# AQUACULTURE LICENCES APPEALS BOARD

2 4 JUN 2025



Notice of Appeal Under Section 40(1) of Fisheries (Amendment) Act 1997 (No.23)

# RECEIVED

# **APPEAL FORM**

REGISTERED POST or by hand to	the ALAB offices at the following address ad, Portlaoise, Co. Laois, R32 DTW5			
Name of Appellant (Block Letters)	THOMAS O'LEARY			
Address of Appellant			3.63	
	f			
	9			
7				
Eircode				
Phone No.	Email add	ress (ent	er below)	
Helicology of the Control of the Con				
Mobile No.		à		
Di di Cali		11		
notified accordingly.	he details given above, the onus is on the a	ppellant t	o ensure that A	LABIS
nounced accordingly.	FEES			
		rest cor		
Fees must be received by the closing date for receipt of appeals			Amount	Tick
An appeal by an applicant for a licence against a decision by the Minister in respect of			€380	
that application				
An appeal by the holder of a licence against the revocation or amendment of that licence				
by the Minister  An appeal by any other individual or organisation				/
An appear by any other individual or organisation				/
Request for an Oral Hearing* (fee pay	able in addition to appeal fee)	E-WE		
*In the event that the Board decides not to hold an Oral Hearing the fee will not be				
refunded				
Fees can be paid by way of Cheque or	Electronic Funds Transfer			
Cheques are payable to the Aquacult	ure Licences Appeals Board in accordance	e with th	e Aquaculture	Licensing
Appeals (Fees) Regulations, 2021 (S.I				Literisting
Electronic Funds Transfer Details	IBAN:	BIC: A	AIBKIE2D	
EL DE MESTALES EN LA PROPERTIE DE LA PROPERTIE	IE89AIBK93104704051067			
Please note the following:				
	ate fee with your appeal will result in your			
<ol><li>Payment of the correct fees m the appeal will not be accepte</li></ol>	ust be received on or before the closing da	ate for rec	cipi of appeals	, otherwise
	uest for an oral hearing) must be submitted	d against	each determina	tion being
appealed.				
er i no kina nona no languran nambi na kito katin na kito i na ili na ili na	1111			





The Legislation governing the appeals is set out at Appendix 1 below.

#### SUBJECT MATTER OF THE APPEAL

NOUACULTURE LICENCE

FOR WOODSTOWN BAY

FOR KINSALE HARBOUR MUSSEL FARM
(JARIEY'S (ONE)

Site Reference Number: -

(as allocated by the Department of Agriculture, Food, and the Marine)

TOS-472A

APPELLANT'S PARTICULAR INTEREST

Briefly outline your particular interest in the outcome of the appeal:

LOCAL AREA RESIDENT AND BUAT DIONER

## **GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

State in full the grounds of appeal and the reasons, considerations, and arguments on which they are based) (if necessary, on additional page(s)):

LICENCE FAILS EN ALL ACCOUNTS re FISHERIES (Amendment) ACT 1997 No L3 Paul IV Sec 61

- see Attached 3 Pages



# **CONFIRMATION NOTICE ON EIA PORTAL (if required)**

In accordance with Section 41(1) f of the Fisheries (Amendment) Act 1997, where an Environmental Impact

Assessment (EIA) is required for the projection other evidence (such as the Portal ID N included on the portal established under Explanatory Note at Appendix 2 below for	lumber) that the prop r Section 172A of th	osed aquaculture e Planning and	the subject of the	his appeal is
Please tick the relevant box below:				
EIA Portal Confirmation Notice is enclos	sed with this Notice o	f Appeal		
Other evidence of Project's inclusion on the Portal ID Number)	EIA Portal is enclose	d or set out below	v (such as	
An EIA was not completed in the Application	ation stage/the Projec	t does not appear	on the EIA	
Details of other evidence	NA			
Signed by the Appellant		Date	23 June	2025
Please note that this form will only be	accepted by REGIS	STERED POST		
Payment of fees must be received on app	or before the closing peal will be deemed		t of appeals, oth	erwise the

This Notice of Appeal should be completed under each heading, including all the documents, particulars, or information as specified in the notice and duly signed by the appellant, and may include such additional documents, particulars, or information relating to the appeal as the appellant considers necessary or appropriate."

