

16.0 Appendix 1: Overview of Observations

16.1. Observations

- 16.1.1. 86 observations were submitted originally in respect of the application for approval of the proposed road scheme from a combination of individuals, community groups, umbrella groups and elected representatives³⁶. Another 211 submissions related specifically to objections to the Compulsory Purchase Order. A list of all observers³⁷ to the proposed project is set out below in Part 1 of this Appendix.
- 16.1.2. It is evident from the submissions made that there is considerable overlap in terms of the issues raised in relation to the proposed project. In order to avoid undue repetition, the issues are summarised below thematically for the information of the Board and details of where they are addressed in the assessment are provided. A high-level non-exhaustive summary of issues raised by each observer is documented in Part 2. Part 2 is included to provide the Board an overview of the nature of concerns of individuals/groups etc. and is not a full summary of issues raised by each observer. However, the full observation has been read and addressed throughout this report.
- 16.1.3. Of importance, this is a list of issues raised in written submissions. Some objectors and observers elaborated on their submissions at the oral hearing and these oral submissions are addressed in the assessment of the project above.
- 16.1.4. Appendix 3 provides an overview of observations submitted at the Further Information Stage.
- 16.1.5. A list of all objectors to the CPO, outstanding at the time of the completion of this report, is set out in Appendix 2. Of note is the fact that some of the objectors made comments about the overall project as part of their CPO objection. These issues are captured in a thematic manner in Part 1 and assessed throughout this report. They are not individually listed below as per the observers in Part 2.

³⁶ 7 are from Prescribed Bodies and are addressed in Section 6.2 of this report

³⁷ With exception of Prescribed Bodies

16.2. Observers Part 1

List of Observers to Project 302848 & 302885

(Note: Prescribed Bodies addressed in Section 6.2 above)

Submissions in Support of the Proposal

1. American Chamber of Commerce Ireland
2. Coach Tourism and Transport Council of Ireland
3. Galway Chamber of Commerce
4. Galway City Business Association Ltd.
5. IBEC
6. IDA Ireland
7. Irish Hotels Federation
8. Parkmore Traffic Action Group
9. Michael O'Connor Salthill Village Community
10. Sean O'Neachtain
11. The Gluas Project Committee (albeit with concerns noted)
12. McDonagh Capital Investments Ltd.

Submissions objecting to the Proposal

1. Alan Curran on behalf of Bus Rothaíochta na Gaillimhe
2. Allan Cavanagh & Courtney Darby
3. Ann Rabbitt
4. Anne Kelly
5. Aughnacurra Residents Association
6. Barbara Flaherty
7. Brendan Mulligan
8. Brian Bruton
9. Brian Walsh
10. Catherine Connolly TD
11. Ciaran Ferrie
12. Damien and Katherine Kelly
13. Dangan House Nurseries & Garden Centre
14. David and Imelda Hickey
15. Derrick Hambleton

16. Desmond & Mary Bluett
17. Donal & Elizabeth Courtney
18. Dunnes Stores
19. Eamonn Smyth & Others
20. Environmental Linkage Group – Galway City Community Network
21. Eve Daly & Laura Kennedy
22. Friends of the Irish Environment
23. Galway AAI County Board
24. Galway City Harriers
25. Galway Cycling Campaign
26. Galway Property Management
27. Genevieve Carter
28. Gerald & Neasa Lawless
29. Gerald L Lyons
30. Gwen Cantwell & Oliver Ryan
31. Hands Across the Corrib
32. James and Cathleen Barrett and others
33. John & Margaret Hughes
34. John & Patricia Connor & Others
35. Joseph Greaney
36. Joseph Hynes
37. Karen McGuire & John Newell
38. Kevin Kelly
39. Linda Rabbitte
40. Louise McNamara
41. M&M Qualtech
42. Maeve Mitchell & David Small
43. Mary Loughnan
44. Mary Silke
45. Menlo Residents Association
46. Michael & Trisha Murphy
47. Miriam Duggan & Seamus Sheridan
48. Monica & Frank McAnena
49. Olive & Vincent O'Connor
50. Paddy & Marina O'Malley

51. Paul & Mary Mahoney
52. Paul & Sarah Hogan
53. Paula Lynch & Bernard Carrick
54. Peter Sweetman & Others
55. Residents of Ard Na Gaoithe
56. Richard Donovan & Caroline Carrick
57. Ronan McDonagh
58. Sarah Patricia Silke
59. Sarah Silke
60. Shane Durcan
61. Sharon Morris & Edward O'Reilly
62. Siobhan Silke
63. Stephen & Debbie Meagher
64. The Atlantic Greenway Project
65. The N6 Galway Action Group
66. Thomas & Mary Kilgarriff
67. Tom & Catherine O'Halloran

16.3. Observers Part 2

List of observers and high-level summary of submission

Observer	Issues	Main References (Not Exhaustive)
American Chamber of Commerce Ireland Coach Tourism and Transport Council of Ireland Galway Chamber of Commerce Galway City Business Association Ltd. IBEC IDA Ireland Irish Hotels Federation Parkmore Traffic Action Group Michael O'Connor Salthill Village Community Sean O'Neachtain The Gluas Project Committee (albeit with concerns noted) McDonagh Capital Investments Ltd.	Supported road development Improve access to the city Increase journey time reliability Provide a more attractive place to visit and live Improve journey characteristics Improve tourism opportunities	Throughout
Alan Curran on behalf of Bus Rothaíochta na Gaillimhe	Refers to Children's Cycle Bus Concerned that applicant did not fully consider the impact of the N59 South Link Road on Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh in terms of safety Road will impact other children travelling to school	10.8 11.13 11.13
Allan Cavanagh & Courtney Darby	Access to Rosan Glas, Drainage reservoirs, Increased traffic, noise, pollution, risk of injury or death Increase in traffic near Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh Inadequate public transport & cycle lanes Inadequate maps and communication Loss of NUIG Amenity lands Impact on Human Health Loss of Homes Costs of road is a greater cost to society	10.8, 11.13 10.8, 11.10 11.4, 11.11, 11.12 10.8, 11.13 10.3, 10.5, 11.3 10.11, 11.2 10.8, 11.6 11.6 10.6, 10.8, 11.3, 11.6, 11.17

Ann Rabbitt	Health Concerns	11.6
Anne Kelly	Concerned about future house for family member Access to Bearna	10.3, 11.17 10.6, 10.8, 11.3
Aughnacurra Residents Association	Rely on N6 Action Group Submission Roadway cannot be constructed without impact on critical life support systems Damage to drainage systems must be resolved Traffic issues in relation to access road & congestion gaining access on to N59; pedestrian safety Landscape & Visual where road crosses the estate/loss of trees Boundary treatment/Loss of screening Powerlines to be relocated Property values Residential amenities Extent of land acquisition is excessive Diminution of privacy Noise mitigation measures inadequate Air pollution Run off from construction compound and impact on hydrology	Noted 10.9, 11.8, 11.9, 11.10, 11.11, 11.12 10.8, 11.10 11.13 11.14 11.14 10.9 10.8 10.8 13 10.8 11.12 11.11 11.10
Barbara Flaherty	Health concerns Residential Amenities, Construction impact on dwelling, views, property value Traffic pollution Impact on flora and fauna Carbon emissions Access to Bearna and Galway City/ severance Safety and security CPO of lands Consultations Route of road Planning policy – low density development – green policies	11.6 10.8, 10.10, 11.6, 11.14 11.11, 11.12 11.7, 12 11.11 10.8 10.8 13 10.11, 11.2 10.6, 11.3 10.3
Brendan Mulligan	Speeches and reports referred to in relation to climate change "Engineering the West" IEI Road is unsustainable More investment in pedestrian/cycling/bus/rail facilities needed Ardaun LAP – severance	10.3, 11.11 10.3 10.4, 11.13 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 11.3 10.3, 10.7, 10.8

