

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 324113

James and Betty Kavanagh

Tourkeel

Athenry

Galway

H65 R660

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 23 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,

I am writing to formally record my strong objection to the proposed gas and diesel peaker power plant in Athenry, Co. Galway. My wife and I are both in our 70s, and we have a son and grandchild living in close proximity to the proposed development. While we may not personally witness the full extent of any long-term consequences arising from this project, we remain deeply concerned about its potential impact on our family, our community, and the surrounding environment. In particular, we are troubled by the possible effects on local air quality, agricultural land, waterways, and the broader natural environment, as well as the contribution such a development may make to climate change. These are not abstract concerns, but matters that could have lasting implications for future generations. For these reasons, we feel a strong responsibility to voice our opposition. We believe it is important to advocate for the protection of our community and environment, and to ensure that decisions made today do not impose unnecessary risks or burdens on my son, grandchild and his future children, who will live with their consequences in the years to come.

I am particularly concerned about pollutants commonly associated with diesel combustion, including nitrogen dioxide, nitrogen oxides, fine particulate matter, sulphur dioxide, and carbon monoxide. These substances are known to have adverse effects on air quality and human health. Prolonged or elevated exposure can

impair lung development in children, increase the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular conditions, and exacerbate existing health issues such as asthma. It is essential that any assessment of this proposal fully considers the potential health implications for children and the wider community. I strongly believe that no development should proceed without clear, evidence-based assurances that it will not negatively impact public health, particularly that of the next generation.

A further concern relates to the proposed on-site storage of up to 6.4 million litres of diesel, which presents several significant risks. Firstly, the transportation of such large volumes of fuel will inevitably increase heavy goods vehicle traffic along the narrow rural roads leading into Athenry. This raises concerns regarding congestion, road safety, and the heightened risk of traffic accidents involving large fuel tankers. Such conditions may pose a particular danger to pedestrians and cyclists, and could discourage active travel by making these routes less safe for local residents, including children. Secondly, the environmental risks associated with storing substantial quantities of diesel must be carefully considered. In the event of a spill, leak, or structural failure, there is a potential for contamination of nearby land and water sources, including underground waterways and private wells. The implications of such contamination for both public health and the local ecosystem could be severe and long-lasting. Given these factors, it is essential that the safety, environmental protection measures, and infrastructure capacity associated with this proposal are rigorously assessed and clearly communicated.

The proposed development would constitute a COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) / Seveso-designated site, involving the storage of up to 6.4 million litres of diesel. This classification reflects the significant hazards associated with such facilities and warrants careful consideration. The presence of large volumes of combustible fuel introduces inherent risks, including fire and explosion. In the event of a major incident, there may be a requirement for emergency response measures, including potential evacuation of nearby residents. This raises concerns regarding the capacity and resilience of local infrastructure, particularly given the limited number of access and egress routes serving the area. In addition, it is important to consider evolving risk factors in the modern context, including the potential for cyber security breaches or other external threats that could impact critical infrastructure. While such risks may be low in probability, their potential consequences are serious and should be addressed through robust safety, security, and emergency planning frameworks. Given these considerations, it is essential that any proposal of this nature is subject to rigorous risk assessment, with clear and transparent communication of the measures in place to safeguard the local community and environment.

In conclusion, while the need for reliable energy infrastructure is acknowledged, this proposal raises significant and far-reaching concerns that cannot be overlooked. It appears fundamentally at odds with the urgent transition toward cleaner, more sustainable energy systems, particularly at a time when individuals and communities are being encouraged to reduce their reliance on fossil fuels. The scale of diesel storage and combustion proposed presents clear environmental, health, and safety risks. These include increased greenhouse gas emissions, potential degradation of local air quality, and associated impacts on public health—especially for children and those with existing respiratory conditions. The proximity of the development to residential areas, schools, and recreational facilities heightens these concerns. In addition, the transport and storage of large volumes of fuel introduce further risks relating to road safety, environmental contamination, and major accident hazards. The designation of the site as a COMAH / Seveso facility underlines the seriousness of these risks, including the potential for fire, explosion, and the need for emergency response measures that could place additional strain on local infrastructure. Taken together, these factors raise important questions about the long-term suitability of this development in its proposed location. In the context of an ongoing climate crisis and the responsibility to protect both current and future generations, it is imperative that planning decisions prioritise sustainable, low-risk alternatives that align with environmental and public health objectives. For these reasons, I respectfully submit a strong objection to the

proposed development.

