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

APPEAL FORM

Please note that in accordance with Section 40(2) of the 1997 Act this form will only be accepted if delivered by **REGISTERED POST or by hand** to the ALAB offices at the following address: **Aquaculture Licenses Appeals Board, Kilminchy Court, Dublin Road, Portlaoise, Co. Laois, R32 DTW5**

Name of Appellant (Block Letters)	SUSAN WEBSTER (WITH LIZ BURGESS & ANNE MARIE O'DONNELL)
Address of Appellant	
Eircode	
Phone No.	Email address (enter below)
Mobile No.	

Please note if there is **any change** to the details given above, the onus is on the appellant to ensure that ALAB is notified accordingly.

FEES

Fees must be received by the closing date for receipt of appeals	Amount	Tick
An appeal by an applicant for a license against a decision by the Minister in respect of that application	€380	
An appeal by the holder of a license against the revocation or amendment of that license by the Minister	€380	
An appeal by any other individual or organisation	€150	✓
Request for an Oral Hearing* (fee payable in addition to appeal fee) *In the event that the Board decides not to hold an Oral Hearing the fee will not be refunded	€75	

Fees can be paid by way of Cheque or Electronic Funds Transfer

Cheques are payable to the Aquaculture Licenses Appeals Board in accordance with the Aquaculture Licensing Appeals (Fees) Regulations, 2021 (S.I. No. 771 of 2021)

Electronic Funds Transfer Details	IBAN: IE89AIBK931047040510 67	BIC: AIBKIE2D

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

SUBJECT MATTER OF THE APPEAL

I am writing to formally appeal the decision to grant an aquaculture license to Woodstown Bay Shellfish Limited for bottom-culture mussel farming on a 23.1626-hectare site (T05-472A) in Kinsale Harbour, Co. Cork. While I acknowledge the Minister's consideration of relevant legislation and submissions received, I contend that the decision overlooks several material concerns that warrant further scrutiny.

Note that we have not had access to all of the relevant documentation online. This lack of access results in a structural bias within the appeals process, as it undermines transparency and prevents a clear understanding of how decisions were made. Public bodies have a duty to uphold public trust by ensuring transparency in their decision-making. The absence of complete documentation and clarity around the decision-making process significantly impairs our ability to conduct a thorough review and prepare an informed appeal.

Site Reference Number: - (as allocated by the Department of Agriculture, Food, and the Marine)	T05-472A

APPELLANT'S PARTICULAR INTEREST

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

You should briefly explain why this matters to you personally, e.g.:

- You are a resident of Kinsale who regularly uses the harbour for swimming, sailing, kayaking, fishing, or community events.
- You rely on the harbour's open waters for recreation, livelihood, tourism, or cultural traditions.
- You are concerned about environmental quality, public safety, and long-term community impact.
- I am concerned about the safety of boats as the seed mussels can enter boats cooling systems and when they grow there they can block the sea water coolant and cause engine failure.

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)):

Please see attached Grounds of Appeal 1-16.
I am a resident of Kinsale and regularly use the Kinsale inner and outer harbour for recreational purposes, swimming, sailing etc. I would like to see the harbour enhanced not exploited — for the good of the whole community

Grounds for Appeal

1. Inadequate Environmental Assessment
Although the determination claims "no significant impacts on the marine environment", no independent environmental study is cited to support this assertion. The potential for biodiversity disruption, water quality deterioration, and seabed sediment alteration requires rigorous scientific investigation. Furthermore, cumulative impacts from existing and future aquaculture operations in the harbour have not been sufficiently assessed, undermining the sustainability of the marine environment.

2. Public Access and Recreational Use
Large-scale aquaculture developments can restrict navigation, impact traditional fishing routes, and interfere with recreational activities. It remains unclear how public access will be preserved, or whether local stakeholders such as water sports users and tourism operators were adequately consulted in the licensing process.