	Health and wellbeing/Noise and Air	11.6, 11.10, 11.11
Brian Bruton	<p>Object to routing through NUIG Sports Campus and through vital sports and recreation facilities/impact on numerous events in NUIG sports lands</p> <p>Not in accordance with land zoning</p> <p>Bridge impacts on beauty and amenity of river & on Menlo Castle</p> <p>Impact on human health not considered</p> <p>Should have been considered with public transport & GTS should be prepared in full</p> <p>Impact on Annex I habitat, bats & peregrine falcon</p> <p>Case 461/17 referred</p> <p>2006 route must be revisited and a tunnel under Corrib</p>	<p>10.8, 11.6</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>11.15</p> <p>11.6</p> <p>10.3, 11.3</p> <p>11.7, 12</p> <p>10.2</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p>
Brian Walsh	<p>Rosan Glas resident – impact of N59 Link Road south on his access to the roads and services</p> <p>Traffic pollution</p> <p>Sustainable development</p>	<p>10.6, 10.8, 11.3, 11.13</p> <p>11.11, 11.12</p> <p>10.3</p>
Catherine Connolly TD	<p>Management have consistently adhered to policy of further road as only solution to detriment of other sustainable solutions</p> <p>Park and Ride objective remains unfulfilled</p> <p>No comprehensive school transport</p> <p>Public transport - failure to increase rail and bus services – city not cyclist or pedestrian friendly</p> <p>Road based on outdated and flawed logic</p> <p>Contrary to NPF, Climate Change legislation</p>	<p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3, 10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.3, 10.4, 11.13, 13</p> <p>10.3, 11.11</p>
Ciaran Ferrie	<p>Necessity for road not demonstrated</p> <p>Assumptions that modal shift can only be achieved after ring road</p> <p>Impact on Menlo Castle – national monument</p> <p>Ireland's commitment to the reduction of GHG</p> <p>Poor planning of Galway over decades – low density development – references Transport studies over the years</p> <p>Bridge further downstream linking Coolough Road to the N59 would build on existing infrastructure</p>	<p>10.4</p> <p>10.3, 10.4, 11.13</p> <p>11.15</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p>
Damien and Katherine Kelly	<p>Route selection concerns/Alternatives/confusing to public/no real public debate about alternatives</p> <p>Level of traffic will increase – not sustainable</p> <p>Noise will increase dramatically – mitigation not suitable</p>	<p>10.6, 10.10, 11.3</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>11.12</p>

	<p>Bus transport is solution with light rail in the longer term, Park & Ride, planning for more roads is not sustainable</p> <p>Carbon footprint</p> <p>Population growth on west side – should concentrate in Oranmore</p> <p>Object with €50 fee to make a submission</p>	<p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>Noted</p>
Dangan House Nurseries & Garden Centre	<p>Who named this route as emerging favoured</p> <p>Demolition of homes</p> <p>Restored Dangan House – no consideration of house or Dangan area and River Corrib</p> <p>CO2 emissions</p> <p>Lack of bus services</p>	<p>10.3, 10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.6, 10.8, 11.3, 11.6</p> <p>10.8, 11.17</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>10.3, 10.6, 11.3</p>
David and Imelda Hickey	<p>Object to CPO of their land for another's access</p> <p>Noise</p>	<p>13</p> <p>11.12</p>
Derrick Hambleton	<p>Future proof development with policies, plans and processes</p> <p>Vulnerable Road Users concerns</p> <p>Other more sustainable options must be considered inc. e.g. Light Rail /Feeder buses / Park & Ride/ HGV management strategy/Modal shift</p> <p>Concern for families made homeless</p> <p>Impact on communities and habitats</p> <p>Building road contravenes legislation</p> <p>Council has failed to build high density development, Refers to Buchanan Report</p> <p>ABP to apply the EIA Directive & mitigation measures</p> <p>GHG are rising, air pollution, mounting legal actions</p> <p>Proposal contravenes Smarter Travel policy /perpetuate unsustainable levels of traffic</p> <p>Impacts on air</p> <p>Polluting surface drainage</p> <p>Poor value for money</p>	<p>10.3</p> <p>10.4, 10.5</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.8, 11.6, 11.17</p> <p>10.8, 11.7, 12, 13</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>11</p> <p>11.11, 10.2</p> <p>10.3, 11.13</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>11.9</p> <p>10.7</p>
Desmond & Mary Bluett	<p>Object to road in The Heath serving agriculture land</p>	<p>10.8, 13</p>
Donal & Elizabeth Courtney	<p>Change character of Aughnacurra</p> <p>Flora & Fauna more important than Humans</p> <p>Better public transport</p> <p>Property Value</p>	<p>10.8</p> <p>11.7, 13</p> <p>10.3, 10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.8</p>
Dunnes Stores	<p>Anchor tenant of Briarhill Shopping Centre – access to be maintained but require clarification on</p>	<p>10.7, 11.17</p>

	detail of access junctions and impact on shopping centre	
Eamonn Smyth & Others	Residents of The Heath – CPO not explained and opposed Use of access during construction Noise	13 10.10 11.12
Galway City Community Network (Environmental Linkage Group of Galway City Community Network)	Goals and policies of group listed Has enough been done to address policy documents which may reduce the need for the road or reduce the scale of the road while still achieving the goals of the project – light rail, HGV management, roundabouts, data, induced traffic Other more sustainable options must be considered – Climate Action Will undermine efforts to promote alternative transport modes Other strategies to be considered including light rail, 30kph, HGV strategy, induced traffic. Urban sprawl, more green belts Safe Travel & Home zones Refer to European Charter of Pedestrian Rights and the Road Danger Reduction Charter, National Cycle Policy Framework, DMURS, NTA Best Practice Guide	Noted 10.3, 10.6, 11.3 10.3, 11.11 10.6 10.6, 11.3 10.3 10.5, 11.13 10.3 as applicable
Eve Daly and Laura Kennedy	Too close to city Route through Dangan Area – benefits of green and blue space for mental health Road planning should be future proofed – population growth Contrary to image of Galway named as European Green Leaf City in 2018 Ch 18 admits that there will be a long term impact – a study should be undertaken Options to improve traffic must be considered but not at expense of human health	10.6, 11.3 10.3, 10.6, 11.3, 11.6 10.3, 11.13 10.3 11.6 11.6
Friends of the Irish Environment	Lack of consideration of alternatives Non compliance with National Policy Non compliance with EIA Directive Analysis of GHG is cursory and consideration of the carbon emissions is missing or inadequately assessed in the EIAR. Basic details are missing Non compliance with international, EU and Irish Law around Climate Change – refer to Paris Agreement and Climate Action & Low Carbon Development Act 2015	10.6, 11.3 10.2, 10.3, 11 10.2, 10.3, 11 11.11 10.3, 11.11

	ABP is required to have regard to National Mitigation Plans, National Transition Objective and mitigating GHG and Climate Change	10.3, 11.11
Galway Athletics County Board County Board (Galway AAI)	Impact on beauty and amenity of Dangan area and NUIG Sports Campus Note other proposals impacting on recreation and amenity land Impact during construction and longer term due to loss of pitches Impact on human health as a result of loss of amenity lands Community severance Health economics-based study, cost benefit analysis and relevant studies required	10.8 Cumulative effects throughout section 11 10.8, 11.6, 11.17 11.6 10.8, 11.6 10.3
Galway City Harriers Athletic Club	<i>Similar issues raised to Galway AAI above</i> Route will severely impact on sports facilities and amenities at Dangan Loss of vital recreation & amenity lands and impact of bridge Impact on Sports Clubs in medium-term construction phase and long term due to lost facilities Human Health impact 2000 signatures object	10.8, 11.6 10.8, 11.12 10.8, 11.6 11.6 Noted
Galway Cycling Campaign	Alternatives: Query if new road is correct response to car dependency Vulnerable Road User concerns Unclear how design is consistent with stated purpose of ring road Road junction and geometry concerns Induced traffic More should be done to support walking and cycling Human impacts and community severance Road is designed to support urban sprawl	10.3, 10.4, 10.6, 11.3 10.5 10.4, 11.13 10.5, 11.13 11.13 10.3, 10.6 10.8, 11.6 10.3
Galway Property Management	Impacts on Rosan Glas residents, in particular the move of the link road road from Bothar Stiofan to Bothar Diarmuida: Access/Traffic Residential Amenity inc. lighting, air and noise Attenuation/Drainage Visual Impacts on Rosan Glas	10.6, 11.13 11.13 10.8, 11.11, 11.12 10.9, 11.10 10.8, 11.14
Genevieve Carter	Access to roadway and house	10.5, 10.8