DATA PROTECTION—the data collected for this purpose will be held by ALAB only as long as there is a business need to do so and may include publication on the ALAB website.

# **Grounds of Appeal**

#### 1. Environmental Concerns:

- a. The designated area is inhabited by a family of Otters , a female and sometimes pups , also an occasional male.
- b. The area is used for feeding by Tern , Guillemot , Gannet and Gulls especially during the breeding season.
- c. Basking Shark, Harbour Porpoise and Bottle-nosed Dolphin also feed in the area.
  - These are all protected species.
- d. The sea bed in the area is colonised by Seagrass (Zostera spp.). These meadows should be protected. (EU Habitats Directive Water Framework 2000/60/EC)
  - Zostera spp. are a significant Carbon sequester system like peat bogs. Zostera spp. were severely impacted in Europe during the 20<sup>th</sup> century by an introduced alien disease and are only now starting to recover.
- e. The seabed in the designated area consists of fine shell sand and mud. Anyone who has swum off the Dock Beach or anchored a boat in the area can attest to this. (This sand/mud was formerly harvested for "manure" according to old Admiralty Chart 2053 of 1966). There is almost no rock or stones and lots of seaweed. I have never seen a live Mussel.
  - This is not a suitable habitat for Mussel (Mytilis edulis) which prefer to attach to a solid substrate by their byssus threads and must stay above the bottom to filter feed.
- f. Dredging /bottom Trawling is extremely damaging, effectively destroying the bottom habitat for many years. This method of harvest is shown to be unsustainable. It releases "stored Carbon" and results in a loss of biodiversity.

### 2. Marine Concerns:

- a. The area is adjacent to the ship channel, disturbed sediment will almost certainly cause shoaling problems for navigation.
- b. Mussel seed will almost certainly not thrive in the "Farm" because of the unsuitable substrate, but will instead attach to other solid structures (Buoys, Marina Fixtures, Quay Walls, Slipways and Boats).

This happened a few years ago after the previous attempt to seed the bed. Perhaps the first generation settled then reproduced but did not remain on the "Farm", the Seed travelling to preferred areas.

This will greatly increase maintenance costs for harbour users. Excessive fouling of boats and boat systems is a serious safety issue resulting in instability and mechanical breakdowns.

c. Sufficient space should be reserved in the outer harbour area for Refuge Anchoring for large and small vessels outside the channel. The "Farm" area will prohibit this.

# 3. Amenities:

- a. The area designated for the "Farm" is used daily by residents and visitors for recreation. Water quality will be adversely affected and the Dock Beach will almost certainly be fouled with seaweed detritus and mud.
  - Access will almost certainly be restricted during Seeding and Harvest.
- b. Local inshore Fishermen routinely set Pots in the "Farm" area for Crustaceans; it can be used even during stormy weather.
- c. Kinsale Yacht Club, O E C School, Sovereign Sailing School and "Sailability" (Sailing for the Disabled) all use that area routinely for racing and sail training and other water sports for adults and children because it is a very safe sheltered place even in rough weather.
- 4. Seed Harvest: The licence states that Seed will be wild local harvested. This process has been largely unsuccessful in recent times (probably because of the damage caused to the Beds by Dredging/Bottom Trawling) The Seed may have to be acquired from non-native sources with a subsequent danger of Alien-invasive species being introduced which could devastate the biodiversity in the area including the Zostera beds and Oyster farms.

This has already happened with Mussel seeding in Ireland in spite of awareness by the operators of the problem.

B I M have admitted that they do not have sufficient Inspectors to completely monitor the Seed Harvesting and eliminate the risk of invasive species introduction.

## 5. Other Concerns:

- a. There has been NO public consultation.
- b. The EIA Risk Assessment under the Habitats Directive IV has not been adequately carried out with regards to the Mussel Farm Project. The disturbance to the water quality and mechanical activity will almost certainly affect the Otters and Cetaceans.
  - The project on its own qualifies as Intensive Aquaculture under EU EIA Directive annex I & II.
  - This is a much more invasive project than the Oyster Cages and should not be "slipped in" with the up-river projects.
- c. The Project suggests it will favourably impact local industries. It is obvious it will negatively impact the local environment, local fishing and tourism.