

Brigid and Johnny Kelly
St. Joseph's,
Castlelambert,
Athenry.
Galway
H65K372

26th May 2026

An Coimisiún Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Re: Formal Observation/Objection – Application Reference ACP-324162 – Proposed Cable Route, Cashla Peaker Plant, Athenry, Co. Galway

Dear An Coimisiún Pleanála,

We are writing as landowners and long-standing residents of the Athenry area, directly and seriously affected by the proposed cable route referenced above. We are in our seventies and have farmed this land all of our lives. We wish to formally and strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

1. THE SPLITTING OF THIS PROJECT INTO TWO SEPARATE APPLICATIONS IS WRONG AND SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN PERMITTED

We wish to begin by expressing our deep anger and disgust at the manner in which this project has been brought before An Coimisiún Pleanála.

The Cashla Peaker Plant and its cable route are one project. They cannot function independently of one another. They should have been the subject of one planning application, assessed together, with one public consultation process. Instead, they have been split into two entirely separate applications — ACP-324113 and ACP-324162 — forcing ordinary members of the public to engage with two separate, complex, and voluminous sets of documentation simultaneously.

We consider this to be a sly and cynical approach to the planning process. It is designed — whether intentionally or not — to confuse, overwhelm, and deter ordinary people from making informed objections. We are deeply disappointed that An Coimisiún Pleanála allowed this fragmented approach to proceed in the first instance, and we call on the Commission to reflect seriously on whether this is consistent with its obligations to ensure genuine, meaningful, and accessible public participation in the planning process.

Furthermore, we are in our seventies and semi retired. We are now required to pay €50 to object to this application, and a further €50 to object to the related peaker plant application ACP-324113 — a total of €100 — simply to have our voices heard on what is, in reality, one single project. We find this deeply unjust. We would not have had to pay twice had this project been submitted as one application, as it should have been. The financial burden placed on elderly residents and farmers in this situation is, in our view, wholly unreasonable and contrary to the spirit of public participation in planning.

2. SEVERE IMPACT ON OUR FARMING OPERATIONS — THREE LAND PARCELS AFFECTED

We are farmers. We have farmed the land along and adjacent to the proposed cable route for decades. The proposed cable route passes through or adjacent to three separate parcels of our land at different locations along the route. The images of the land is shown below

The construction works and associated infrastructure — in particular the cable junction boxes — will have a devastating impact on our farming operations in the following ways:

(a) Direct severance of land: See image 1. The placement of cable junction boxes along the route means that certain parcels of our land will be rendered completely inaccessible during the construction period. We will be unable to reach portions of our own land. This is an unacceptable interference with our property rights and our ability to farm our land.

(b) Grossly extended travel times for farm machinery: Where our land is not completely cut off, the works will force us to divert farm machinery around the construction zones. We have calculated that moving machinery between our affected land parcels — journeys that currently take a matter of minutes — will require detours of approximately 40 minutes per journey due to the proposed works and road closures. Over the course of a six-month construction period, this will result in an enormous loss of productive farming time, increased fuel costs, additional wear on machinery, and significant financial loss to our farm.

(c) Timing and seasonal impact: Farming does not pause for construction projects. The six-month construction period will inevitably overlap with critical farming seasons — including silage, hay, and livestock management. The inability to access our land or move machinery efficiently during these periods could have serious consequences for our farm's productivity and viability.

We do not believe that the applicant has carried out any meaningful assessment of the cumulative impact of the proposed works on agricultural landowners with multiple affected parcels along the route. This is a significant omission in the Environmental Impact Assessment and must be addressed.

3. COMPLETE INACCESSIBILITY OF LAND DUE TO JUNCTION BOX PLACEMENT

As noted above, the positioning of cable junction boxes along the route means that certain portions of our land will be completely inaccessible for the duration of the works. See Image 1. This goes beyond inconvenience — it constitutes a direct and serious interference with our rights as landowners and with our ability to maintain and manage our land and livestock.

We call on An Coimisiún Pleanála to require the applicant to:

- (a) Provide a detailed map clearly identifying all land parcels affected by junction box placement and associated works;
- (b) Demonstrate that the positioning of each junction box is strictly necessary and that alternative locations that do not sever landowner access have been fully assessed; and
- (c) Commit in writing to maintaining access to all privately owned land at all times throughout the construction period, or alternatively to provide full and fair compensation where this is not possible.

4. INADEQUATE CONSULTATION WITH AFFECTED LANDOWNERS

We have not been adequately consulted about the impact of this proposal on our land and farming operations. As landowners with three separate parcels affected by the route, we would have expected a detailed, individualised consultation process. This did not occur to any satisfactory degree. The applicant cannot claim to have assessed the impact on agricultural landowners without having engaged meaningfully with those landowners.

5. CONCLUSION

We are elderly farmers who have worked this land all our lives. We are not opposed to progress or to energy infrastructure in principle. But we are entitled to have the impact on our land, our livelihood, and our way of life properly assessed, properly explained, and properly mitigated. That has not happened here.

The decision to split this project into two applications has forced us to pay twice, engage with twice the paperwork, and make twice the submissions — at our age and on our income. We find this deeply wrong and we ask An Coimisiún Pleanála to take note of the burden this places on ordinary rural people.

For the reasons set out above, we strongly urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to:

- (a) Refuse permission for the cable route as currently proposed; or alternatively
- (b) Require the applicant to substantially revise the routing and junction box locations to ensure full and unobstructed access to all privately owned land parcels at all times;
- (c) Require the applicant to carry out and submit a full agricultural impact assessment covering all landowners with multiple affected parcels along the route;
- (d) Consider whether applications ACP-324162 and ACP-324113 should be assessed together as a single integrated project; and
- (e) Consider whether the current observation fee structure is appropriate where a single project has been fragmented into multiple applications, effectively doubling the financial burden on members of the public.

We trust that An Coimisiún Pleanála will give full and proper consideration to the very real impact this proposal has on the lives, livelihoods, and land of the farming families of this area.

Yours faithfully,

Johnny and Brigid Kelly

bc.kelly90@gmail.com 0872106464



Image 1



Image 2



Image 3