	<p>Drainage</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Environmental & Planning Matters</p> <p>Information is incomplete</p>	<p>10.8, 11.9</p> <p>11.12</p> <p>10, 11</p> <p>11.1</p>
Gerald and Neasa Lawless	<p>Road will not resolve serious traffic problems – limited access points on and off ring road – result in commuter traffic continuing in and out of city</p> <p>Bus and rail needed</p> <p>Limestone pavement still under threat</p> <p>Impact of bridge on Menlo Castle</p> <p>Removal of NUIG pitches</p> <p>Traffic light junction should be created where link road meets the N59 instead of flyover west of Circular Road</p> <p>Link road will create traffic on Circular Road</p> <p>Route passes too close to school – source of pollution</p> <p>Question route</p> <p>Possible savings with alternate suggested</p> <p>Object to CPO – The Heath is a residential development and not suited for agricultural traffic</p>	<p>10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 11.3, 11.6, 11.13</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>11.7, 12</p> <p>11.15</p> <p>10.8, 11.6</p> <p>10.5, 11.13</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>13</p>
Gerald L Lyons	<p><i>Submission split into two sections – strategic and individual:</i></p> <p>Sustainable Development Policy – scheme violates all policy and principles of sustainable development</p> <p>Profound impact on shape, fabric and culture of the city</p> <p>More rational planning approach would be to subsume transport strategy within a long-term vision for sustainable development</p> <p>Applicant relies on outmoded planning ideas about automotive-centric development with implications for air and noise pollution</p> <p>Climate Change</p> <p>Modal shift</p> <p>Transport and Land Use planning – decades of poor planning</p> <p>Failure to provide meaningful public transport</p> <p>Poor design of major intersections</p> <p>Development will reinforce planning mistakes</p> <p>Based on outmoded concept of industrial formation</p> <p>Scale of investment is very large and close to Dublin Metro North</p> <p>Population demographics – modest growth</p>	<p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3, 11.11, 11.12</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>10.3, 11.3, 11.13</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.5, 11.13</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.4, 11.13</p>

	<p>Cost benefit analysis</p> <p>Is road fit for purpose – sustainable, meet objectives</p> <p>Radial/axial traffic error</p> <p>School traffic impact on traffic</p> <p>Individual impact on The Heath as noted by other persons above</p> <p>Issues with CPO process</p> <p>Height of Letteragh Junction – visual, noise and amenities</p> <p>Impact on schools</p>	<p>10.4</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.4</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>As per The Heath</p> <p>13</p> <p>11.14, 11.12, 11.6, 10.8</p> <p>10.8</p>
Gwen Cantwell & Oliver Ryan	Rosan Glas concerns as noted above	As above
Hands Across the Corrib	<p>Counter to climate change commitments</p> <p>Road will generate increased traffic</p> <p>Light rail usage statistics erroneous</p> <p>Parkmore traffic can be solved by a standalone solution</p> <p>Evictions from family homes</p> <p>Object to principle of fee</p>	<p>11.11</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>10.6, 11.3, 11.13</p> <p>10.5, 11.13</p> <p>10.6, 11.3, 11.6, 11.17</p> <p>Noted</p>
James Barrett and others	<p>Family and others use network of safe boreens and network of rights-of-way in the Menlo-Coolough-Ballinfoile-Ballindooley area (Gaeltacht area) cycling and walking reducing their carbon footprint</p> <p>Right of ways will be curtailed during construction – Sean Bothar/Bothar Nua/Menlo castle boreen/quarry – request alternative arrangements</p> <p>Historical significance of area</p> <p>Plan to use quarry compound permanently post construction/ tunnel maintenance bldg</p> <p>Area will be used as rat runs during construction when roads are closed</p> <p>Concerns with quarrying and tunnelling</p> <p>Ringfort in quarry/declassification of national monuments & protected structures/unidentified famine settlement</p> <p>Flooding in area/Structural defects from quarrying</p> <p>Social exclusion – Consultations inadequate</p> <p>Natural heritage of the area – removal of swathes of hedgerow/nesting season/flora and fauna of area/loss of Annex I is irreplaceable</p>	<p>10.10, 13</p> <p>10.10, 10.8</p> <p>11.15</p> <p>10.10, 13</p> <p>10.10, 11.13</p> <p>10.10, 11.7, 11.8, 11.15</p> <p>10.10, 11.10</p> <p>10.11</p> <p>11.7, 12</p>

John & Margaret Hughes	<p>Irresponsible of the Applicant to drive a road through Ard an Locha, hopes shattered by plans</p> <p>Cannot understand how the 2006 GCOB has been abandoned because of Bog Cotton and limestone pavement in favour of the current scheme removing families and damaging countless other homes</p> <p>European Law has enabled such schemes to savage the human environment in favour of the natural environment. Concerned about themselves and neighbours</p> <p>Suffer impacts on visual intrusion, noise, air, loss of light, loss of amenity, disturbance and economic loss – not possible to mitigate</p>	<p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.3, 11, 12</p> <p>10.2, 10.8</p> <p>10.8, 11.11. 11.12. 11.14</p>
John & Patricia Connor and other residents of Racecourse Avenue/ Ballybrit area	<p>Too close to the city destroying 54 homes</p> <p>Devastating for families in area</p> <p>Construction impacts</p> <p>Any structure within 250m of the motorway should require special consideration and not 150m as stated on page 1430 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Object to acquisition of Racecourse Avenue and use for construction traffic.</p> <p>Design of motorway behind the Racecourse at the mobile phone mast has gone outside the original 150m corridor</p> <p>Impact on health</p> <p>Access to Lisheen Cemetery is inadequate</p>	<p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.8</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p> <p>13</p> <p>10.5</p> <p>11.6</p> <p>10.8</p>
Joseph Greaney	<p>Height of the motorway</p> <p>50m from boundary property</p> <p>No access to original family home</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Land is rezoned for future development and serviced</p> <p>Property value</p>	<p>10.5</p> <p>10.5</p> <p>10.5, 13</p> <p>11.12</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.8</p>
Joseph Hynes	<p>The northern link road will transform home, farmland and commonage into a spaghetti junction</p> <p>Dangan and riverside amenities are an irreplaceable asset</p>	<p>10.5, 10.6. 11.3</p> <p>10.8</p>
Karen McGuire & John Newell	<p>Note land at boundary is being CPO'd in order to protect rare bats – anxious that this land may be used for other reasons which may cause pollution and affect health</p> <p>Dust and air impacts on health</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>Marsh Fritillary Butterfly</p>	<p>10.3, 11.7. 13</p> <p>11.6, 11.11</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>11.7</p>
Kevin Kelly	Reoccurring flooding	11.9, 13

