

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 324113

Francis & Elaine Mulry

Lisheenkyle East

Athenry

Galway

H65H662

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 17 April 2026

Re: Observation to the proposed development of open-cycle gas turbine (OCGT) and generator with ancillary equipment.

Location: Pollnagroagh and Rathmorrissy (Townlands), Athenry, Co. Galway

Applicant: Bord Gáis Energy Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

This proposed plant is located in the wrong location. It is too close to a growing town and even the hinterlands are too close and grossly populated. I have young kids which are going to schools in very close proximity to the proposed plant, not to mention the local sport club facilities in direct line of the prevailing wind.

Cumulative Health Impacts Over Time

I have serious concerns about how this proposed peaker plant would operate over time. Although it would run intermittently, it would do so at extremely high intensity, and the potential use of diesel adds to these concerns, as it could result in repeated short-term spikes in air pollution. While individual emission events may be brief, the fact that they could occur repeatedly over many years—potentially up to 2050—raises concerns about ongoing exposure and cumulative health impacts.

Pollutants such as nitrogen oxides and fine particulate matter are known to worsen asthma, trigger respiratory symptoms, and contribute to long-term conditions including chronic respiratory and cardiovascular disease.

This is particularly concerning for nearby residents, especially vulnerable groups such as children, older people, and those with existing health conditions. There is still uncertainty regarding whether the lasting and cumulative effects of these emissions have been fully studied, which leads to real concerns that continued exposure during the development's lifetime could affect public health and wellbeing in the future.

Long-Term Accumulation of Pollutants and Chemical Residues

I am particularly concerned about the risk of pollution to soil and groundwater from this proposed development. The inclusion of diesel storage tanks, hardstanding areas, drainage systems, and other infrastructure increases the likelihood that pollutants could gradually enter the ground over time, potentially up to 2050. Substances such as hydrocarbons from diesel and gas, along with other chemical residues, may build up slowly, particularly where there are repeated small leaks, routine operational losses, or occasional spills, with impacts accumulating over time.

What is especially worrying is that this type of pollution may not be immediately visible but could result in long-term damage to groundwater quality and soil health. This has implications not only for environmental protection but also for local agriculture, which depends on clean soil and water. Overall, there is significant concern that these long-term and cumulative risks have not been fully addressed and could have lasting consequences for the local environment and livelihoods.

Protection of Agricultural Livelihoods

Farmers work diligently within stringent environmental guidelines and uphold rigorous standards of environmental stewardship, fully recognising the importance of these obligations. There is concern that an industrial development of this nature—particularly one involving diesel use and long-term emissions, potentially until 2050—could introduce risks that undermine that work by affecting land quality and increasing environmental pressures. This situation presents significant challenges for farmers, who should not face penalties for problems caused by factors beyond their control. There are concerns that agricultural risks remain overlooked and the development may affect local farming long-term.

Exposure During Daily Activities and School Times

As a parent in the area, I am concerned that children living nearby or attending local schools will be exposed to higher levels of air pollution when the plant is operating at peak times, particularly when they are outdoors during school drop-off, break times, and after-school activities. During physical activity, children breathe more rapidly, increasing their intake of pollutants and making them more vulnerable to harmful effects. What is especially worrying is the potential for repeated exposure during key stages of development, which could have lasting impacts on their health and wellbeing. Overall, this raises serious concerns as to whether these risks have been fully considered.

Unsuitability of Rural Road Network

There are serious concerns about the proposed site entrance on the L3103, which is an exceptionally dangerous stretch of road where introducing an access point would create an unacceptable level of risk. The road is extremely narrow and cannot safely accommodate two heavy goods vehicles passing at the same time, there is no hard shoulder to allow for safe manoeuvring or recovery, and visibility is severely limited due to blind dips and sharp corners. These are significant existing hazards that already pose a real danger to road users, and the addition of a site entrance would further increase that risk.

