use of the Lease under the Marine Institute Smartbay National Infrastructure Programme. However, while considering this application we discovered that applicants for NIAP funding can apply to Smartbay Ireland Ltd. (not for profit) to test in Galway Bay in relation to Aquaculture, Bio-Chemistry and Novel Marine Technologies such as antifouling coatings and more. Aquaculture is a particularly worrying issue given the salmonid rivers that flow into Galway Bay. Copper antifouling coatings have already been tested at the site under the NIAP. There is published research from 2013.
We strongly object to the granting of this application as the NIAP research use of the Lease and the intention to expand the user base of the site under the NIAP to include academics, small to medium enterprises (SMEs) and multinational companies (MNCs) nationally, and internationally has not been part of the public consultation process and the public do not know what information regarding this use of the Lease, if granted, was supplied to the external bodies consulted.

We strongly object to the granting of this application because we have learned from various publications and state body websites, that the subsea observatory and cable end equipment included in the current application FS006566, are already in place and operative. What trust can the public have in the Developers as regards the use of Galway Bay, now and for the next 35 years?

It is evident from the above that the application contains misleading information, and the full nature and extent of the proposed project has not been identified in the application put before the public.

We strongly object to the granting of this lease as the Developers’ application states that the lease sought is to be as broad as possible to allow the testing of as yet “uninvented” devices? What are the implications of such a broad lease being granted for the Natura 2000 Habitats and species in the marine environment of Galway Bay for the next 35 years?

We believe that Application FS006566 is part of a larger project including FS005751 and Galway County Council Application 13/947, already funded and installed. How are these applications separate when none appear to be independently viable and all the applications reference the others as part of an overall plan? How are the public to believe that all options are all open when 2/3 of the project is already in place and SEAI has already funded developers of Ocean Energy Devices to test in Galway Bay? Are all options open to the public or is this a ‘pro forma’ decision?

Public Consultation

We strongly object to the granting of this application as the process of public consultation and provision of information regarding the above application has fallen far short of that required by the Aarhus Convention and experienced by citizens of other EU countries.

The Developers, The Marine Institute and SEAI, say they have held three public meetings, produced a bilingual frequently asked questions Leaflet after the second of these meetings, and offered to meet with members of the public in groups of no more than three, by appointment,
with names and questions submitted in advance, at their headquarters in Oranmore, after the third meeting. Their website also states that “some participants requested more time to allow informed public submissions” after the third meeting, so Minister Coveney extended the period of consultation from 2/8/16 to 9/9/16.

The above is disingenuous in the extreme. The public consultation process from the point of view of the community living closest to this development is very different, as outlined below.

1. The first meeting 19/01/16 in Spiddal, was not advertised to any noticeable extent; local Public Representatives were neither informed nor invited, nor were those most local to the development. The flyers announcing the meeting did not draw attention to the fact that the developers were applying for a thirty five year Foreshore Lease and were planning what amounts to an industrial development in Galway Bay. The flyers announced a public information evening, Galway Bay Marine Renewable Energy Test Site, with speakers from the Marine Institute, SEAI and Smartbay Ireland. If a person had chanced to see a flyer, there was nothing to tell them that the meeting was anything other than a talk or presentation, a lecture perhaps of interest to a specialist audience, rather than something that will directly impact on them, their family, their home, their community and their country, for the next 35 years.

2. The Developers held their second meeting on 14/6/16. The flyers were the same as for the first meeting, no mention of the application or of consultation. This was mentioned on Radio na Gaeltachta on 13/6/16 and people spread the word to their neighbours, others ran house to house, alerting the community, hence this meeting was better attended than the first. No Public Representatives knew of the meeting, the Dáil sits on Tuesdays. No Local Councillors seemed to know anything of the project. I now know that the Developers had submitted an application in February and then another revised version in April.