	Change of landscape around Cappagh Road Noise, and pollution Public Lighting	11.14 10.8, 11.11, 11.12 10.8
Linda Rabbitte	Live adjacent to quarry and use same access as quarry, concerned with condition of road Concerned about hazardous waste and construction compound in quarry Level of flooding in quarry underestimated Concerned with structural damage to house Impact on health due to noise, dust and air Object to ROW being extinguished Quarry zoned agricultural – to use it for compound is to change the use – material contravention Risk of instability to rock mass due to drilling and blasting – impact on species Impact on protected structures in Menlo area and Coolough village All public ROWs must be maintained Alternatives must be revisited Public transport/climate change	10.8, 13 10.10 11.9 13 11.11, 11.12 13 10.3 12 11.15 13 10.6, 11.3 10.6, 11.3, 11.11
Louise McNamara	Rosan Glas concerns Access and impact on shop	As above As above
M and M Qualtech Ltd.	Query if assessment carried out on impacts to their business	11
Maeve Mitchell & David Small	Rosan Glas concerns	As above
Mary Loughman	NUIG Sports grounds/ Impact on amenities	10.8
Mary Silke	Parkmore traffic chaos Living in traffic island with cars backed up Parkmore Road and motorway to the rear Closure of road during Galway Race festivals Construction traffic Noise, vibration, dust during construction Loss of wildlife	10.5, 10.6, 11.13 11.13 10.7, 10.8 10.10 11.11, 11.12 11.7
Menlo Residents Association	Object to CPO of traditional farmland in Menlo area Pollution Menlo/River Corrib as an amenity is under threat Diminish view of Menlo Castle Menlo is unique as an SAC providing access to nature	13 11.11, 11.12 10.8 11.14, 11.15 12
Michael & Trisha Murphy	Case for development is insufficient and not in accordance with PPSD	10.3

	Routing through Dangan does not accord with planning policy	10.3, 10.6, 11.3
	Alternatives assessment is inadequate and brief never included alternatives to a road	10.3, 10.6, 11.3
	Not in the best interest of people and communities	11.6
	Health and safety risk in schools, homes and businesses	11.6
	Human habitat grossly misunderstood in comparison to ecology – critical city amenities are being destroyed, NUIG, Letteragh Lands, Cappagh/Ballymoneen NHA, Corrib riverside	11, 12
	Construction highly intrusive due to elevated tracts of road	10.5, 10.8, 11.14
	Queries how ARUP were selected	Not applicable for the Board
	Destruction of homes is unprecedented	10.3, 10.6, 11.3, 11.17
	Destruction of communities	10.8
	No reason why if the ring road used GEAR rationale that houses and businesses would be destroyed	10.3, 10.5, 10.6, 11.3
	Road is the single most damaging public project in recent history	10.3, 10.6, 11.3, 11.17
	There are alternatives – EIA investigation of alternatives was inadequate	10.6, 11.3
	Procedures used in selection of route were unfair	10.6, 11.3
	Development of GTS was flawed	Not applicable for the Board
	Nothing in documentation to justify acquisition of Aughnacurra road	13
	Proposed solutions proffered to the Board	10.6, 11.3
	2006 road excluded prior to GTS on ecological grounds	10.6, 11.3
	Public participation inadequate	10.11, 11.2
	Lack of alternatives is contrary to EIA Directive	10.6, 11.3
	Use of GTS as a justification for the road is flawed and contrary to EIA Directive	10.3
	Proposal breaches adopted Plans	10.3
Miriam Duggan & Seamus Sheridan	Rosan Glas concerns	As above
	No opportunity for consultation	10.11, 11.2
Monica & Frank McAnena	Use of The Heath road for heavy machinery	10.10
	Safety issues	10.10
Olive & Vincent O'Connor	Proximity of road to dwelling	10.5
	Noise	11.12
	Visual Impact	11.14
	Destruction of homes and impact on community	11.17

Paddy & Marina O'Malley	<p>Route selection process is flawed and imbalanced – alternative route blue & green routes results in destruction of 2 houses</p> <p>Not in accordance with PPSD</p> <p>Investigation of alternatives is inadequate</p> <p>Health & Safety risks</p> <p>Human habitat is ignored to avoid impacting ecology</p> <p>Planning irregularities with route option chosen in relation to timing of GTS and design of road</p>	<p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>11.6</p> <p>11.7</p> <p>10.6, 11.3 albeit no specific legal irregularities are proffered</p>
Paul & Mary Mahoney	<p>Too close to city</p> <p>Not a ring road – splits Castlegar in two</p> <p>Should be further east similar to 2006 GCOB</p> <p>Construction impacts drilling, blasting rock breaking</p> <p>Dust and debris</p> <p>Impact on health</p> <p>Structural damage to house</p> <p>Noise, air pollution</p> <p>Houses to be demolished with many left in close proximity</p> <p>Moved outside the original 150m corridor</p> <p>Oppose acquisition of Racecourse Avenue</p>	<p>10.5, 10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.8</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.10, 11.11, 11.12</p> <p>11.11</p> <p>11.6</p> <p>13</p> <p>11.11, 11.12</p> <p>11.17</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>13</p>
Paul and Sarah Hogan	Rosan Glas concerns – blocking access, noise, attenuation ponds, visual impact, air	See above
Paula Lynch & Bernard Carrick	Rosan Glas – as above	See above
Peter Sweetman and others	Ref to C258/11, C164/17, C461/17	10.2
Residents of Ard Na Gaoithe	<p>Residential Amenity inc. noise (query monitoring locations) & lighting</p> <p>Access/Traffic onto Clybaun Road</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>Visual Impacts and Landscaping</p> <p>Construction Phase concerns</p>	<p>10.8, 11.12</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>10.9, 11.9</p> <p>11.14</p> <p>10, 11, 12</p>
Richard Donovan & Caroline Carrick	Rosan Glas as above	See above
Ronan McDonagh	<p>Noise, vibration</p> <p>Land is zoned for development</p>	<p>11.12</p> <p>10.3, 10.8</p>
Sarah Patricia Silke	Dust, Blasting damage	11.11

	Construction Traffic	11.13
	Garden wildlife	11.7
	Water table & treatment systems	10.9, 11.9
	Utilities	10.9
	Access to property	10.10
Sarah Silke	As per Sarah Patricia Silke	As above
Shane Durcan	Rosan Glas as above	See above for RG
Sharon Morris & Edward O'Reilly	Losing home and second house and second site	13
	Stress on children and community	11.6
	Health and well-being cause by stress	11.6
	Bat specialist visited 3 times but no such concerns for their family	10.8, 10.11, 11.7
	Impact on community	10.8
	No solution for community – to offer sites	13
	Fear for sourcing site in an area in the city boundary	10.8
Siobhan Silke	As per Sarah Patricia Silke	As above
Stephen & Debbie Meagher	Home is less than 30m from Motorway	10.5, 10.6, 10.8, 11.6
	Estate will be severed (Aughnacurra)	11.12, 11.14
	Noise & visual mitigation	
	Maintenance of existing boundary wall to 9 Aughnacurra	13
	Planting Plan	11.14
The Atlantic Greenway Project	Not objecting but concerned with location of some sections	10.6, 11.3
	Provides overview of alternative routes	10.6, 11.3
The Galway N6 Action Group	Entire scheme is misconceived	10, 11, 12, 13
	Analysis on which EIAR is based is flawed in terms of alternatives, prioritising flora & fauna over humans, purpose of road is confused, mitigation measures such as tunnelling have not been considered, scale of project is excessive and not justified, devastating impact on residential communities, proposal to thread a motorway through an urban area is misguided	11
	Decision to build road predates the GTS - entire GTS was predicated on a road	10.3, 10.6, 11.3
	Public Participation inadequate	10.11, 11.2
	Unsustainable solution	10.3
	2006 option was discounted before the GTS	10.6, 11.3
	Proposal does nothing for Public Transport	10.3
	Lack of integrated planning	10.3
	Concern with 'motorway' design – no clear indication of consideration of alternative 'lesser'	10.5, 10.6, 11.13,

