

File With _____

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO: PL 16.207212.Defer Re O/H ☐

TO:SEO

Having considered the contents of the submission ~~dated~~ received 05/10/04 fromBrandon Philbin I recommend that section 131 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000~~to~~/not be invoked at this stage for the following reason(s): No new issues.E.O.: Kieran SamersDate: 05/10/04

To EO: _____

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage. ☒~~Section 131 to be invoked - allow 2/4 weeks for reply~~ ☐S.E.O.: M. DulanDate: 6/10/04

S.A.O.: _____

Date: _____

M _____

Please prepare BP _____ - Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission

to: _____

Allow 2/4weeks - BP _____

EO: _____

Date: _____

AA: _____

Date: _____

CORRESPONDENCE FORM

Appeal No: PL 16.207212.

M c. Fagan

Please treat correspondence received on 05/10/04 as follows:

1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant _____

2. Acknowledge with BP 23.

3. Keep copy of Board's Letter ☐

Response to section 131.

1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____

2 Keep Envelope: ☐

3. Keep Copy of Board's letter ☐

Amendments/Comments

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

4. Attach to file

(a) R/S ☐

(d) Screening ☐

(b) Mapping ☐

(e) Inspectorate ☐

(c) Processing ☐

RETURN TO EO ☒

EO: Kieron Somers

Date: 05/10/04.

Plans Date Stamped ☐

Date Stamped Filled in ☐

AA: James Fagan

Date: 6/10/04

Ref: PL 16.207212
P.A Reg. Ref: P03/3343

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
TIME _____	BY _____
05 OCT 2004	
LTR-DATED _____	FROM _____
PL _____	

Rosspport,
Ballina,
Co.Mayo.
October 3rd 2004

Dear sir,

I am writing with regard to the submissions made to An Bord Pleanála by Mr. Tom Philips and associates on August 31st and September 15th 2004 in relation to the proposed gas refinery at Ballinaboy Bridge, Co. Mayo.

Upon examining the documentation provided it is clear that most if not all that is being proposed in relation to matters of soil mechanics, movement of peat etc. is of an experimental nature and yet to be used in a development of the kind proposed.

My most serious concern is that of the stability of the proposed pipeline in the peat. The issue of how the pipeline will be secured into the peat is something that the applicants continually fail to address. This most basic of questions is one that has yet to be definitively answered.

The other major issue is the routing of the proposed pipeline so close to residential properties. The implications of this regarding health and safety raise serious concerns. The huge volume and pressure of the raw gas, water slugs, methanol, toxic materials as well other impurities it would be comparable to having a bomb in our front garden.

This type of development has not been done anywhere in the world. I refer to the report made by Mr. Kevin Moore of the need for a more comprehensive assessment of the situation.

I wish to make note of the fact that representatives of Shell Exploration and Production have been allowed to use the planning system as a means of correcting the gross inadequacies and inaccuracies of their EIS submissions of the last 4 years. While I understand that the planning process is one that allows applicants the time to clarify submissions I firmly believe that in this case that time has been used by the applicant to conduct work that should have been conducted at the start of the process.

These would include the taking of peat samples, bore holes in Sruth Fada Conn estuary and surveys along the proposed route of the pipeline.

It is my opinion that had an independent EIS of the entire proposed development been commissioned we would have been presented with the true facts.

The area of the proposed development has been and should remain to be one with a pristine environment. The addition of the proposed development serves only to disrupt the delicate balance of the nature in the area.

The vast volume of traffic to be generated by the proposed development will disrupt the residents of this entire area in a most serious manner. Journeys to Belmullet or Castlebar would incur long delays; that is presuming that alternative routes are passable.

When all of the issues outlined above can still be of concern this late in the planning process then surely there is a simple conclusion.

My own conclusion is that this is quite simply the wrong type of development and that the site being proposed is the wrong one.

Yours Sincerely,

Mr. Brendan Philbin.

Brendan Philbin

For inspection purposes only.
Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
TIME _____	BY _____
05 OCT 2004	
LTR-DATED _____	FROM _____
PL _____	