Dorota Richards

Subject:

FW: New Third Party objection entered for Reg no: P0852-02. (Reference Number:

P0852-02-171009121645)

Attachments:

P0852-02 objection.pdf

Importance:

High

From: Peter Sweetman [mailto

Sent: 09 October 2017 12:29

To: Licensing Staff < licensing@epa.ie>

Subject: New Third Party objection entered for Reg no: P0852-02. (Reference Number: P0852-02-171009121645)

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

Importance: High

Objection

09/10/2017 12:16 submitted on:

Title:

Mr

First Name:

Peter

SurName:

Sweetman

Organisation

Name:

Address Line 1: ROSSPORT SOUTH

Address Line 2:

Address Line 3: **BALLINA**

County:

Mayo

Post Code:

0000

Email:

Objector Type:

Third Party

Oral Hearing:

No

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

1

PETER SWEETMAN & ASSOCIATES ROSSPORT SOUTH BALLINA **COUNTY MAYO**

Environmental Protection Agency Johnstown Castle Wexford

2017-10-09

OBJECTION RE;

P0852-02 Mr Peter McKenna Feebaghbane, Scotstown, County Monaghan.

I wish to object to the above Proposed Decision of the Adequate 1.

Adequate information has not been provided to enable the EPA to complete an environmental impact assessment of this likely significant indirect effect on the environment in relation to the proposal to spread the manure generated by the proposed development on lands that are remote from the site.

No information has been provided on the potential for significant effects on European sites arising from such spreading, and in the absence of an appropriate assessment that deals with this matter, being an indirect effect of the proposed development.

The Judgement of CJEU Peter Sweetman and Others v An Bord Pleanála. Case C-258/11 states at;

40 Authorisation for a plan or project, as referred to in Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, may therefore be given only on condition that the competent authorities - once all aspects of the plan or project have been identified which can, by themselves or in combination with other plans or projects, affect the conservation objectives of the site concerned, and in the light of the best scientific knowledge in the field – are certain that the plan or project will not have lasting adverse effects on the integrity of that site. That is so where no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects (see, to this effect, Case C-404/09 Commission v Spain, paragraph 99, and Solvay and Others, paragraph 67).

Therefore the Proposed Decision is not valid in EU law.

Yours faithfully

Peter Sweetman

Rets Sweetman

Please respond by email to sweetmanplanning@gmail.com

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.

Dorota Richards

Subject:

FW: Successful Objection Payment for Licence Number P0852-02. (Reference Number: P0852-02-171009121645) - Payment submitted on 09/10/2017 12:18

From: Licensing Staff

Sent: 09 October 2017 12:29

To: 5.5

Cc: Licensing Staff < licensing@epa.ie>

Subject: Successful Objection Payment for Licence Number P0852-02. (Reference Number: P0852-02-171009121645)

- Payment submitted on 09/10/2017 12:18

Thank you for your online Third Party Objection for licence number P0852-02. Your objection has been received by the Environmental Protection Agency and will be acknowledged once the Objection has been validated.

A fee of €126 will be debited from your credit card once the objection has been confirmed.

Your reference number is P0852-02-171009121645. Please retain this for future reference.

Regards,

Environmental Protection Agency

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

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and

intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they

are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify

the EPA postmaster - postmaster@epa.ie

The opinions contained within are personal to the sender and

do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Environmental Protection

Agency.