	<p>options or 'need' for a motorway – no analysis of whether a more modest road would achieve the objectives</p> <p>Flawed route selection process</p> <p>Threading motorways through urban areas went out of favour in the 1960s.</p> <p>Route selection report reviewed</p> <p>Nothing in EIA Directive to suggest Biodiversity is the prime consideration – however other issues such as Human Beings were relegated to second place</p> <p>Slightly modified 2006 route could achieve similar solution with less impact on human environment. If tunnelling can solve the problem of the SAC at Lackagh why was it not considered for the original 2006 route</p> <p>Residential areas not considered a constraint</p> <p>Health impacts</p> <p>Impact on Ard na Locha and Aughnacurra</p> <p>Query CPO process – why some houses and not others</p> <p>Tunnel – other tunnels proposed – why not at Dangan</p> <p>Noise issues</p> <p>Impact on N59</p> <p>Profound impact on Menlo Castle as well as the Protected Structure BH12 to be demolished</p> <p>Proposal will increase carbon footprint</p>	<p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.5, 10.6, 11.13</p> <p>11</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>10.6, 11.3</p> <p>11.6</p> <p>10.8</p> <p>13</p> <p>10.5, 10.6, 11.3,</p> <p>11.12</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>11.15</p> <p>11.11</p>
Thomas and Mary Kilgariff	<p>Concerns about the access road from The Heath Development Plan is a contract</p> <p>Road designations have legal implications</p> <p>Application is invalid having regard to its description – CPO process</p> <p>Human environment was ignored at the expense of ecology</p> <p>It is over-designed and over-engineered</p> <p>Lack of interaction between transport policy appraisal and evaluation</p> <p>Destruction of 44 houses represents 0.162% of the housing</p> <p>Induced traffic – traffic figures are underestimated having an impact on environmental issues</p> <p>Focussed on the blue route</p> <p>Noise WHO figures</p> <p>Absence of integrated transport strategy</p>	<p>13</p> <p>10.3</p> <p>10.2, 11.13</p> <p>10.2, 13</p> <p>11</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>10.3, 10.5</p> <p>10.6, 10.8, 11.3, 11.17</p> <p>11.13</p> <p>11.3</p> <p>11.12</p> <p>10.3</p>

	Absence of Alternatives	10.6, 11.3
	Induced traffic	11.13
	Climate Change	11.11
	EIAR has not fully dealt with topics	11
	Tunnel under racecourse emphasises lack of priority and empathy to homeowners	10.5, 11
	Health issues	10.5, 10.8, 10.6, 11.3, 11.6
		11.6
Tom & Catherine O'Halloran	Noise	11.12
	Light	10.8

16.4. Thematic Summary of submissions

Where the issue has been addressed and assessed in this report is highlighted in brackets.

16.4.1. Support for the project

- Road is a vital component in developing the city as a regional centre of scale for the west. (10.3, 10.4, 10.7, 11.6, 11.16)
- The road is part of the European Commission's Trans-European Transport Network (TenT) comprehensive scheme which aims to close gaps, improve cohesion, remove bottlenecks and eliminate technical barriers that exist within EU transport networks. (10.3)
- The development of Galway as envisioned in the NPF will be restrained without the provision of key infrastructure. (10.3, 10.7, 11.6)
- A key aspect of the delivery of the GTS is the delivery of the N6 Galway City Ring Road. (10.3, 10.4, 10.7, 11.3)
- Delivery will have a positive impact on the quality of life for workers and citizens. (10.3, 10.4, 10.7, 11.6)
- Dedicated bus corridors would improve efficiency of public passenger transport thereby encouraging a modal shift and result in a reduction in traffic congestion and journey times. (10.3, 10.4, 10.7, 11.6)
- There is overwhelming policy support for the proposal. (10.3)
- Galway city and county's 100 hotel and guesthouses are heavily reliant on having an effective transportation infrastructure in place to remain competitive and attract visitors. (10.3, 10.7)
- Roadway is needed to provide access to the Gaeltacht areas and encourage economic development west of the city in the Gaeltacht areas. (10.3, 10.7, 11.6)
- The development of Galway as laid out in the NPF will be significantly restrained without this road. (10.3)

- The road will allow easier access to Salthill as a tourist destination and midway point along the Wild Atlantic Way. (10.3, 11.6)

16.4.2. Need for the development

- Need for a road is being pursued to the detriment of other more sustainable public transport solutions. (10.4)
- The €650 million project represents very poor value for money and is not a solution to Galway City's traffic gridlock. (10.7)
- Applicants have failed to adequately demonstrate the necessity of the road. There is no certainty that a ring road will make any appreciable difference on the traffic congestion. Only 3% of the total trips in and around Galway City are actually bypassing the city. It has not been demonstrated how a ring road can improve the situation for people commuting into the city on a daily basis. (10.4, 11.13)
- The project will have a profound and permanent impact on the shape, fabric and culture of the city – it needs to be considered carefully within the broad context and objectives for the longer-term sustainable development. (10.3, 10.4)
- Fundamental error with the scheme is the traffic problems are assumed to be radial versus axial. If radial, ring road would make sense, but they are axial and only solution is modal shift. (10.3, 10.4, 11.13)
- The purpose of the road is confused – is it a bypass, an urban distributor road or a ring road. (10.4, 10.5, 11.13)
- The scale of the road – full motorway for its entire length is excessive and has not been justified. (10.4, 10.5, 11.13)
- Only 3% of the traffic is bypassable – Galway is at the end of a motorway and it may be asked where is this motorway going – to the east it links to all the major population centres but to the west there is Connemara which is a thinly populated area with no large towns – such a destination does not justify a motorway. (10.3, 10.4, 10.6, 10.7, 11.3, 11.13)

- Failure of the 2006 GCOB provides an opportunity to step back and re-evaluate the problems in the city – numerous transport plans referred to - but the road consistently seen as the ‘silver bullet’ to solve the complex planning and transportation problems (10.3, 10.4, 10.6, 11.3)
- It has not been demonstrated how a ring road can improve the situation for 20,560 people commuting into the city on a daily basis. There is an enormous potential for Galway to switch from its reliance on cars to a multi-modal system that prioritises public transport and active travel. The applicants assume that modal shift can only be achieved after the road is built.(11.3, 11.13)

10.4.3. Policies and objectives of statutory plans and other policies

- Road would undermine Smarter Travel Policy and would be contrary to Planning Policy Guidelines 2015. (10.3)
- Copies of speeches, sections of various reports from international to national and citizen assembly information submitted. Road considered to be unsustainable development. Engineering the West team’s submission to Galway City Council in relation to Ardaun submitted. (10.3, 10.6, 10.7, 11.6, 11.13)
- The proposal is based on outdated and flawed logic and is in conflict with the NPF which is committed to sustainable development. Will contribute to urban sprawl. (10.3)
- The emission of Greenhouse Gases does not meet the requirements of the EIA Directive. (10.3, 11.11)
- Non-compliance with international, EU and Irish Law as regards climate change. (10.3, 11.11)
- There will be an impact on the Ardaun lands – the 2009 M6 effectively split the Ardaun corridor and the N6 GCRR has negative implications for the lands and will increase the severance between Ardaun South and Doughiska. (10.3)
- The findings of the ABTA for Ardaun need to be taken into account by the Board. (10.3)

- The proposed routing of a motorway through Dangan Lower does not accord with the planning policy context. (10.3)
- The GTS is written into the new Galway City Development Plan 2017 – 2023 to give certainty to land use development as well as place it on a statutory footing. (10.3)
- The GTS should be lodged at the same time as the road. (10.2, 10.3)
- Dangan/NUIG sports campus is zoned for recreational purposes – not for a road. (10.3)
- The quarry is on lands zoned for agriculture not for a road or a construction compound. (10.3)

16.4.4. Legal and procedural matters

- The designations as a Motorway/Dual Carriageway and ring road have legal implications. The proposal is imprecise in its description and designation and the application cannot be valid. (10.2)
- It is not possible to grant permission due to CJEU cases C-258/11, C-164/17 and C-461/17. (10.2)
- A Social Impact Assessment has not been submitted. (11.1, 11.6)
- Article 6(4) should have been pursued with the original route. (10.2)

16.4.5. Public consultation.

- Inadequate maps and communication have been provided. (10.11, 11.2)
- Insufficient communication with residents directly affected. (10.11, 11.2)
- Public participation process has left much to be desired. (10.11, 11.2)
- Frustration with whole process. (10.11)
- Dealt with by the Council with a degree of contempt. (10.11)