3. The Developers criticised as “rumours” talk of 60m high turbines (the “rumour” was a fact from their February Application), presented information about their work as if the meeting were a marketing talk at a conference rather than a consultation with the public about what might be done and why. There was little information on the substance of the application; questions about light, noise and Smartbay Ireland Ltd were not answered. The closing date for public submissions was three days away on 17/6/16 and the Developers were unable to tell the public how, or to whom to make a submission. I now know that the public consultation period had started on the 19/06/16, why did the Developers wait until the consultation period was almost over to hold this meeting?
4. As a result of the above the public contacted their public representatives, and on 16/06/16, the need to extend the consultation period was highlighted in the Dáil and an extension was granted to 01/07/16.

5. Local people then began to realise the extent of the sea of paper to be read, not just in this application but in related applications they discovered, FS005751, and Galway County Council Application 13/947, and the amount of additional research that would be required to understand and assess it, in order to be able to make informed submissions.

6. Therefore, the public asked their Elected Representatives to ask Minister Coveney for an extension of time and the matter was raised in the Dáil and in writing to the Minister. An extension was granted until 02/8/16, though the Minister did state that he would like to see Galway Bay continue as a test bed into the future. (Oirechtas.ie.)

7. At this point, going through the available documents in the application, the public realised that there was nothing in the application to show them what the project would actually look like or sound like, and myriad other questions for which the documentation did not provide answers.

8. Therefore, the public asked for a Public Meeting with the Developers that their Elected Representatives could also attend; this was initially refused by the Developers and only granted after written representations to the Developers by the public and their representatives.

9. This third meeting was held on 21/07/16, the meeting was very well attended by the public and seven of their elected representatives. The first part of the meeting was a presentation by the Marine Institute and SEAI followed by questions from the public. Many questions asked were not answered, even when asked several times, for example, regarding Smartbay Ireland Ltd (not for profit) and its Directors. We were told the project was not Grid connected, but the Minister had previously stated in an email, that it was grid connected. The Developers admitted that noise levels had been considered by a desk top study that referred to studies of noise at wind farms on land. The meeting was brought to a close by the Chair before all those present had received answers to their questions or had had an opportunity to ask them.
10. Therefore, all the public representatives at the meeting, of all parties and none, recognised and supported the need for an extension of time as people still had legitimate questions to ask that had not been answered by the Developers. The next **eleven days** were spent by the public and their elected representatives, frantically trying to get an extension of time, or, at the very, least an answer as to whether one would be granted or not. At the same time they were trying to get to grips with the application and formulate a submission. This was unimaginably stressful for the public, and this situation continued without a word from Minister Coveney.

11. An elected representative rang a member of the public on the day of the deadline, 02/08/16, to say an extension was probably going to be granted but wouldn’t confirm this in writing. Not until around noon that day did the Minister, publicly announce an extension of time, to 09/09/16. Is that a respectful way in which to treat the public or their local representatives?

12. The meeting of the 21st of July coincided with the start of the Dáil Summer Recess ending on the 27/9/16. The public had asked for an extension of time into this new Dáil term so that they would have access to their public representatives and a forum where their representatives could ask questions on their behalf at national level. We believe this was unreasonably denied by the Minister, as the meeting above had raised serious questions about the project and its impact on the environment, and highlighted the lack of reliable, accurate and objective information available to the public.

13. The defective public consultation outlined above was also further flawed by being minimised as an issue impacting on the people of a relatively small geographic area by excluding the wider communities of Galway and Clare who will also be impacted by this project, as will the country as a whole.

2. Access to Information.
1. Throughout the public consultation period detailed above it has been extremely difficult to get unambiguous, accurate and specific information about the project. Documents have been drip fed to the public, made publicly available only when asked for, for example, the EIA Screening Report, complete with Appendices, was only made available online on the 30/08/16.

2. Minister Coveney said in the Dáil that the public have had the same amount of time to consider this application as they would have had if the application had an EIS. Time alone does not constitute consultation. If the public had adequate site specific information provided in this application, as would be the case if DECLG had decided that the applicant had to produce an EIS and NIS for the project. Therefore, the public have had to spend their time trying to access accurate, objective and unambiguous information about the project.

3. The application does not have an Environmental Impact Statement so there is little or no site specific information to rely on as to the impact of the project on the environment of Galway Bay. The information provided is in many instances dated, inaccurate, inapplicable to the proposed project and at times, inexplicable.