High-Intensity Emissions and Diesel Impacts

I am concerned about the potential impact of air pollution from this proposed development. Pollutants such as nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) are known to damage air quality, irritate the lungs, and contribute to long-term harm to both human health and the environment. Although the plant would not operate continuously, it may run at extremely high output when required, leading to short but intense bursts of pollution, particularly during start-up and peak demand periods. The possible use of diesel during these times is especially worrying, as it produces higher levels of harmful emissions, including nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide, and particulate matter.

These pollutants can penetrate deep into the lungs and enter the bloodstream, increasing the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular illness, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, older people, and those with existing health conditions. Fine particulate matter can also travel long distances and accumulate over time, meaning the impacts may extend beyond the immediate area and persist in the long term. In summary, I have reservations regarding the thoroughness of the assessment of these emissions. This issue presents significant implications for public health and environmental protection, especially in relation to EU air quality standards established by Directive 2008/50/EC.

Short-Term Exposure

I'm concerned that emissions from the planned peaker plant could impact the environment, particularly if diesel is used at start-up or during periods of high demand. Diesel exhaust releases various dangerous pollutants, such as nitrogen oxides, fine particles, and other toxic chemicals. These substances are associated with respiratory issues, impaired lung function, and heart disease. What is especially worrying is that these emissions may occur in short but intense bursts rather than in a steady, predictable way, particularly during start-up and peak operation. The average-based modelling used in the assessment seems not to capture this kind of real-world operation completely.

There are worries that residents in nearby areas might face greater pollution levels than expected, especially when the weather is calm and pollutants linger instead of spreading out. There is considerable uncertainty regarding how accurate these air quality forecasts are, which makes it hard for the community to be sure that both public health and the environment are truly safeguarded.

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.

Public Health Protection

There is significant concern within the community about the potential impact of air pollution from this proposed peaker plant on human health, particularly during periods when it is operating at full capacity and emissions are highest. The possible use of diesel is especially worrying, as it introduces additional harmful pollutants that can travel long distances and accumulate in the environment.

There is ongoing uncertainty concerning the operational frequency of the plant, its emission rates, and the extent of public exposure to pollutants through 2050. Because these issues remain unresolved, it is difficult to verify that all risks have been considered. Given these unknowns, it is wise to adopt a careful strategy to protect public health; unless definitive evidence proves no harm, any dangers to residents should be considered as part of the planning process.

Risk of Groundwater Contamination from Fuel Storage and Handling

I am concerned about the risks of soil and groundwater contamination from this proposed peaker plant. The development would involve the storage and handling of fuels such as diesel, along with lubricating oils and other chemicals, all of which could pose a risk to the surrounding environment. There is a real possibility that these substances could leak, spill, or enter the ground through surface runoff over the long lifetime of the facility, potentially up to 2050, and even small but repeated incidents could lead to a gradual build-up of pollution in soil and groundwater.

This is particularly worrying because once groundwater becomes contaminated, it is extremely difficult and costly to remediate, and the impacts can persist for decades. This raises serious concerns about the long-term protection of local water resources and the surrounding environment. There remains uncertainty about whether these risks have been adequately managed, raising substantial worries that the project might cause permanent damage to water quality. This would violate the obligations under EU Directive 2000/60/EC, which mandates the protection of water bodies and prohibits their deterioration.

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.

Dependence on Groundwater for Domestic and Agricultural Use

I am concerned about the potential risk to groundwater from this proposed development. The area depends heavily on clean groundwater for essential needs, including drinking water, farming, and livestock, making it a vital resource for the community. The introduction of an industrial facility involving the storage and handling of fuels creates an ongoing risk to this resource, and any contamination, even if accidental, could have serious and long-lasting consequences for water quality, livestock health, and agricultural productivity.

