

Objection No. 5

Noeleen Keavey

From: Licensing Staff
Sent: 08 May 2015 15:59
To: Noeleen Keavey
Subject: FW: New Third Party objection entered for Reg no: P0738-03. (Reference Number: P0738-03-150508033446)
Attachments: Submission Ref P0738- 03 Martin Harrington.pdf

Importance: High

From: Martin Harrington [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 May 2015 15:35
To: Licensing Staff
Subject: New Third Party objection entered for Reg no: P0738-03. (Reference Number: P0738-03-150508033446)
Importance: High

Objection submitted on: 08/05/2015 15:34

Title:

First Name: Martin

SurName: Harrington

Organisation Name:

Address Line 1: Tallaghan

Address Line 2: Geesala

Address Line 3: Ballina

County: Mayo

Post Code: 0000

Email: [REDACTED]

Objector Type: Third Party

Oral Hearing: No

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

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DETERMINATION OF A REVIEW OF AN INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS LICENCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 87(2) OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ACT 1992 AS AMENDED.

Ref P0738-03

I have expressed my deep concerns about the proposed Corrib Gas Project from its inception and have used all legal and statutory means open to me as a citizen of Ireland, a member state of the EU, to pursue the proper validation of these concerns.

I wish to, once again, in this instance lodge my objection to Proposed Decision ref P0738-03.

I find it incredible, given the length of time from application for IPPC licence ref P0738-01 (December 2004) and the contorted and convoluted myriad applications for changes to the proposed plan or project since then – and in fact since the original planning application in November 2000 – that it can be stated by the EPA that 'no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects on the integrity of these EU sites' (p4 Inspector's Report Addendum 3 08/04/15).

The following – Inspector's Report Addendum 2, 27/03/15 - which uses the terms 'not likely' and 'unlikely' hardly qualifies as scientific language.

6. Section 16 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive (85/337/EEC, as amended) and Section 17 Reasoned Conclusion on Environmental Impact Assessment

With regard to the conclusions in Section 16 of the Inspector's report and specifically the impact of any accidental emission, I would like to clarify that any accidental emission is **not likely** to have a significant effect on the environment.

With regard to section 17 of the Inspector's report and specifically the potential impacts on the environment, I would like to clarify that they are **unlikely** to damage the environment as a whole.

I have read in their entirety the submission of Mr Peter Sweetman together with the submission of Ms Monica Muller and Ms Maura Harrington and I state that I concur with and adopt these submissions.

Martin Harrington

Submitted by email Friday 08 May 2015 accompanied by fee €126 paid by credit card