Our Case Number: ACP-323060-25

An Coimisiún Pleanála

Stephen and Mary Hunt
Hunts
Behybaun
Ballina
County Mayo
F26 FW32

Date: 28 August 2025

Re: Mayo County Council Ballina Flood Relief Scheme Compulsory Purchase Order No 1 of 2025
River Moy, County Mayo

Dear Sir / Madam,

An Coimisiún Pleanála has received your letter of objection in relation to the above mentioned compulsory purchase order.

In respect of same, please note that in circumstances where:
(i) no objections are received by the Commission within the period provided for making objections, or
(ii) all objections made are subsequently withdrawn, or
(iii) all objections made relate exclusively to matters which can be dealt with by a property arbitrator the Commission will inform the local authority as appropriate and, in such circumstances, the local authority can itself confirm the order with or without modification or refuse to confirm the order in accordance with the provisions of section 216 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

The Commission has absolute discretion to hold an oral hearing in respect of any application before it, in accordance with section 218 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. Accordingly, the Commission will inform you on this matter in due course.

If you have any queries in the meantime please contact the undersigned officer of the Commission at laps@pleanala.ie Please quote the above-mentioned An Coimisiún Pleanála reference number in any correspondence or telephone contact with the Commission.

Yours faithfully,

Lauren Griffin
Executive Officer
Direct Line: 01-8737244

AA02

Teil	**Tel**	(01) 858 8100
Glao Áitiúil	**LoCall**	1800 275 175
Facs	**Fax**	(01) 872 2684
Láithreán Gréasáin	**Website**	www.pleanala.ie
Ríomhphost	**Email**	communications@pleanala.ie

64 Sráid Maoilbhríde
Baile Átha Cliath 1
D01 V902

64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Teil	**Tel**	(01) 858 8100
Glao Áitiúil	**LoCall**	1800 275 175
Facs	**Fax**	(01) 872 2684
Láithreán Gréasáin	**Website**	www.pleanala.ie
Ríomhphost	**Email**	communications@pleanala.ie

64 Sráid Maoilbhríde
Baile Átha Cliath 1
D01 V902

64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

An Coimisiún Pleanála
64 Marlborough street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

25/08/2025

Ballina Flood Relief Scheme
Case reference: CH16.323060

Address: Hunts, Behybaun, Ballina, County Mayo, F26 FW32

Dear sir/madam

As the owners and residents of the above property, We, Stephen and Mary Hunt, wish to object to the Compulsory Acquisition of our Land as part of the Ballina Flood Relief Scheme. The property comprises an occupied two-storey residence, with mature gardens, trees and outbuildings. The Tullyegan river channel is situated along the northern boundary of the property.

The Local Authority is seeking permanent wayleaves (refs. T71-02) and temporary working areas (refs. T71-01 & T71-03) amounting to a total of 481sq.m of our residential property. This would have inexplicable impact on the enjoyment of this property for our family, removing gardens, hindering privacy and generally destroying the suburban residential character of the area.

Proposals that had been submitted with the flood risk assessment do not clearly set out the intention for the entire area of my property subject of the CPO notice. In short, we are unclear as to how our property would be treated, including landscaping, boundaries and services, and why our property is to be acquired.

From the outset we wish to flag that we are bemused that the Local Authority did not submit the application for the Flood Relief Scheme and the associated CPO simultaneously. The site notices erected for the CPO used the same locations and notice boards that had been used previously for the Flood Relief Scheme planning application, making it difficult for the general public to identify that the CPO had subsequently been lodged.

While we recognise the wider societal benefits in undertaking the associated flood risk scheme, the extent of ground required from our property is grossly excessive, particularly when considering the following:

- more convenient maintenance access to the river channel along the north of my property would be available from the properties to the north that are either vacant or undeveloped. These unoccupied properties, including their extensive rear hardstandings, also provide greater scope to be incorporated

into the flood relief measures, with substantively less impacts on property owners;

- when considering the extent of the 4 hectare property containing a vacant house (Eircode F26 NTF6) to the north, which is to be used as a temporary works area and the permanent wayleave (refs. T73-01 and T73-02), the area of my property and residence being sought under the CPO appears grossly excessive and unnecessary and the Local Authority has not provided sufficient justification for seeking to acquire parts of my property, temporarily or permanently;
- the flood relief scheme does not explore the fact that other broader processes on this relatively small river subcatchment, such as rural land reclamation, ground infilling and agricultural drainage, as opposed to climate change, have primarily increased flooding in the area, and it is these measures that should be addressed in order to avoid the necessity to affect urban properties consisting of family homes by CPO;
- the extent of area required is excessive and exorbitant relative to the identified flood design levels, including freeboard, the existing flood prevention measures and the associated works intended as part of the flood relief scheme in this area, including a flood wall measuring 0.86m in depth along the northern boundary of my property – subsurface works are noted but these do not necessitate the permanent loss of property;
- other neighbouring lands with less efficient land uses, such as residual green areas along the river channel in Rehins Fort or agricultural lands west of the railway line, would provide alternative options to resolve the flood risks identified, however the Local Authority has not pursued these options in any reasonable manner. For example within Rehins Fort compensatory native woodland is only proposed, which is most likely intended to obstruct the potential to use this area as a temporary or permanent works area.

We object to the subject CPO as it represents a gross infringement of our property rights and we would appreciate the holding of an oral hearing to express these concerns further.

Sincerely

Mary Hunt. Stephen Hunt.

Stephen and Mary Hunt