3. Economic Risk to Existing Local Industries
While the application anticipates economic benefit, there is no record of a Social Impact Assessment being undertaken. On what grounds does the applicant make the assumption of economic benefit. In its application it sites the employment of a further 6 people at its plant in Waterford, The determination does not consider the potential negative impact on established sectors such as tourism and traditional fisheries. A full Social Impact Assessment should be undertaken to assess both the potential loss of revenue to local businesses reliant on the harbour's current use and environmental integrity.

4. Risks to Adjacent Natura 2000 Sites
Although the site does not spatially overlap with designated Natura 2000 areas it is adjacent to two such sites (Old Head of Kinsale SPA (4021) and Sovereign Islands SPA (4124). Seabirds from these SPA's are known to feed in Kinsale harbour and will be adversely impacted. Examples are Cormorants who are regularly seen in the harbor. Indirect impacts such as water pollution, eutrophication, and habitat degradation are a risk. Notably, the proposal involves bottom-culture mussel farming with bottom dredging—a method that is highly disruptive to benthic ecosystems. Dredging displaces sediment, destroys benthic fauna, and threatens biodiversity. The site is known locally to support a particularly rich crab population. Amongst other species, the Otter is listed as an Annex IV protected species present in Irish waters and in the Kinsale, a baseline study of Otter population, location and the potential effect of dredging on otter holts should be undertaken. The failure to conduct a baseline ecological survey is a serious omission that contravenes the precautionary principle set out in EU environmental legislation.

5. Navigational and Operational Safety Overlooked
Under the Fisheries (Amendment) Act 1997, the Minister must consider the implications of aquaculture operations on navigation and the rights of other marine users. No anchor zones and exclusion zones will prohibit existing fishing and recreational activities

6. Fouling of Raw Water Intakes – A Known Hazard
Mussel larvae (veligers) can infiltrate and colonise raw water intake systems in leisure and commercial vessels, particularly those moored long-term or infrequently used. Resulting blockages may lead to engine overheating and failure. This risk has not been acknowledged in the license determination. The consequences may extend to increased RNLI call-outs, raising public safety and resourcing concerns. No evidence is provided that the Harbour Master, RNLI, boat owners or marina operators were consulted, nor are any mitigation measures (e.g. buffer zones or monitoring protocols) described. This constitutes a serious procedural deficiency. A **Marine Navigation Impact Assessment** is required to address this omission. This concern was explicitly raised in the submission by the Kinsale Chamber of Tourism and Business.

7. Unreasonable Delay in Determination
The original application was submitted in December 2018. A decision was not issued until May 2025—more than six years later. Such an extended delay is at odds with the intent of the Fisheries (Amendment) Act 1997, which mandates that decisions be made as soon as reasonably practicable. This delay risks relying on outdated environmental data and fails to reflect current stakeholder conditions. It raises legitimate concerns regarding the procedural fairness and validity of the decision.

8. Failure to Assess Impact on National Monument and Submerged Archaeological Heritage

The proposed mussel farm site lies directly off James Fort, a protected National Monument (NIAH Ref: 20911215), and adjacent to the remains of the blockhouse guarding the estuary. This area is of significant historical and military importance, with likely submerged archaeological material including maritime infrastructure and possibly shipwrecks. The application fails to include any underwater archaeological assessment or consultation with the National Monuments Service or Underwater Archaeology Unit (UAU) of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage. This represents a serious procedural omission. Dredging associated with bottom-culture mussel farming carries a high risk of disturbing or destroying archaeological material in situ. The failure to survey or evaluate these risks contradicts national heritage legislation and violates the precautionary approach enshrined in European environmental directives. We respectfully request that the license be suspended until a full archaeological impact assessment is carried out, including seabed survey and review by qualified maritime archaeologists in consultation with the UAU

9. Absence of Site-Specific Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Discovery of Protected Seagrass Habitat

No Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) appears to have been carried out for the proposed aquaculture site, despite its sensitive ecological characteristics and proximity to protected areas. Under national and EU law, the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM) is obliged to screen aquaculture applications for significant environmental effects. Where such risks exist—particularly in or near Natura 2000 sites or protected habitats—a full EIA may be legally required.