4. We still don’t know what the project will actually look or sound like, by day or by night. The photomontages provided were taken on a misty morning in November, when even the hills of Clare are invisible. The Coastal Track where one the montages was taken cannot be identified by local people and the Developer failed to respond to requests to visit the area and answer our query.

Competent Authority to Assess this Planning Application

We strongly object to the granting of this application on the grounds that there is a perceived lack of objectivity and the process of the application does not appear to comply with modern standards of transparency, fairness and independence.

An important question regarding this application from the beginning has been the question of who is the competent authority. Minister Coveney has said that he is the independent decision maker with responsibility for deciding this application, but would also like to see Galway Bay continue as a “test bed”, which would seem to raise questions regarding that independence. The application has been with the Foreshore Section of DECLG from the pre application stage onwards; this Department decided neither an EIA nor AA was needed for the project. This Department also decided which external bodies were to be consulted and which excluded, and
many of the individuals consulted in their capacity as part of these external bodies will be members of the Marine License Vetting Committee advising the Minister as to the correct decision with regard to this application. Is the Minister satisfied that there is sufficient objectivity, independence and transparency in this decision making process?

However, as this application is of strategic importance to the state, concerns energy and environmental infrastructure that are of strategic, economic and social importance, and will have a significant effect on two planning authorities, Galway and Clare County planning authorities, this application ought, in any case, be subject to a specialised planning application to An Bord Pleanála.

Who is the Competent Authority to decide on this application and please explain why?

‘Project’ Vs Plan/Programme Assessment

We object to the granting of this application as we believe that it does not serve the national interest. We are completely in favour of, and see the need for renewable energy, but we remain unconvinced that this project will further the renewable energy programme in a way that benefits society as a whole.

This proposed development is not an isolated project; it is part of a larger plan/programme of Ocean Energy Testing Facilities, and therefore, comes under the remit of the SEA Directive. This renewable energy site application is in fact both a project within the meaning of the EIA Directive and a plan/programme within the meaning of the SEA Directive and should therefore be subject to assessment with complies with the requirements of both Directives.

At present, there seems to be no national programme that includes an SEA of all Ocean Energy Test Sites along the coast of Ireland, current and planned, putting our environment at risk by the lack of an SEA. This proposed project is part of a programme/plan that links with Ocean Energy Test facilities in Cork, AMETS in Mayo, and a wider programme of National and EU funded research with ‘Smartbay Ireland’ Ltd., (not for profit). Another Ocean Energy Test Site - ‘Westwave’ – has been in operation located offshore in Co. Clare.

The Irish Wave Energy Developers Association Ltd., (not for profit) (IWEDA) – has identified a gap in wave energy test facilities and states that “there is a need for a benign ocean test site in Ireland at around 1/15 scale.” This company has a current Foreshore Licence application to investigate a suitable site for a 1/15 Wave Test Site off the coast of Mayo in Belmullet. (See Foreshore Application FS006505). A similar Foreshore Licence application was lodged and later withdrawn in Galway Bay, for a near shore area outside the site of the current Marine Institute Foreshore Lease application.

All these, and the many more similar individual projects that will be seeking to use near shore coastal waters, competing with existing users, need to be considered cumulatively and
collectively in the context of the SEA Directive. This would ensure proper governance and use of financial resources, avoid duplication and protect the environment by the placement of such projects in appropriately assessed environments. This would serve to protect other coastal rights and interests and avoid adverse impacts on one resource to facilitate the harnessing of another. This is necessary if the pursuit of a clean renewable energy source is to be successful.

The current approach seems to be one of determining consent for projects, one by one, without any consideration as to their cost benefit value in the wider context, at incalculable environmental cost and without consideration an overall strategy.

**SEA – Alternative Sites**

We strongly object to the granting of this application on the grounds that no other sites have been considered nor has the site chosen is utterly unsuited to this development.

