

AN BORD PLEANÁLA

21 DEC 2018

LTR DATED _____ FROM _____

LDG- _____

ABP- _____

Brian Bruton

101 Dangan Heights,

Newcastle

Galway

19th December 2018

The Secretary,

An Bord Pleanála,

64 Marlborough Street,

Dublin 1

AN BORD PLEANÁLA

LDG- 011061-18P3

ABP- _____

21 DEC 2018

Fee: € 50.00 Type: PMO

Time: 0930 By: Reg Post

Re N 6 Galway Ring Road/Motorway /Protected road scheme

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to formally submit my concerns to An Bord Pleanála to the proposed N6 Galway City Ring Road scheme.

A primary concern and my main objection is to the routing of the proposed scheme through the Dangan area and in particular the route crossing through the Dangan Sports Grounds and NUI campus. This route would severely impact the sports facilities and amenities of the area. The loss of vital Recreation and Amenity lands (as zoned and currently in use) at NUI Galway and the permanent negative impact of a massive overhanging bridge structure on the beauty and amenity of the Dangan area. These lands are the finest public amenity in the city, thanks to the good work of NUI Galway over the last 50 years. These are made available and widely used by the people of Galway in their thousands weekly and by sports clubs and teams from across the Country. The sports facilities include the Regional Sports Centre, track and hockey pitch, rugby, GAA and soccer pitches, and miles of running and walking trails. The grounds are used by multiple NUI Sports clubs, by athletics clubs such as Galway City Harriers, by Rugby, Rowing and other sports such as Triathlon, Hockey etc., for training camps and summer camps, and by the local and wider Galway community for walking and other recreation. GCH for example organize over 700 training sessions a year with between 20-200 participants of which circa 300 are held on the running trails and pitches in Dangan most directly affected. Major events such as Colleges GAA (Sigerson Cup etc.), Collingwood Cup, NUI Galway 8k, Galway Athletics races, Triathlons and Duathlons, the Galway Regatta, Rugby games and Mini Rugby camps

21 DEC 2018

LTR DATED _____ FROM _____
LDG- _____

etc. are also held on these grounds regularly. The destruction and diminution of recreational and amenity lands is not in line with the area zoning, and not proper planning, and not suitable for a motorway.

The negative impact on Sports Clubs in Galway in both the medium-term construction phase i.e. 2-3 years, and importantly in the long term due to the lost footprint of pitches, running and walking trails, and the lack of any provision whatsoever in terms of replacement of same in the medium term must be considered as a huge deadweight against this proposal. A substantial portion of the Dangan facilities will be the subject of a CPO, and 4 of the existing usable 7 pitches will be decommissioned in the medium term, 3 in long term (with 1 artificial replacement), as well as the part demolition of the pavilion, and the destruction of running and walking trails around the sports facilities. This amounts to the decimation of superb sports and recreation facilities, will have a huge impact in the medium term and in the long term a severe and profound impact. The proposed mitigation measures and bridge solution are frankly irrelevant as they put a coach and horses through a place where amenity, and recreation is currently king. To put a motorway in place of sports and recreation facilities located one mile from Galway City Centre is not good planning to say the least.

The planning application submitted does not take proper account of the severe impact on human health notably in the areas of Loss of Amenity lands, nor on Community severance i.e. the impact on Sports clubs and teams that use the NUI Galway sports campus and will now be homeless and their members without vital training and meeting facilities; nor the Diminished opportunity for Physical Activity due to the severe and profound impact on the Sports campus, the river walks and the general natural beauty and amenity of the area ; nor the negative impact on Mental Health and wellbeing on people due to the closure and limited access for many years to the sports campus and Dangan area and the profound negative change a motorway will have on these lands long term. The EIS in Chapter 18 admits there will be long term negative amenity impact, that sports facilities and recreational lands will be severely impacted, and also does not properly investigate the impacts on Human Physical health, mental health, wellbeing nor community severance as a proper study should. Any attempt to plough a motorway through this amenity should be rejected. These lands are the finest sports facilities and public amenities in Galway, are irreplaceable given their central location, and damaging these will damage the city, its people and their health and wellbeing in the long term. A revised routing must be considered and the proposed application rejected as a result.