What is particularly worrying is that once groundwater becomes contaminated, the damage can be extremely

difficult—if not impossible—to reverse. This raises serious concerns about whether this type of development is appropriate for this location. To sum up, significant worries persist that the dangers to groundwater have not been fully assessed, and any consequences could be permanent.

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.

Vulnerability to Diesel-Related Air Pollution

As a parent living in the area, I am particularly concerned about the potential impact of this proposed development on children's health. Children are particularly susceptible to the effects of air pollution because of their developing respiratory systems, elevated respiration rates, and greater exposure to outdoor environments. Although peaker plants do not function on a continuous basis, they can produce significantly elevated levels of output during initial start-up phases or times of peak energy demand. This may lead to brief yet significant emissions of pollutants, particularly when diesel fuel is utilised. These emissions contain fine particles and nitrogen oxides that can penetrate deep into the lungs, which may affect lung development and increase the risk of respiratory conditions such as asthma. Overall, this raises serious concerns about the health and wellbeing of children and whether these risks have been fully considered.

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.

Cumulative Impact on Child's Development

As a parent in the area, I am concerned about the impact of fine particulate matter over time. These pollutants can travel long distances and accumulate, meaning children may be exposed not only during peak pollution events but also through ongoing low-level exposure. The cumulative effect of this is particularly worrying, as repeated exposure during key stages of growth and development could have lasting impacts on lung development and overall health. From a community perspective, this raises serious concerns about the long-term safety of this development for children, and it is not clear that these cumulative impacts have been fully considered.

Need for Precaution Due to Uncertainty

There is significant concern regarding the insufficient assessment of long-term health impacts on children, particularly with respect to repeated exposure associated with intermittent plant operation and diesel utilisation. Since children are especially susceptible to air pollution, uncertainty surrounding these effects

warrants scrutiny. It is inadequate to presume minimal risk without substantial, transparent evidence. Given these circumstances, it is recommended that a precautionary approach be adopted to prioritise the health and wellbeing of children and to ensure that all potential risks are thoroughly evaluated and mitigated.

Increased Heavy Traffic and Diesel Transport Risks

As someone who lives locally and uses this road, I am concerned about road safety in relation to the proposed entrance on the L3103. This stretch of road is already extremely narrow, with no hard shoulder, making it difficult for two heavy goods vehicles to pass safely and leaving no margin for error. Visibility is also poor due to blind dips and sharp bends, meaning drivers often cannot see oncoming traffic in time. The proposed development would increase traffic levels, including heavy goods vehicles, construction traffic, and fuel deliveries such as diesel tankers, all of which require space and clear sightlines that this road does not provide.

Given that these rural roads are used by residents, farm machinery, and school-related traffic, the addition of significant industrial traffic would increase the risk of accidents and create a more hazardous environment. Overall, there is strong concern that the existing road infrastructure is not suitable for this level of traffic and that the associated safety risks have not been adequately addressed.

School Safety and Peak-Time Risks

As someone who lives locally and extensively uses this road, I am concerned about the proposed location of the site entrance on the L3103. This section of road is already extremely dangerous, as it is narrow, has no hard shoulder, and does not provide sufficient space for two heavy goods vehicles to pass safely. Visibility is also poor due to blind dips and sharp bends, meaning drivers often cannot see oncoming traffic in time, and introducing a site entrance at this location would significantly increase the risk to all road users.

There are strong concerns that adding traffic—particularly large vehicles—would worsen these existing hazards, especially near homes and schools during busy periods such as morning and afternoon times. The interaction between heavy goods vehicles, farm machinery, and everyday local traffic creates a higher risk of accidents, particularly for children and other vulnerable road users. Overall, this is not a suitable location for this level of traffic, and the associated safety risks for the community are a critical concern.

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.