SEA of the overall national plan would provide an appropriate instrument for addressing the question of alternative locations and alternative solutions on a nationwide scale. It would also help to identify the cumulative effects of all such developments in the environment. Contrary to the SEA Directive no alternative locations for this Test Site have been assessed or considered for this application. Considering alternative scenarios is a Directive requirement of the SEA process, and not simply a ‘recommended guideline’, as stated in the Environmental Report. (pg. 12). This report in FS006566 seems to suggest that due to the ‘fact’ that the Test Site has been in existence for the past ten years, it now ought to be exempt from SEA Directive Legislation. The proposed project is often referred to as the “upgrade of the existing test site”. This is used to account for the failure to consider any other site for the proposed development and to suggest that the proposed project is no different from what has been in situ and part of the landscape for the last ten years. However, the original ten year Foreshore Lease granted in 2006, was “for the purpose of testing wave energy devices and no other purpose whatsoever”, tested one at a time, for a period of six months at a time, with no cable connection to shore permitted. The maximum height of any device permitted was four (4) m above water. The site has been little used during the period 2006 to 2016, and the permission granted was restrictive. Therefore, to call the present application for a 35 year Foreshore Lease an “upgrade” is disingenuous and misleading. The permitted activity under the original ten year Lease and the activities sought to be permitted by the current application are so different in duration, nature and impact on the environment and amenity of Galway Bay, that the latter cannot be seen as a simple continuation of the former. Therefore, FS006566 should not be exempt from SEA on these grounds.

Reference to the existence of the Test Site at its present location raises the question of how the Test Site was granted a Foreshore Lease in this environmentally sensitive location in 2006 without any public consultation.
Were the legally protected habitats and species in the surrounding environment of the test site declared on the application form?

Is the Minister satisfied that the legally required Environmental Assessments were carried out when the Foreshore Lease was granted in 2006?

How did the developer ascertain that the site had “negligible impact on the marine environment since its inception”?

**SEA: In combination and cumulative effects, of other plans and programmes at National and Regional Level.**

I object because I believe that FS006566 does not assess the potential in-combination effects on the environment and other marine users with respect to other relevant plans, programmes and policies.

Is the Minister satisfied that this Lease if granted will not impact adversely on the legally binding aims and objectives of the plans and policies of other state bodies and jeopardise state investment in these? For example, those of the EPA, Fáilte Ireland, Galway and Clare County Councils, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service and The Heritage Council? This is not an exhaustive list.

**EIA and AA Assessments**

We strongly object to the granting of this application on the grounds that legislation for the protection of the environment has been breached and incalculable damage to the environment of Galway Bay will ensue.

We strongly object the granting of this application as it does not have an Environmental Impact Statement or a Natura Impact Statement.

We strongly object the granting of this application as we are not satisfied that the information supplied to the public by DAHG in demonstrates an understanding of the nature, size and location of the project and its potential effects on Natura 2000 sites. Where are the birds?

Is the Minister satisfied that your Department has met its statutory requirements with regard to the implementation of National and EU Law in regard to this application?
Defective EIA Screening Process

We strongly object to the proposed development due to the fatally flawed EIA Screening process in FS006566, examples of our many concerns, taken from the Applicants’ Environmental Screening Report of August 2015, are given below, this is not an exhaustive list.

The EIA Screening Report provided by the applicant fails to consider the all the criteria set out in the Directive.

The EIA Screening Report excludes assessment of Landscape and Visual Impact, and Marine Archaeology.

All legally protected environments surrounding the Lease site have not been included in the EIA Screening Report.

The Screening Report has many serious inaccuracies, contradicted by evidence elsewhere in the application, for example the statement at 4.1.8 “The proposed Galway Bay Marine and Renewable energy Test Site will not generate any pollutants”, this statement is patently untrue, what about noise and light pollution, chemicals in sacrificial anodes leaching into the water toxic to life and degrading water quality? This is contrary to the Water Directive and goals set to reach GES with respect to water quality.

Section 4.1.9 of the Report states that impacts from accidents would be temporary and localised. This is impossible, given the risk of fuel, lubricant and other liquid leakages at a site located in the marine environment, so close to shore and to so many legally protected habitats.

