



Further Observation – Arklow Bank Wind Park Phase 2 – ABP-319864-24

From Dennis Higgins <dennis.higgins21@gmail.com>

Date Mon 7/27/2026 5:24 PM

To Marine <marine@pleanala.ie>

 1 attachment (42 KB)

ABP-319864-24 - Dennis Higgins.pdf;

You don't often get email from dennis.higgins21@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an **External Email** and may have malicious content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the ICT Helpdesk.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my further observation in relation to the additional information submitted by Sure Partners Limited for the Arklow Bank Wind Park Phase 2 application.

I previously made a valid written submission regarding this application in 2024, under the same name and address provided in the attached letter.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email and advise if any further information is required to ensure that my observation is accepted as valid.

Kind regards,

--

Dennis Higgins

dennis.higgins21@gmail.com | [0851444174](tel:0851444174)

[TWITTER](#) | [LINKEDIN](#)

**Offices of An Coimisiún Pleanála,
64 Marlborough Street,
Dublin 1**

**Observation on Additional Information
Arklow Bank Wind Park Phase 2
ACP Reference: ABP-319864-24**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I previously made a valid observation in relation to this application in 2024. I am now making this further observation in response to the additional information submitted by Sure Partners Limited.

I live in County Wicklow and have a strong personal connection to Brittas Bay and the wider Wicklow coastline. This is not simply a scenic area to me. It is part of our community, our local economy and our family life. I support renewable energy and recognise that Ireland needs to develop offshore wind. However, I remain firmly of the view that Arklow Bank is the wrong location for a development of this size and scale.

Having considered the additional information, I do not believe it provides sufficient certainty that the project will not damage the sandbank, interfere with sediment movement or contribute to coastal erosion along Brittas Bay and the wider Wicklow and Wexford coastline. The applicant's conclusions appear to rely heavily on modelling of a complex and constantly changing natural environment. Models can be useful, but they cannot predict every future storm, wave pattern or movement of sand over the full lifetime of the development.

This is particularly concerning when the modelling period appears to be shorter than the expected operational life of the project. If the predictions are wrong, the consequences may not become clear until damage has already occurred. Monitoring after construction would not necessarily restore an altered sandbank, damaged dunes, affected wildlife habitats or eroded beaches.

I am also concerned about the level of seabed disturbance involved in the construction of foundations, cables and scour protection. The potential effects on water quality, bathing waters, fish, seabirds and marine mammals must be established with confidence before permission is granted. These risks should not be dismissed as negligible unless the applicant can demonstrate that conclusion clearly and reliably.

There is a very personal reason why I feel strongly about this. I am the father of a young son who has already faced enormous challenges in his life. Like every parent, I worry

about the world and environment he will inherit. I want him to grow up enjoying the beaches, natural coastline and wildlife of County Wicklow, just as generations before him have done. He and other children should not be left carrying the consequences of decisions made today if the environmental assessments later prove to have been wrong.

Brittas Bay and the surrounding coastline are also vital to local tourism, recreation, employment and the wellbeing of the people who live here. The open seascape and natural character of the coast are important public assets. Once they are significantly changed or environmentally damaged, they may not be capable of being restored.

The central question remains: what is the probability that the applicant's conclusions are wrong, what would the consequences be if they are wrong, and who would ultimately bear the cost? In my view, that cost would be borne by local communities, future generations, the State and the natural environment and not principally by the developer.

I do not believe the additional information has removed the reasonable concerns surrounding the long-term effects of this proposal. I therefore respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for Arklow Bank Wind Park Phase 2 in its present location and require offshore wind development to be placed in a safer and less environmentally damaging location further offshore.

Yours faithfully,

Dennis Higgins