16.4.6. Alternatives considered.

- Park and Ride facilities on both the east and west sides of the city was a specific objective of the City Development Plan. (10.6, 11.3)
- Failure to look at provision of increased rail services and vastly improved bus services. (10.6, 11.3)
- No comprehensive school transport system to lift traffic off the roads. (10.6, 11.3, 11.13)
- There is room further north that, with the inevitable continued residential development in the future, would ensure this bridge would not become another city crossing but would be truly a ring road. (10.6, 11.3)
- The section on Alternatives gives no credible consideration to alternatives involving a significant shift of trips to walking, cycling and public transport. (10.6, 11.3)
- The route selection process was unfair and not in the best interests of the public. The route selection process was excessively concerned with impacts on flora and fauna to the detriment of impacts on humans. (10.6, 11.3, 11.6, 11.7, 12)
- A hybrid of the original blue & green routes results in the destruction of only 2 homes. (10.6, 11.3)
- Bus lanes should have been included. (10.6, 11.3)
- Out-of-city options between the city and Lough Corrib were pretty much ignored. Entire process seems to have been heavily guided by a desire to avoid ecological impacts at all costs – anything to avoid the use of Article 6(4). This is done at the expense of the human population. (10.6, 11.3, 11.7, 12)
- Go back to the original 2006 GCOB route – less impact on dwellings. (10.6, 11.3, 11.7, 12)
- No other public transport improvements included in this application. (10.3)
- Asked to provide feedback on 12 routes which was confusing. (10.6, 11.3)

16.4.7. Severance of communities/loss of dwellings

- Aughnacurra estate of 13 houses of which 5 are being CPO'd. Estate is a private estate and no person has the right to traverse the road. Access is compromised and there may be a decrease in width of internal road. Proposed access is not of an acceptable design. Ownership of internal private road should be retained by remaining residents. (10.6, 11.3, 13)
- 54 houses to be demolished or acquired is devastating for the families and communities left behind. (10.8, 11.6, 11.17, 13)
- Families will be made homeless. There isn't the housing stock in Galway to rehouse these people. (10.8, 11.6, 11.17, 13)
- People on the edge of the city boundary will not get planning permission to replace their dwelling in the county administrative area. (10.8, 11.6)
- Communities being split apart. (10.8, 11.6)
- Site was bought initially with the intention to build second home for children – road will stop that. (10.8, 11.6, 13)

16.4.8. Impact on amenities of the area particularly the Sports Campus of NUIG and the River Corrib.

- Route would severely impact the sports facilities at Dangan NUIG campus. Lands are made available to the public and are widely used. (10.8, 11.6)
- The loss of any recreation and amenity land in the city is unacceptable – lands are the finest amenity lands in the city thanks to the good work over 50 years of NUIG. (10.8, 11.6)
- Impact during construction would be in the order of 2-3 years and in the long-term due to the lost footprint of pitches, running and walking trails and lack of provision of replacement of same. (10.8, 11.6)
- Teams will be left homeless and without vital training and meeting facilities. (10.8, 11.6)

16.4.9. Impact on pedestrians, cyclists and school children.

- Gaelscoil Mhic Amhlaigh is served by a bike convoy of up to 20 school children – this will have to be cancelled due to safety concerns. “Bus Rothaiochta na Gaillimhe” involves adult volunteers accompanying children by bicycle to school along a set route and has been running since September 2018. This was not fully considered by applicants with respect to the N59 Link Road South. This will attract higher numbers of traffic. Much of the morning traffic consists of parents driving their children to school – better, safer infrastructure for cycling and walking would alleviate car congestion. (10.8, 13)
- Increased traffic on local roads will impact children travelling to school on cycle or by foot. (10.8, 10.5)
- Require assurances that sufficient consideration has been given to vulnerable road users where traffic will be directed to other roads. (10.5, 11.13)
- Serious impact on Bushypark school. (10.5, 11.13)
- Design of junctions is hostile to vulnerable road users. (10.5, 11.13)

16.4.10. **Impacts on health and quality of life and general amenity.**

- There will be an impact on individual dwelling privacy and privacy of estates. (10.8)
- Mental health already impacted due to scheme – already fraught with worry, stress and concerns. (11.6)
- Quality of life will be severely affected due to motorway running through the area. (11.6)
- No account of health impact due to loss of amenity lands at Dangan has been taken. No account of impact on mental health taken. (11.6)
- Scheme will cause overshadowing, injure visual amenity and reduce daylight. (10.8)
- Object to location of attenuation ponds near to housing estates. Numerous submissions were made from various residents’ groups and individuals raising health and safety concerns relating to attenuation pond locations. (10.8)

- Object to lighting proposed – lights will shine into dwellings where there was previously none. (10.8)
- Provided with no assurance regarding the nature or adequacy of access that will be available to homes. (10.8, 13)
- Inadequate drainage details have been provided. (10.9)
- Health will be impacted with noise and air pollution. (11.6, 11.11, 11.12)
- Increased risk to pedestrians using roads including Bothar Diarmuida and Ragoon Road. (10.5, 10.6)
- Roadway will destroy the character of the Dangan area. (10.8, 11.14)
- Unclear how construction of a motorway can be realised without impacting amenities such as utilities supply, noise, hazardous emissions, road traffic safety, drainage systems (including septic tanks). (10.9, 11.11, 11.12)
- This road will only serve to open up more lands for developers further out from the city. (10.3)
- Object to use of quarry site as the largest site compound. (10.10)
- Access to Lisheen Graveyard compromised. (13)
- The construction activities will result in structural impacts on adjacent dwellings. (10.10, 11)
- Object to Racecourse Avenue being used for construction traffic. (10.10, 11.13)
- Building more roads results in greater cost to society than the road user. (10.3)
- Object to road's proximity to dwelling and impact on individual's health. (10.6, 11.3, 11.6)
- Query schemes impact on protection of ground water and public health. (11.6, 11.9)
- Open up areas to crime. (10.8, 13)

16.4.11. Strategic traffic matters, public transport and impact on local road network.

- Application has failed to assess long-term traffic generation associated with the road. (11.13)
- Application has only considered next 5 years – should be considering the next 100 years. (11.13)
- Reference made to the M50 and how its expansion induced more traffic and congestion remains. (11.13)
- The induced traffic aspect has not received due consideration; thus the traffic figures are greatly underestimated. (11.13)
- Logic to justify road is fundamentally flawed – if extra roads were needed to be built before bus lanes could be implemented, there would be no bus lanes in cities. The provision of the road without any legally binding public transport/demand management conditions could not be considered a ‘long term’ solution. (10.3, 11.13)
- Public transport should have been prioritised – bus services are not frequent and this road will only encourage more people to use their cars. (10.3, 10.6, 11.3, 11.13)
- Cost of road – money better spent on improving public transport, cycling and pedestrian facilities. A significant investment should be made in greenways and a passing loop at Garraun Railway Station would facilitate more trains. (10.3, 10.6, 11.3)
- There will be increased traffic congestion on local roads as commuters try to get onto the new road. (10.8, 11.13)
- Residents will be unable to leave their housing estates due to the location of the new road and new accesses onto it. (11.13)
- Rosan Glas housing estate: numerous objections from residents within this estate objecting to the positioning of N59 Link Road South as it will impede access to and from estate, increase local journey times and add to traffic congestion as they will meet increased traffic on this link road. Query why link

road was not located closer to Bothar Stiofan. Consider that the road will not have a positive impact on the residents of Rosan Glas. Opportunity to provide for a green area separating the zoned enterprise lands and the residential area – road should be moved further west. (10.6, 10.8, 11.3)