The proposed use of the site poses public health risks that have not been considered at all, the map on page 7 of the report shows the north shore of Galway Bay, closest to the site, as being devoid of human habitation which I assure you it is not. In addition, the area is used by local fishermen, winkle pickers, walkers, seaweed harvesters and bird watchers. Residents from the nearby hotel regularly explore the area.

We are appalled that criteria to be considered in relation to the “ Location of the Proposed Development” as set out on page 6 of the report,”(a) wetlands”, to “(h) Landscapes of cultural or archaeological significance” have all been left out of the EIA Screening Report.

Section 4.1.5. of the Environmental Screening Report screens out the possibility of this development having “significant cumulative effects with any proposed onshore developments are not considered likely”. What about the Galway Harbour Development which has been screened out, despite being before ABP, and the Rossaveal Harbour Development, which involves blasting, dredging, and dumping at sea, and the creation of more than ninety berths, and the increased Marine Leisure Craft traffic that will ensue from both these developments. Have water
quality issues in relation to raw sewage outlets in the area been considered in assessing the cumulative effects of the project applied for? This is not an exhaustive list of the developments that should have been screened in for assessment.

The Assessment of the Environmental Screening Report, which led to the decision that an Environmental Impact Statement was not required for this application, was not provided when requested from his Department during the public consultation process.

Is the Minister satisfied to grant this 35 Year Lease given the flawed screening process above which lead to the inexplicable decision that this project does not need an EIS?

**AA Assessment**

We strongly object to the granting of this Lease on the grounds that the AA Directive has been incorrectly applied in that this project alone and in combination with other plans and projects is likely to have significant adverse effects on the Natura 2000 Network of sites around Galway Bay. The list below is some of the many grounds on which our objections are founded.

We believe that, at the very least, an Appropriate Assessment was obviously required for this project, and we believe that the Precautionary Principle should have been applied.

The AA Stage 1 Screening Report contains contradictory information, identifies the risks to protected species, and yet concludes that no Stage two Appropriate Assessment is required.

Given the potential identified for the leaching of toxic chemicals such as aluminium and zinc from sacrificial anodes, leakage of fuels, lubricants and hydraulic fluids from the machinery, plant, generators, and devices to be deployed, at a test site located in the marine environment, why are Black Head Poulsallagh reefs, less than 8km away, screened out? Why are Natura sites, in areas such as the Aran Islands and the Burren screened out given the transboundary nature of the sea and mobility of reptiles, mammals, fish, birds and bats?

Ramsar protected site 838 is adjacent to the site and is an important habitat for many protected wetland and marine bird species, The Connemara Bog Complex is less than 4km away and home to the Merlin among other protected species. What informed the screening decisions made in the report with regard to Annex 1 birds, given the risks identified?

This project is in tidal waters, any leakage of chemicals/hazardous fluids from the site will travel, as will noise in and on water. Is the Minister satisfied that protected sites further afield have been excluded in error? For example, the Aran Islands protected sites and species?
Please explain what is meant by the “voluntary” NIS screening to be prepared by the Developers and why this was not available to the public as part of the application.

Objectivity and Transparency

We strongly object to the granting of this lease due to public concerns regarding openness, transparency and objectivity in the planning and preparation and presentation to the public of this application. There are serious concerns about the exclusion of environmental and tourist stakeholders in the external bodies’ consultation section of the application and the silence of others.

We strongly object to the granting of this application as we have not been made aware of, and we cannot see how this project is of benefit to the communities surrounding Galway Bay, many of whom make their living from Tourism, directly or indirectly. Visitors come here because of the landscape, heritage and culture, to walk, swim, cycle, sail, fish, and experience peace and quiet. Therefore, how can an industrial test site enhance or benefit the area or its inhabitants?

We strongly object to the granting of this application as the potential impacts of this project on Tourism completely absent from the application, inexplicable, given its proven economic importance at both local and national levels.

We question the need for this project which we believe is not suitable as a test site nor as a permanent energy site. What other ocean energy test sites exist in Ireland and the EU?

Why is there a need for this one in Galway Bay? Is it just duplicating other EU funded test site facilities?

Is the Irish Wave Energy Developers Ltd application for a 1/15\textsuperscript{th} scale testing site in Belmullet connected to this application in Galway?