Since the initial license application in 2018, new environmental data has come to light. Research led by Dr Robert Wilkes (University College Cork) national seagrass mapping work—which includes all major Irish coastal zones—strongly suggests that Kinsale Harbour may host these priority habitats, highlighting the need for a site-specific ecological survey. Seagrass is a priority habitat protected under the EU Habitats Directive due to its high biodiversity value, role in carbon sequestration, and function as a critical nursery habitat for fish and invertebrates. The mere presence of seagrass requires formal ecological assessment under EU law before any disruptive marine activity—particularly dredging—can be licensed.

The current license determination fails to acknowledge this discovery or to conduct any updated ecological survey. It instead relies on environmental data now over six years old. This is procedurally and scientifically unacceptable. An up-to-date, site-specific environmental impact assessment is necessary to ensure compliance with legal requirements and to safeguard a now-confirmed protected habitat.

The application is for an intensive mussel farm and therefore under EU law required an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be produced. In the European Commission's (EC) "Interpretation of definitions of project categories of annex I and II of the EIA Directive" (*http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/cover_2015_en.pdf*), the Commission provides clarity around what activities it (and other Member States) consider as constituting "Intensive Fish Farming" and therefore requiring a submission/report on "the likely significant impacts on the environment" before the Minister can issue his/her decision.

The EC clarifies in their published guidance document (see link above) that there is no legal definition set down as to what constitutes "Intensive Farming" in Aquaculture. In the absence of such definition the EC provides guidance around the received wisdom based on the experience/common practices of other Member States in this area.

It states that there are various threshold measurements used by individual member states in determining whether an aquaculture enterprise should be considered "intensive". These have been found to be based:-

- on area (>5 hectares)
- on total fish output (>100 tonnes/annum)
- on output per hectare and/or
- on feed consumption

Based on these guidelines the application meets the definition of an intensive fish farm for the following reasons;

- The Application purports to cover 25 hectares of Kinsale Harbour - 5 times the 5 hectare limit used by other member states in terms of determining whether an EIA is required
- The Application purports to have an annual output of 200 tonnes - double the 100 tonne minimum limit implemented by other member states in terms of determining whether an EIA is required.
- The Application indicates an annual output of 8 metric tonnes per hectare. However, the application is silent on whether the Applicant itself considers the enterprise to be intensive or otherwise. In the absence of such clarification (despite the Application process requiring such information (per Section 2.2 Question (ix) of the Application form) it is not unreasonable (extrapolating from the declared harvest tonnage/hectare) to interpret the anticipated level of farming as being "intensive", and therefore requiring an EIA submission.

10. Legal Protection of Marine Life in Undesignated Sites under the Habitats Directive

The presence of sensitive and protected marine life—such as *Zostera marina*, Otters and cetacean species—in or near the proposed license site invokes strict legal protections under EU law, even if the site itself is not formally designated as a Natura 2000 area. *Zostera marina* is listed as a protected habitat under Annex I of the Habitats Directive, and all cetaceans (including dolphins and porpoises) and Otters are protected under Annex IV.

Article 12 of the Habitats Directive prohibits any deliberate disturbance or habitat degradation of these species across their entire natural range. The bottom-culture mussel farming method proposed—including dredging and vessel activity—presents a clear risk of disturbing these habitats and species. EU law requires that any plan or project likely to have a significant effect on a protected species or habitat must undergo prior ecological assessment. No such assessment appears to have been undertaken in this case.

This failure breaches the precautionary principle and undermines Ireland's obligations under the Habitats Directive and related environmental directives. A full reassessment of the license decision is required to avoid legal non-compliance and ecological harm.