The proposed route would have a directly negative environmental impact on the amenity, and scenic beauty of the Menlo Castle, River Corrib, and Dangan areas which are the most in the city. The grim nature of the existing Quincentenary bridge and surrounds is an example of what could seriously injure the beautiful amenity of the area

This Motorway /protected road scheme should have been considered in tandem with i.e. at the same time as The Galway Transport Strategy. Planning a motorway in the

absence of concrete and exact public transport proposals is not proper planning. It merely encourages car use, enables wide population distribution and dispersed communities. The GTS should be prepared in full and should be lodged along with a road route and therefore this application should be refused until such a plan is done and submitted.

As per the EIS there will be a significant negative impact on several key environmental sites and species on and around the road route, namely the Limestone pavement Annex 1 Habitat, and other Annex 1 Habitats as noted in Chapter 20, on Bats, on the Peregrine falcon. These should be independently assessed and considered thoroughly by the Board.

The recent ECJ decision in Case C-461/17, regarding the requirements of a Natura Impact Assessment should be considered by A Bord Pleanála/. As such, the CJEU found that, together with habitats and species for which the site is protected, the NIS must also identify and examine the implications of the project for all species present on that site. A NIS, the CJEU added, must also identify and examine implications for species and habitats outside site boundaries "provided those implications are liable to affect the conservation objectives of the site"

The judgment ruling from that case is below and this must be considered in full by An Bord Pleanála in relation to this planning application

On those grounds, the Court (Second Chamber) hereby rules:

1. Article 6(3) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora must be interpreted as meaning that an 'appropriate assessment' must, on the one hand, catalogue the entirety of habitat types and species for which a site is protected, and, on the other, identify and examine both the implications of the proposed project for the species present on that site, and for which that site has not been listed, and the implications for habitat types and species to be found outside the boundaries of that site, provided that those implications are liable to affect the conservation objectives of the site.
2. Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43 must be interpreted as meaning that the competent authority is permitted to grant to a plan or project consent which leaves the developer free to determine subsequently certain parameters relating to the construction phase, such as the location of the construction compound and haul routes, only if that authority is certain that the development consent granted establishes conditions

AN BORD PLEANÁLA

21 DEC 2018

LTR DATED _____ FROM _____

LDG- _____

ABP- _____

that are strict enough to guarantee that those parameters will not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

3. Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43 must be interpreted as meaning that, where the competent authority rejects the findings in a scientific expert opinion recommending that additional information be obtained, the 'appropriate assessment' must include an explicit and detailed statement of reasons capable of dispelling all reasonable scientific doubt concerning the effects of the work envisaged on the site concerned.
4. Article 5(1) and (3) of, and Annex IV to, Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, must be interpreted as meaning that the developer is obliged to supply information that expressly addresses the significant effects of its project on all species identified in the statement that is supplied pursuant to those provisions.
5. Article 5(3)(d) of Directive 2011/92 must be interpreted as meaning that the developer must supply information in relation to the environmental impact of both the chosen option and of all the main alternatives studied by the developer, together with the reasons for his choice, considering at least the environmental effects, even if such an alternative was rejected at an early stage.

Options must be considered to improve traffic in the City but not at the expense of Human Health, Sports facilities and vital Recreation and Amenity lands, as well as vital Habitats and species resident in the area.

Specific traffic improvement plans such as a proper Galway Transport Strategy and accompanying action plan for public transport solutions, along with a road scheme, must be provided and submitted, in tandem, in order to properly address and future proof the city and its transport strategy. Furthermore in relation to this application, a Corrib Tunnel, or a revised routing e.g. the GCOB 2006 crossing, or other engineering solutions must be considered that does not impact whatsoever on the aforementioned areas, facilities or habitats.

I hereby urge the Board to consider favourably my objection
I enclose the relevant fee.

Yours sincerely


Brian Bruton