How much State and EU funding has been spent on all ocean energy test sites in Ireland to date? Please provide details.

How much State and EU funding has been spent in connection with the test site in Galway Bay from the original application in 2004 to date? Please provide details including the details of wave energy devices tested at the site to date, periods of deployment and grant funding provided?
What has been learned from the Galway Bay Test Site to date with regard to Wave Energy devices?

We want to know how and why such a project was so far advanced without any local or national discussion as to whether or not it was a sustainable use of such a precious natural resource as Galway Bay.

**Conclusion**

We object to the granting of this lease as it is disingenuous to describe it as the “upgrade of the existing test site”. This is used to account for the failure to consider any other site for the proposed development and to suggest that the proposed project is no different from what has been in situ and part of the landscape for the last ten years. However, the original ten year Foreshore Lease granted in 2006, was “for the purpose of testing wave energy devices and no other purpose whatsoever”, tested one at a time, for a period of six months at a time, with no cable connection to shore permitted. The maximum height of any device permitted was four (4) m above water. The site has been little used during the period 2006 to 2016, and the permission granted was restrictive. Therefore, to call the present application for a 35 year Foreshore Lease an “upgrade” is disingenuous and misleading. **The permitted activity under the original ten year Lease and the activities sought to be permitted by the current application are so different in duration, nature and impact on the environment and amenity of Galway Bay, that the latter cannot be seen as a simple continuation of the former.**
From:
Sent: 09 September 2016 23:46
To: foreshore
Subject: FS006566

Submission made to: Marine Planning and Foreshore Section, Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, Newtown Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@envirion.ie.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh/Address ..
________________ ______________________________
Guth/En /Tel/ríomhphost /email_ ________ Data: 9/9/2016

Please confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

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:

. Is the Minister satisfied that the ‘project’ has been appropriately assessed as required by various EU legislation?
. I was not aware of the application until the last few days of the public consultations.
From: foreshore
Sent: 09 September 2016 23:54
To: foreshore
Subject: FS006566

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:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
Guthán /Tel/riomhphost /email_ _______ Data: 9/9/2016

Please confirm receipt of this submission naming the individual above.

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:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

. Is the Minister satisfied that the ‘project’ has been appropriately assessed as required by various EU legislation?
   I was never contacted to be informed of the application or its implications for the local environment, either by telephone, letter, email, etc.
   There is no support for this development in the local area.

I strongly object to this application on the grounds stated above
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:
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Not enough information available on the negative effects on the environment and marine ecosystem
I object to this application
Submission FS006566

I object to the granting of the above application on the grounds that the intended use of the site for NIAP research in aquaculture and other purposes is not assessed as required by law.

I object to the granting of a lease of such length it is excessive.

I object to the lack of tourism assessment, this provides many livelihoods in Galway and Clare and these have not been considered.

I object to the granting of this lease because the siting of an industrial site in Galway Bay is a National Scandal and will damage the environment and the culture and heritage of the West of Ireland for the next 35 years.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:
Dáta: 6/2/16

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

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number: F5006566        Applicant: The Marine Institute
Application: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go lándir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra bui chomh maith le tuibríni goithte le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfhorraithe agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa móir eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil facsim togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Phhruaigh na Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopáil nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shíl an Atlantaigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscaí is tábhachtait air fad i gCois Phhraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain in bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laíníocht ar Rialtais amach anseo.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sínithe: 

Dáta: 6/9/16

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/ríomhphost/email:

Dáta: 28/08/2016

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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaithe, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cuiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go móir do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearaíse mhóra bui chomh maith le tuirbíní go dtí theacht agus cuirfídh sé as go móir don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpá móir eolas ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fhharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantaaigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thíonchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscall is tábhachtach ar fad i gCois Fhharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ro-thfada agus chuirfeadh sé laincísí ar Rialtais amach anseo.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Síntie:

Dáta: 28/8/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/fíomhphost/email:
Dáta: 27/8/16

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"

A chara,

Maidir le iarraidh Fhonas na Mara atá thuaisluaithe, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:

1. Faoi dhúl an Aontais Eorpach agus faoi dhúl na hÉireann, tá gá le EIA i gcás aon mhór-thográ a mbeadh tionchar suntasach aige ar an timpeallacht – ach amháin sa gcás go mbeadh tástáil agus seiceáil chuig déanta ar an togra. Ní léir domsa go bhfuil aon tástáil nó seiceáil chuig déanta ar an togra. Ní mór mheid, láthair agus an cineál togra a thógáil san áireamh – rud nach bhfuil déanta.