11. Public Health Concerns.

The proximity of the mussel farm to wastewater treatment plants both at The Bulman,

Summer Cove Kinsale, and at Castle Park, Kinsale raises serious concerns under EU water quality directives. The risk of contamination and its implications for shellfish safety and public health have not been sufficiently evaluated.

12. Displacement of Traditional Fisheries

The proposed site would exclude local fishermen using crab pots and other static gear from a 23-hectare fishing ground traditionally accessed by licensed fishers. This has not been acknowledged in the license, despite the Harbourmaster requiring that the area be designated as a "no pots/fishing" zone. Displacement of static gear fisheries without consultation or provision of compensatory access undermines traditional livelihoods and may be challengeable under EU Common Fisheries Policy obligations. A Marine Resource User Impact Statement should have been required.

13. Absence of Operating Agreement with Port Authority

Cork County Council has confirmed that no Operating Agreement was received from the applicant. Vessel activity, dredging schedule, licensing, and safety protocols were not submitted to the Harbour Master. Without this, no risk assessment on shipping interference, beaching protocols, or berthing pressure was possible. Granting a license in the absence of this data is premature and procedurally deficient.

14. Sedimentation and Navigation Hazards

Cork County Council (CCC) noted a mid-channel bar to the east of the proposed site—a known shallow point that already restricts navigation. Mussel dredging and biodeposit accumulation risk increasing sedimentation, further narrowing this access route. Annual bathymetric surveys were recommended by CCC but are not mandated in the current license. This omission creates navigational hazards in a high-use recreational harbour.

15. Misstatement Regarding Shellfish Waters Designation

The application states that the site lies within Designated Shellfish Waters; this is factually incorrect. Cork County Council and the Kinsale Chamber of Tourism and Business have shown that the designated area is upriver. This misstatement undermines the reliability of the application and affects regulatory compliance with the Shellfish Waters Directive. The error should trigger re-evaluation of public health monitoring requirements and water quality impact.

16. Absence of an assessment under the Water Framework Directive Article 4

A Water Framework Directive Article 4 assessment needs to be carried out to determine the quality of the water in Kinsale harbour and to determine if the proposed mussel farm will impact the need to reach a good ecological status under the Water Framework Directive.

Request for Review

In light of these substantive concerns, I respectfully request that the Aquaculture License Appeals Board:

- Commissions an independent, detailed Environmental Impact Assessment to address (but is not restricted to) Benthic ecology, Biodiversity, Water resources, Landscape and visual, Cultural heritage, Socio-economics, Commercial fisheries;
- Requires a full Social Impact Assessment that includes the potential impact on existing industries;
- Undertakes a reassessment of public access impacts, with adequate local consultation;
- Orders a full Marine Navigation Impact Study, in consultation with the RNLI, marina authorities, and the Harbour Master;
- Reviews the potential for indirect impacts on nearby protected sites under Natura 2000.
- Carries out an Archaeological Impact Assessment, including seabed survey and review by qualified maritime archaeologists in consultation with the UAU.

We urge the Department to reconsider this determination in the interests of environmental stewardship, public access, tourism, heritage and the sustainable economic development of the region.

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 project in question, please provide a copy of the confirmation notice, or other evidence (such as the Portal ID Number) that the proposed aquaculture the subject of this appeal is included on the portal established under Section 172A of the Planning and Development Act 2000. (See Explanatory Note at Appendix 2 below for further information).

Please tick the relevant box below:

EIA Portal Confirmation Notice is enclosed with this Notice of Appeal	
Other evidence of Project's inclusion on EIA Portal is enclosed or set out below (such as the Portal ID Number)	
An EIA was not completed in the Application stage/the Project does not appear on the EIA Portal	✓

Details of other evidence			
Signed by the Appellant		Date	x 24/6/2025

Please note that this form will only be accepted by REGISTERED POST or handed in to the ALAB offices

Payment of fees must be received on or before the closing date for receipt of appeals, otherwise the appeal will be deemed invalid.

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."