

| Submission on Objection                |  |
|--|--|
| Submitter:                             | Pat Moran                                  |
| Submitter Address:                     | The Mount, Cheekpoint, County Waterford, . |
| Submission on Objection Title:         | Submission on Objection                    |
| Submission on Objection Reference No.: | SOS010285                                  |
| Submission on Objection Received:      | 08 April 2022                              |

| Application |                                |
|-------------|--------------------------------|
| Applicant:  | SSE Generation Ireland Limited |
| Reg. No.:   | P0606-04 difer                 |

See below for Submission on Objection details.

Attachments are displayed on the following page(s).

Pat Moran

The Mount

Cheekpoint

**County Waterford** 

08/04/22

## Ref - Response to the Licence P0606-04 submissions

Dear Sir or Madam

A few comments on the 5 submissions as regards the Licence review of Licence P0606-04.

1) The SSE Submission

The SSE submission as regards Chlorine and monitoring at SW2 and SW8 does not address the core issue which is the continuous discharge of Chlorine contrary to what is applied for and granted in the planning application. I would also say that continuous Chlorination at SW8, SW8 can only be seen as a Chlorine trap which on entering nothing survives after exiting. Not to have addressed these issues at the review stage reflects badly on a plant portraying itself as manufacturing Green energy. The boundary changes to a law man a bit late in the process along with a piecemeal development with a grey area between Zoning, Planning and licensing again.

- 2) The 4 other Submissions
- Raised points that can best be summarised as pointing out the Law for the protection of the Environment is <u>optional</u> as regards Planning, Licensing and also when it comes to assessing the individual and in combination effects of Licences.
- 2) The Submission calls into question the value of AA, NIS and EIS statements.
- 3) The best way of showing what the submissions refer to is the <a href="MAP1">MAP1</a>
  (Designated Shellfish Area) with the Shellfish Designated boundary. The red boundary indicating the protected Shellfish Designated area can best be described at the present time as a 30km squared as a Shellfish decimated area. As reefs are referred to in one of the submissions, I draw attention to the reef no longer in existence; it ran out to the Spit Lighthouse (Passage East). Locally referred to as the Mussel Bank. When the Mussels were wiped out within the Shellfish area, the Mussels that were responsible for holding the

reef together all died, the reef collapsed along with the entire reef community never to return.

The consequences when the Law and protection are seen as optional in such a crucial area such as Waterford Estuary, the confluence of 3 major river systems the immediate area 30km squared of Habitat, Biodiversity and Species loss can and is being felt over 9,000km squared area of catchment. To name a few fish species Twaite Shad, Eels, Flounder, Sole, Salmon and Lamprey. Furthermore what is affecting the birds and the animals? As the damage and the area can no longer be seen as insignificant, the precautionary principle needs to be applied to all licences that have the potential to be either on their own or in combination contributing to the problems Licence P0606-04 would have to be seen as having the potential in its present form also as a result of the review determination.

Yours sincerely

Pat Moran

Consent of copyright owner required for any other use.