Inadequate Assessment of Traffic Impacts

The placement of a site entrance at this hazardous location on the L3103 raises serious safety concerns. The road is already constrained by its narrow width, the absence of a hard shoulder, and extremely poor visibility due to blind dips and sharp corners, yet the Environmental Impact Assessment does not appear to fully

address the safety implications of introducing an access point at this location. There are also concerns that the cumulative impact of additional traffic has not been properly assessed, including construction traffic, ongoing operational traffic, and fuel deliveries, and the interaction between heavy goods vehicles and existing road users—such as local traffic, school-related movements, and agricultural machinery—has not been examined in sufficient detail. Overall, the lack of a thorough and robust traffic safety assessment creates significant uncertainty as to whether the local road network can safely accommodate this development.

Risk of Fire and Explosion from Fuel Storage

As someone living in the area, I am very concerned about the safety risks associated with this proposed development. The project involves the storage, handling, and use of highly flammable fuels such as natural gas and diesel, which carry an inherent risk of fire or explosion. In the event of equipment malfunctions, leaks, or operational challenges, these substances may pose an ignition risk, potentially resulting in significant incidents. Considering the intermittent yet high-intensity operation of a peaker plant, the likelihood of such occurrences warrants careful consideration.

The potential consequences are particularly worrying, as any incident could have serious impacts on nearby homes, residents, farmland, and livestock. This raises significant concerns about whether the risks have been fully assessed and whether this location is appropriate for a development of this nature.

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.

Proximity and Worst-Case Scenario Risks

There are serious concerns about the location of this proposed development, given its proximity to residential homes, agricultural land, and local infrastructure. In this context, even a low-probability event could have serious consequences for public safety, property, and the local rural economy. While such incidents may be unlikely, the potential impact of events such as fire, explosion, or fuel-related incidents could be significant, particularly given how close the development is to where people live and work. The Environmental Impact Assessment does not clearly demonstrate that worst-case scenarios have been fully examined, with limited detail on potential fire spread, explosion impact zones, and fuel ignition risks. Without this information, the true scale and severity of potential impacts remain unclear, giving rise to significant concern about the level of risk associated with the development.

Emergency Response and Adequacy of Assessment

There are serious concerns about the lack of clear information on emergency response planning for this proposed development, including how a major incident would be managed, evacuation procedures, coordination with local emergency services, and the overall effectiveness of any response. This is particularly concerning in a rural area where the road network is already limited and constrained, which could make access and evacuation more difficult in an emergency and increase risks to nearby residents. When considered alongside the absence of detailed worst-case scenario analysis, it is not clear that risks to human health and safety have been reduced to an acceptable level, creating significant concern about the

preparedness of the development to respond to a major incident.

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.

Conflict with National and EU Climate Targets

There are serious concerns regarding Ireland's legally binding obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amendment) Act 2021, as well as wider EU climate frameworks. The continued development of gas-fired generation, including peaker plants, will result in additional carbon dioxide emissions over the lifetime of the project, raising questions about alignment with national carbon budgets and emissions reduction targets. In this context, there is concern that the proposal may undermine the State's ability to meet its climate commitments and transition to a low-carbon 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.

Ineffective Engagement and Limited Opportunity to Participate

There are concerns that, while documentation has been made available, the approach to community engagement has not ensured meaningful or effective participation. Many residents were not directly informed of the development, and engagement appears to have relied on passive methods rather than proactive outreach. Opportunities to engage were limited and may not have reached all affected individuals, particularly those without the time, resources, or technical background to interpret the material. Effective consultation requires early, inclusive, and accessible engagement with the community, and it does not appear that this standard has been achieved in this case.

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.

Lack of Worst-Case Assessment

The Environmental Impact Assessment bases its findings on expected operating scenarios instead of evaluating the worst-case possibilities. Because the plant's operation will depend on electricity demand, it's unclear how often or how intensely it might run. This uncertainty also applies to diesel usage, which could produce higher emissions than those estimated. Without a thorough assessment of the most severe potential impacts, it is impossible to guarantee that major environmental effects will not happen.

Conclusion

This proposal presents important concerns regarding people, public health, agriculture, and the surrounding environment. Because the documentation is complex and community engagement has been limited, many individuals have found it challenging to take part in the decision-making process. Communities should not face uncertain or potentially substantial environmental risks. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that planning permission be refused.

Yours Sincerely,

James + Betty
Kavanagh

Name: James and Betty Kavanagh

Date: 23 April 2026