2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thográ as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearaí máora buí chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus curridh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fhharraige ná sa Spídéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopáil nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantáigh Fhillín agus an droch-thionchar a bhíodh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscal is tábhachtaí air féin. Chois Fhharraige?

5. Tá lèas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laincísí ar Rialtais amach anseo.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sínithe:                                       Dáta: 28/8/16

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise which are not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/ríomhphost/email:
Dáta: 28/8/16

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”

A chara,

Maidir le larratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thográ as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gailimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra buí chomh maith le tuirbini gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfharraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa móir eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fhharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shli an Atlantáigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thionschar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar — ceann de na tionscail is tábhachtáil ar fad i gCois Fhharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-Fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laistigh ar Rialtais a phlé a lánse.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sínithe:                                               Dáta:

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

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuslaíte, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearaí mhór a bu iomhacht le tuirbhíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolais ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopáil nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantáigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscal is tábhachtait ar fad i gCóis Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 blíain i bhfad ró-hhada agus chuirfeadh sé láncheol ar Rialtais amach anseo.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area's most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country's most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn't widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.


I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh/Address:

Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:

Dáta: 28/8/16

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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do álleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra bui chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfídh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfharraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Frharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaidh nó i sceilíonna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantacha Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscail is tábhachtach ar fad i gCois Frharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laincís a bhfuil i bhfad ró-fhada.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sínithe: 

Dáta: 

28/8/16

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/rólphost/email:
Dáta: 6/9/2016

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"

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearaí mhóra buí chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirdh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa móir eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolais ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spídéal. Ní raibh aon eolais ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantaisí Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireachta sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscail is tábhachtach ar fad i gCois Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-thhada agus chuirfeadh sé laicisi ar lár a rith a chéile as na bhfoirne.
I refer to the above foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.


I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Selctar ar son: / On behalf of:

Sealadh/Address:

Guthan/Tel/ríomhphost/email:

Dáta: 28 Lúnasa 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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhothar na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearaís mhórá buí chomh maith le tuirbíní goaithne le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopáal nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantache Fhíáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscal is tábhachtai ar fad i gCóis Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 blain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laicisciúí ar Rialtais anach anseo.

Dept. of Environment, Community & Local Government

- 7 SEP 2016

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

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackles future Governments.

S’nithe: ___________________________  Date: 28 Luain  
2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:  
Seoladh/Address:   
Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:  
Dáta: 28/8/2016

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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarritas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go lánídir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go móir do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra buí chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go móir don radharc atá agam ar an bhfharraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa móir eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantach Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar — ceann de na tionscail is tábhachtait ar fad i gCóis Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 blain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laicisi ar Rialtais an domhain.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sinithe: ___________________________  Dáta: 28/8/16

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:
Dáta: 28/8/16

Please confirm receipt of this individual submission referencing the above name.
Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number: F5006566
Applicant: The Marine Institute
Application: “Foreshore Lease Application to Construct an Offshore Electricity Generating Station”

A chara,
Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:

1. Faoi dhíl an Aontais Eorpaigh agus faoi dhíl na hÉireann, tá gá le EIA i gcás aon mhór-thogra a mbeadh tionschar suntasach aige ar an timpeallacht — ach amháin sa gcás go mbeadh tástaíl agus seiceáil chuí déanta ar an togra. Ní léir domsa go bhfuil aon tástaíl nó seiceáil chuí déanta ar an togra. Ní mór méid, láthair agus an cineál togra a thógáil san áireamh — rud nach bhfuil déanta.