There are also concerns regarding the suitability of local roads for this type of traffic. Rural roads are not built to support continuous industrial activity, and when heavy trucks, farm equipment, and regular local vehicles

share these routes, it often leads to difficult and dangerous traffic conditions. The introduction of additional industrial traffic, including construction vehicles and diesel deliveries, would further increase the risk and make these roads more dangerous for all users.

Major Accident Hazard and Regulatory Concerns

I am concerned about the potential for major accidents associated with this proposed development. A gas-fired peaker plant, combined with on-site fuel storage, introduces real risks, including fire, explosion, and the release of fuel. According to the requirements of the Seveso III Directive, any development involving hazardous substances must present clear evidence that relevant risks have been appropriately identified, assessed, and minimized. In this instance, it appears that full compliance may not have been achieved. Locally, there is concern regarding whether the probability and impact of serious incidents have been comprehensively evaluated or clearly demonstrated, which raises ongoing questions about the adequacy of risk management and the safety of nearby residents.

Scale, Integration, and Rural Context

There are serious concerns that the scale and industrial nature of the proposed development are not in keeping with the surrounding rural environment. Building large-scale plants, structures, and infrastructure would result in a prominent addition to the landscape that does not match the area's current appearance. There is no evidence showing this development could blend into its environment or that its visual effects could be properly reduced. This raises concerns in relation to the Galway County Development Plan, particularly Policy GB1, which requires that developments be designed and located in a manner that allows them to integrate effectively into the landscape.

Availability of Cleaner Alternatives

Although cleaner and more sustainable alternatives to fossil fuels—such as renewable energy, energy storage, demand response, and grid flexibility measures—are available, building new gas infrastructure may lessen the urgency to invest in these solutions. Given the climate crisis, emphasis should be placed on low-carbon and renewable options instead of furthering dependence on fossil fuels; this proposal could delay the shift toward a more sustainable energy system.

Lack of Clear, Accessible, and Effective Communication

There are concerns that community engagement in relation to this project has been insufficient and ineffective. Many residents did not receive any direct communication or notification about the proposed development, and while some individuals report receiving a flyer or attending an information event, the material provided was highly technical and difficult to understand without specialist knowledge. This limits meaningful public participation, as effective consultation requires information to be accessible, clearly explained, and actively communicated to all affected members of the community. In this case, the complexity and level of technical detail in the documentation creates a barrier to understanding, meaning that many people cannot fully assess the potential impacts of the development.

Absence of Worst-Case Scenario Assessment

There are concerns that the Environmental Impact Assessment relies on assumed or typical operating scenarios rather than fully assessing worst-case conditions. As a demand-led facility, a peaker plant may operate more frequently, for longer periods, or at higher intensity than predicted, and this may include the use of diesel during start-up, testing, or operational phases. As a result, actual emissions and environmental

impacts could be significantly greater than those modelled. A comprehensive evaluation of worst-case scenarios is essential to ensure the reliability of the assessment. Without such an analysis, it is not possible to affirm with confidence that major negative environmental impacts will be avoided, and this omission constitutes a critical limitation.


Reliance on Regulation Does Not Eliminate Risk

The Environmental Impact Assessment depends on forthcoming regulation, licensing, and monitoring to manage environmental effects. Nonetheless, regulatory oversight cannot entirely remove environmental risks or ensure that actual emissions and impacts will match those projected by models. Uncertainty persists regarding the long-term performance of the development, especially under diverse operational scenarios.

Conclusion

Due to the concerns mentioned—such as uncertainty about how often operations will occur, overall environmental impacts, and risks related to diesel use—this project is not viewed as proper or sustainable development. There has also been insufficient consideration of the possibility that the actual impacts could be greater than those evaluated. Therefore, we respectfully ask that approval for this application be refused.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Francis & Elaine Mulry". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Name: Francis & Elaine Mulry

Date: 17 April 2026