- Further clarification required on the detail of both the Coolagh and Ballybrit Crescent junctions in terms of how they will impact on the multi-directional access to Briarhill Shopping Centre – proposed road is complex and extensive in nature – it is unclear how new junctions will impact on traffic movements. (11.13)
- Galway has inadequate public transport and cycle lanes – if these were properly implemented and incentivised much of the traffic problems would be alleviated. (10.6, 11.3)
- Concerned that the proposal will direct arterial traffic along roads with a residential and school function. (10.7, 10.8)
- Impact on current right of ways. (13)
- The Heath residents have a legitimate expectation that the roadway would at all times operate in a manner consistent with the Development Plan in place at the time of development – the internal road is not suitable for agriculture or to serve more than 12 dwellings or any intensification of use. (13)
- Must travel further to get to Bearnna village. (10.6)
- New circuitous routes being proposed for residents in the Forai Maola/Truskey area. (10.6)
- Road is unsuitable for a rural area. (10.6)
- More traffic from Carraroe and Spiddal will utilise this road as more houses are planned for this area but employment is in the east. (10.3)

16.4.12. **Noise and vibration impacts.**

- Noise levels will be in excess of 60dB. Screening effectiveness is queried. Strong evidence to indicate that traffic noise levels in excess of 53dB L_{den} have known adverse health effects. (11.6, 11.12)

- Extent of proposed noise mitigation measures are inadequate. (11.12)
- There is inadequate information in relation to the visual appearance of the noise barriers. (11.12, 11.14)
- There will be noise pollution as a result of this road affecting well-being. (11.6, 11.12)
- Controlled blasting – will it impact on the structural integrity of dwellings. (11.11, 11.12)
- Concerns with impact during construction of rock breaking/blasting on businesses. (10.10, 13)
- It is not apparent that the impact of noise on lands zoned for residential development in Ardaun has been assessed. (10.3)
- Query location of noise monitors, e.g. at Rosan Glas there is no noise and there will now be an increase that is not 'negligible'. It is difficult to accept that there will be no impacts on air or noise during operation and construction with the construction of a new distributor road. (11.11, 11.12)
- No noise mitigation measures for the residents of The Heath have been included in the EIAR. (11.11)

16.4.13. **Air and climate impacts.**

- Planning decisions have failed to mitigate continuing climate emissions, air pollution and congestion. The Board have a legally binding obligation to ensure that the decision satisfies the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act. (10.3, 11.12)
- Road breaches Ireland's legally binding commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and its commitments under the Paris Agreement. (10.3, 11.11)
- Impact on air pollution and health. Increase in pollution will impact health. (10.3, 11.6, 11.11)
- Harmful CO₂ emissions. (11.6, 11.11)
- Motorway will cause an increase in Carbon emissions. (11.6, 11.11)

- Ireland is a 'laggard' in responding to climate change and the road will make no contribution to limiting global warming. (10.3, 11.6, 11.11)
- EIAR failed to provide any mitigation measures regarding traffic generation and climate emissions. (11.11, 11.13)
- During construction air and dust will be a major nuisance. (11.11)
- Have the grossly understated car emissions been used in the assessment. (11.11)
- Road is utterly in conflict with our commitments under climate change legislation. Project fails to recognise that we cannot continue 'as is' rolling out more roads with the concomitant increase in cars. (10.3, 11.11)

16.4.14. **Landscape and visual impacts.**

- Aughnacurra: Road will be higher than houses within the estate – more details are required with respect to the embankment and landscaping and screening. (10.8, 11.14)
- Clarification of boundary treatment raised in numerous submissions. (10.8, 11.14, 13)
- The grim nature of the Quincentenary bridge is an example of what could seriously injure the beautiful amenity of the area. (11.14)
- Motorway will be elevated thereby blocking scenic views currently being enjoyed by residents. (11.14)
- The road will forever change the character of the area. (11.14)
- The view of Menlo Castle from the riverside will be altered dramatically. (11.14)

16.4.15. **Impacts on flora and fauna / Ecology prioritised over all other matters**

- Appears that the impact on flora and fauna was a more important issue than the disturbances to the human habitat. (11.7, 12)
- Impossible to understand how the original 1999 scheme could be abandoned because of its impact on inanimate and arguably unimportant items such as

bog cotton and limestone pavement in favour of the current scheme which sees no difficulty removing families from their homes. (11.7, 12)

- The Marsh Fritillary Butterfly must be protected. (11.7)
- Land must be farmed in order to maintain the rich biodiversity of karst areas. (11.7, 12)
- Tunnel could still pose a threat to the Limestone Pavement. (12)
- Project will have to go down the Article 6(4) route anyway. (12)
- Traffic will impact on flora and fauna, motorway will impact on trees and plants. (11.7)

16.4.16. **Water quality and flooding impacts.**

- A recurring flood occurs on the public road at Cappagh Road. This new road will present a significant safety concern. (11.10)
- Water table levels will be affected. (11.9)

16.4.17. **Traffic modelling.**

- Concerned with traffic volumes measured and predicted, and with the traffic distribution predicted. (11.13)
- No analysis as to whether a more modest road might achieve the objective. (11.13)
- Difference in Population figures in NPF vs. TII (11.13)

16.4.18. **Material assets including socio-economic impacts and future development plans for lands.**

- No details provided as to need to acquire lands in The Heath housing estate to provide access to lands currently zoned agriculture. Are there plans for future development of these lands? (13)
- The Councils have failed to build the amount of appropriate high-density housing in city suburbs to keep pace with housing demand thereby encouraging long commutes. (10.3)

- Land zoned for residential development may be impacted. (10.3)
- Concerned that residents losing homes within the city boundary will not be recognised as having a housing need within the county boundary. (13)
- Purpose of CPO of lands at The Heath are not explained in the documentation. (13)
- Many properties that remain, but in close proximity to the road, will be devalued. (10.8, 13)
- Design and location of road will lead to further urban sprawl. Developers already building houses due to location of the new road. Property developers west of Galway have been favoured. (10.3)
- Some dwellings will lose land previously earmarked for another dwelling for a child. (10.3, 13)
- Poor planning of Galway by the Councils has resulted in sprawl. (10.3)
- Land take at Ardaun will have huge implications for the sustainable development of the area. (10.3)

16.4.19. Cultural heritage impacts

- Impact on the setting of Menlo Castle – bridge will utterly diminish the view of the castle and irreparably damage the setting. (11.15)
- Dangan House was built in 1841 and has been painstakingly restored. Impact of road - no regard has been shown for homes, historical or otherwise. (10.7)
- Removal of stone wall and replacement with timber fences is contrary to the Development Plan policies. (13)

16.4.20. EIAR / NIS Deficient

- There will be a significant negative impact on sites and species namely the Annex I Habitat. Refer to ECJ Case C-461-17. (10.2)
- The Board must assess the direct and indirect impact of the project and the adequacy of the mitigation measures proposed on: Smarter Travel policy, Traffic Generation, Traffic congestion, Air pollution, Greenhouse gas

emissions, cumulative impact with a general rise in traffic. If adverse impacts cannot be mitigated then consent cannot be granted. The Board has failed to attach traffic management conditions to new roads. These considerations form the basis of a Judicial Review on any consent granted without adverse impacts being addressed or mitigated. (10, 11, 12)

- EIAR does not describe the forecasting method for CO2 emissions contrary to the EIA requirements. (11.11)
- The Board needs to satisfy itself that the mitigation measures will mitigate environmental impacts, are clearly identified and quantified, and are subject to clear conditions. (11)

16.4.21. **Property values (also addressed in CPO)**

- Proposal will undermine property values and sales in the area. (13)
- Scheme will result in an elevated structure in front of dwellings (Aughnacurra) which will reduce values. (10.8)
- Land being acquired is excessive and is questioned. (13)
- Not possible to sell house with CPO possibility. (11.6, 13)
- Road will impact on future development potential for another family home on lands. (10.3)