2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhórá buí chomh maith le tuirbini gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Choíshrí Fharraige ná Sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shlí an Atlantach Fhíilín agus an droch-thionschar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscal is tábhachtai ar fad i gCois Fharraige?

5. Tá lèas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laicísí ar Rialtais amach anseo.

Dept. of Environment, Community & Local Government
- 7 SEP 2016

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

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sinithe:                                      Dáta:  

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 Rd, Wexford, Co. Wexford. Email: foreshore@environ.ie

Seolta ar son: On behalf of:

Seoladh/Address:

Guthán/Tel/ríomhphost/email:


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

Submission regarding Foreshore Lease Application Number: F5006566 Applicant: The Marine Institute

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

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:

1. Faoi dhlí an Aontais Eorpaigh agus faoi dhlí na hÉireann, tá gá le EIA i gcás aon mhór-thoghra a mbeadh thionchar suntasach aige ar an timpeallacht — ach amháin sa gcás go mbeadh tástáil agus seiceáil chuí déanta ar an togra. Ní léir domsa go bhfuil aon tástáil nó seiceáil chuí déanta ar an togra. Ní mór méid, láthair agus an cineál togra a thógáil san áireamh — rud nach bhfuil déanta.

2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra buí chomh maith le turibini gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfharraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa móir eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopia nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faci Shlí an Atlantáigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscail is tábhachtaitr faid i gCois Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bláin i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laincísí ar Rialtais amach anseo.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area's most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country's most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn't widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackles future Governments.

Sínithe

Dátá: 6/1/2008

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:
Seoladh/Address:
Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:
Dáta: 6/9/2016

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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Hhora na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra buí chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus cuirfídh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarrage agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopáí nó i scoléanna.

4. Céard faoi Shli an Atlantais Fhiáin agus an droch-thionchar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscal is tábhachtaí ar fad i gCois Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-thhada agus chuirfeadh sé laicísí ar Mhaitiúis Bheach airse.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.

Sinite: ______________________

Date: 6/9/2016

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

Signer

Date 2/9/2016

I reserve the right to add to my submission, should further concerns arise in light of information not presently available to me.
Seolta ar son: / On behalf of:

Seoladh/Address:

Guthán/Tel/riomhphost/email:

Cáta: 6/9/2016

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”

A chara,

Maidir le iarratas Fhoras na Mara atá thuasluaite, is mian liom gur in aghaidh go láidir ar na cúiseanna seo a leanas:


2. Chuirfeadh a leithéide de thogra as go mór do áilleacht Chuan na Gaillimhe. Beidh fearais mhóra bui chomh maith le tuirbíní gaoithe le feiceáil ó mo theach agus curfidh sé as go mór don radharc atá agam ar an bhfarraige agus ar Chuan na Gaillimhe.

3. Tá easpa mór eolais ann faoin togra agus ní raibh eolas ar fáil faoin togra go forleathan i gceantar Chois Fharraige ná sa Spidéal. Ní raibh aon eolas ar fáil i siopaí nó i scoileanna.

4. Céard faoi Shíl an Atlantáigh Fhiáin agus an droch-thionschar a bheadh ag a leithéide ar thurasóireacht sa gceantar – ceann de na tionscall is tábhachtáir aíradh i gCois Fharraige?

5. Tá léas 35 bliain i bhfad ró-fhada agus chuirfeadh sé laincísí ar Rialtais anbháis ansin.
I refer to the above Foreshore Lease Application and strongly object to the proposed development. I object on the points outlined below:

1. 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, 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.

2. I strongly object in order to protect our most iconic landscapes as coastal tourism is the area’s most important industry. The sea station, wind turbine and other devices would be a blot on one of the country’s most scenic locations.

3. I found that it was difficult to access information regarding the proposed project as local library is not open fulltime and information wasn’t widely available in shops or schools.

4. I fail to understand why tourism has not been considered in this application and the detrimental effect this project would have on tourism, and on our widely-acclaimed Wild Atlantic Way.

5. I do not understand why a 35 year lease is being considered because, if granted, it will shackle future Governments.


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 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,

Date: 29/09/2016

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

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

Signed, ____________________________ Date: __________/________/2016

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