17.0 Appendix 2: List of Objectors to CPO, outstanding at time of completion of report

Aldi Stores (Ireland)
Bell, Helen
Bio-Medical Research Ltd.
Bolster and Duane, Joy and Pat
Boyle, Geraldine
Brooks Timber and Building Supplies Ltd.
Broughan, Peter
Burke, Padraig and Imelda
Burke, Matthew and Eileen
Burke, Matthew and Mary
Burke, Tom
Butler, Suzanne
Cairn Homes Properties Ltd.
Cairn Homes Properties Ltd.
Caiseal Geal Teoranta (Castlegar Nursing Home)
Callaghan, James
Carter, Genevieve
Carter, Frank
Cawley, Maureen
Clancy, James
Clancy, Nora
Codyre, Ann
Codyre, Pat
Codyre, Mary
Codyre, Pascal
Codyre (Reps of), Nora
Concannon, Martin
Concannon, Martin
Concannon, John
Concannon, Thomas
Concannon (Deceased), John
Concannon and Giblin, Martina and Alan
Conneely, Maura
Conneely, Michael
Conneely, Mary
Connolly, Peter and Michelle
Connolly Group,
Connor, Michael and Ann
Costelloe, Mary
Coughlan, John and Kathleen
Coughlan - Agent, John and Kathleen
Cronin, Martin
Cumann Luthcleas Gael Bother na Tra,
Cunningham, Tom and Clare
Curran, Dermot and Patricia

Dempsey, John
Dineen, Sean and Audrey
Dolly, Catherine
Dolly and Fernandes, Catherine, Seamus, Brian, Sheila
Dooley, Mary
Dooley and King, Niamh and Damian
Doyle (Dept. of Education), Brian
Duffy, Helena
Fahy, James
Fallon, Thomas
Farrell, Patrick and Ann
Farrington, Anne Marie on behalf of John
Feeney, John
Feeney, Mary
Feeney, Martin
Finn Murphy, Bernadette
Flaherty, Michael and Geraldine
Flattery, Mary
Flynn, Brendan and Valerie
Flynn, Gerard
Flynn, Marie
Francis, Patrick and Lena
Francis, Pat and Helena
Galway City Council,
Galway Race Committee,
Garran Ard Property Management Co. Ltd.
Gavin, James and Tracy
Gill, Tom and Yvonne
Gill and Others, Kevin
Glennon, Peter and Christine
Glynn, John
Goggin and Kenny, Deirdre and Michael
Greaney, Joseph
Greenan and Cunningham, Se and Marion
Griffin, Anne
Griffin, Patrick
Harney, Dermot and Sarah
Higgins, Martina
Hosty, Tom
Hughes, Katie
Hughes, Lauren
Jennings (Estate of), Eileen
Keane, Tom
Keane, Bartley and Marguerite
Keane (Reps of), Nora
Kearns, Patrick
Kelly, Shane
Kenny, Brian and Mary
Kerin, Michael and Annette
Kerin, Annette and Michael

Kerin , Family
Kerrigan, James and Ann
King, Martin and Moyra
Kinport Construction,
Lally, Michael
Lydon, Mary and Padraic
Lynn, Paul
Maloney (Reps of), John
Martyn, Sean and Kathleen
McCarthy, Finbarr
McCarthy, John and Kathleen
McCarthy, John and Kathleen
McDonagh, Mark
McDonagh, Ursula and Kevin
McDonagh, Sylvester Christopher Patrick
McGrath, Thomas
Mcgrath, Patrick John
McHugh Property Holdings
McLoone, James
McLoughlin, Ray and Helen
McMahon Ltd, James
McNamara, Noreen
Molloy, Eamonn
Moloney (Reps of), James
Monahan and Joyce, Fintan and Therese
Mulhern, Paul and Anne
Mullins, Michael
Murphy, Anne
NAMA/GVA Donal O'Buachalla,
Needham and Rea, Loretta and Tom
Nestor, Mary
Nestor, Michael
Nestor, Michelle
Nestor, Christina
O Connell, Maura and Dermot
O' Connell, Mary and Ann
Ó Curraoin, Máirtín
O' Dell, Gerard and Susan
O' Dell, Gerard and Susan
O' Dell, Gerard and Susan
O' Donnell, Emily and James
O' Donovan and Scully, Marie and Patrick
O Halloran, Peter
O' Halloran, Bridie
O' Hanlon and McConnell, Tony and Peggy
O' Hara, Leo and Jo-Anne
O' hEocha, Colm and Marie
Pearce, Nora and Michael
Roadstone Limited
Ryan, Gwendoline

Ryder, George and Phyllis
Silke, Angela
Silke and Skelton, Angela and Raymond
Silke and Skelton, Angela and Raymond
Targeted Investment Opportunities
Tesco Ireland Ltd.
Tobin, Ross
Tuam Road Developments Ltd.
Tully, Deirdre
Tully, Sean and Orna
Tully, Michael
Tummon, Paschal and Aine
Vantage Towers Ltd.
Waldron, Pat
Wallace, Peter and Bridie
Ward, Rose

18.0 Appendix 3: Observers at Further Information Stage

18.1. List of observers at Further Information Stage

1. Darren Frehill
2. Annette and Michael Kerin (x 2 submissions)
3. Peter and Michelle Connolly
4. Michael and Trisha Murphy
5. Linda Rabbitte
6. Clada Group
7. Boston Scientific Ltd
8. Galway N6 Action Group Co. Ltd.
9. Kerry Quinlan and Juan Sotoparra
10. Strategic Land Investments Ltd.
11. Geological Survey of Ireland
12. An Taisce
13. Irish Water
14. Udaras na Gaeltachta
15. Development Application Unit
16. HSE

18.2. Summary of Observations

A number of points made were a repeat of issues previously raised and are not repeated here in the interest of brevity.

18.2.1. Route Selection

- Submission gives an inaccurate description of the route selection process undertaken – this was pre-determined to a significant extent. (10.6, 11.3)
- Route selection was skewed to prioritise ecology over other matters most particularly Human Beings. (11.7, 12)

- The road will do little to address the reasons for the traffic congestion – fact that 80% of all journeys are destined for the city will not be alleviated by building a bypass (10.4, 11.13)

18.2.2. Noise

- Query location of baseline noise monitors, particularly at Ard Na Gaoithe, and are of opinion that results will actually be higher at locations on the northern side of the estate. (11.12)
- Refer to EPA daytime limit of 55dBA and expected 58dBA at Ard Na Gaoithe and express concerns with noise monitoring location to monitor impacts. (11.12)
- Barriers proposed for boundary of Kerin's residence will not provide protection for upstairs noise-sensitive rooms – suggest specialist silenced acoustic air vents. (11.12, 13)
- Further request that the Board seek more recent traffic analysis for projections and noise impact studies and query use of Electric Vehicles in analysis. (10.4, 11.3)
- Concerns with location of substation and noise in no.11 Ard an Locha. Request visual screening and relocated to less visually prominent location. (11.14, 13)

18.2.3. Landscaping

- Request improvements to landscaping in Ard an Locha. (11.14)
- It is noted that only 1000m of stone walls in the Barna area are being replaced despite in excess of 3000m being removed. Post and rail fences provide no shelter for animals or crops. There is little respect for the county's heritage. (11.14)

18.2.4. Parkmore Link Road – Resolved at Hearing

- Alignment of Parkmore Link Road will adversely affect Boston Scientific lands to a disproportionate extent. Original concerns not addressed as it still severs lands restricting future expansion for a major national employer and FDI.

- Alternative options have not been given due regard contrary to the 2014 EIA Directive.

18.2.5. Gort Na Bro Roundabout

- Concerned with omission of access to retail park from existing roundabout and replacement with four-arm junction opposite current access road to Gort Na Bro – this will divert a lot of traffic nearer to the Gort Na Bro housing estate. The current layout provides a green buffer between the retail park and the housing estate. (10.8, 10.5)

18.3. Alternatives

- Lack of coherent public transport solution as an alternative is in serious contravention with regard to national obligations to reduce carbon emissions. (10.6, 11.3)

18.4. Drawings

- Welcome the additional drawings but query the lack of mammal underpasses in Barna. (11.7, 12)
- The application should include drawings and details of all family homes and work premises due to be demolished as would be required in other planning applications. (13)
- The details of cycling and pedestrian crossings in the Barna section do not improve facilities. (10.8, 11.13)

18.5. Other issues

- Specific submission relating to lands south of An Post on the Tuam Road – request access. (13)
- Consider adequate and meaningful consultations have taken place (10.11, 11.2)