

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
1	Yes, I agree... would have also liked the addition of Floating Offshore Wind designated areas in the event of potential Planning Issues with Fixed Bottom close to / within view of the coastline	Yes	Yes I do and it is very important	Yes. However due to insufficient port capacity and the length of time and cost to secure planning , we will not meet our 2030 targets and the Bristol Channel Ports and the French Ports of Brest and Le Havre will be used to stage the early phase developments
2	No I have been fishing some of these areas for the last forty years why should we have give up our traditional ways to suit a green agenda and make money for bid multi nationals greedy companies	██████ they will time surveys for a time of year when they know there won't much to be seen	No	No multi national companies will just source the cheapest labor they can get with a few local workers as a or stunt
3	No I have been fishing some of these areas for the last forty years why should we have give up our traditional ways to suit a green agenda and make money for bid multi nationals greedy companies	██████ they will time surveys for a time of year when they know there won't much to be seen	No	No multi national companies will just source the cheapest labor they can get with a few local workers as a or stunt
4	Yes, agree	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Aontaím	Aontaím	Aontaím	Aontaím
6	No as they were chosen to maximise profit. There has been little to no engagement with marine businesses or marine education centres. This project will severely impact marine species and cause further disruption to protected species.	No	No. What will the impact on swell be?	No
7	No this is degradation of our civic rights	No	No	No
8	No this is degradation of our civic rights	No	No	No
9	No ..these are in areas where I fish and have crab lobster pots and is in prime herring and sprat spawning areas which we often target during winter months ..my vessel is 11 metres and impossible to go around and avoid these areas due to occasional high seas and strong tides ...move these mpas further out where our European friends are fishing and see what your answers will be ..	No	No	No
10	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
11	No. Too close to the cost line.why is it not the same distance as everywhere else in europe. Ruining our tourist industry and our coast line	When bringing ashore is it true that nothing will survive for a distance around the lines. Killing all fish etc	No. How many square miles of sea life will be killed	Will ruin the south coast
12	No, too close especially area A	Not reassured	Not reassured	No
13	No they are too close to shore and will alter the coastline irrevocably	Putting steel and fibreglass monstrosities in pristine waters connected with cables is neither environmental or sustainable	The turbines will destroy fishing activities	No. Wind provides very little employment and rhe projects will be drivers of unemployment through lost fishing and tourism
14	Three out of four yes. Tonn Nua absolutely not. It is far too close to the coastline and will impact both business and people. It's 12 km from a unesco area there is no way this should be allowed. This will set the precedent for the future, please scrap this area and do right by the Irish people.	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
15	No as Tonn Nua is far too close to shore & will affect the people and businesses. Insane Idea next to a UNESCO area & should be scrapped, who ever thought up such a idea , a disgrace to the people of Ireland	No as Tonn Nua is far too close to shore & will affect the people and businesses. Insane Idea next to a UNESCO area & should be scrapped, who ever thought up such a idea , a disgrace to the people of Ireland	No as Tonn Nua is far too close to shore & will affect the people and businesses. Insane Idea next to a UNESCO area & should be scrapped, who ever thought up such a idea , a disgrace to the people of Ireland	No as Tonn Nua is far too close to shore & will affect the people and businesses. Insane Idea next to a UNESCO area & should be scrapped, who ever thought up such a idea , a disgrace to the people of Ireland
16	Areas B,C,D are reasonably located. However A is problematic. Turbines of the size proposed, situated close to the inner extent of area A (12km) will have a dramatic visual impact in a sensitive geo heritage area and significantly degrade the coastal landscape.	In the environmental report, siting turbines at a distance of 5-15 km from shore is noted as having a "substantial level of impact". The Copper Coast drive is a scenic route featured in international publications including the New York Times, National Geographic and more. This needs to be considered as a visually sensitive area. Damaging the perception of the coastal landscape here will have a large negative economic and cultural impact.	Turbines situated close to the inner extent of area A (12km) will damage the tourism potential of the Copper Coast UNESCO Global Geopark.	I am concerned at the lack of national characterisation of the coastal landscape and the potential for the underestimation of degradation of coastal character along the mid Waterford coast.
17	No and Yes. Option A is too close to the shore. You will have gathered this opinion from engagements to date. The communities in Waterford coastal areas will not accept building in this zone - don't waste taxpayers money trying. Concentrate your efforts on the other options. Simple really. I and many others I've spoken to are for development, but not in option A.	Yes - but irrelevant for Option A	No. Again irrelevant for option A in any case.	Plan led yes, but not developer led...
18	STOP DESTROYING A PRISTINE ENVIRONMENT	Hopefully this will be performed with out big money involvement and influence.	Please check the results of maritime life due to this disruption in the ocean. The sound waves have confused animals whereby causing their deaths!!	These are very expensive to both build and maintain. I don't believe this will be a windfall of profits or energy. People will be sorry that they let big money to destroy the Atlantic Ocean.
19	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Totally agree	Completely.	Yes.	Unsure.
21	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
23	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Yes. Because we need to move away from fossil fuels and at this point spoiling "the view" is not a reasonable arguement against taking action.	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	I agree	I agree	I agree	I agree
27	Yes, we need this	Yes, we need to protect our environment and do our bit for reliable renewable energy	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
28	Yes I do.	Yes	Yes	Yes I do, this plan-led framework is a great step forward for our renewable energy systems and is a much needed plan.
29	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
31	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
32	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
33	Strongly disagree. The Copper Coast is a UNESCO Global Geopark. The proposed windfarm will damage the visual beauty of the area. Few doubt the benefit of wind farms but to locate it in this location is unwise. Proposals to locate wind farms in unsuitable areas causes local communities to protest which gives the impression that people are against all windfarms. The reality is that most people are only strong against windfarms in unsuitable locations. The local communities also need to be the ones who directly benefit from locating a windfarm in the area where they reside. If this was done, there would be less opposition. If the wind farms were located further out to sea, there would be less opposition. My strong opposition is against the proposed area that is closest to shore.	Yes	No strong opinion.	Strongly disagree. Because the windfarm is located off the Waterford coast, the people and businesses or Waterford should be the ones who directly benefit. Under the proposed plan, the local people and businesses do not substantially benefit. It is unwise to locate something in a community without having it benefit the community. It causes opposition and resentment. E.g. Local communities could have an ownership stake, get discounts on electricity, etc.
34	No. Wind turbines present a danger to birds, bats, sea creatures and habitats, sailing boats, cargo ships, fishing vessels, rescue craft and helicopters, and maintenance crews. Wind turbines cost more to place, maintain and manage when at sea. But wind turbines, on land or at sea, are unreliable intermittent uncontrollable inefficient problematic technology ill-suited to grid electricity supply. The extra sites, necessarily wide spread and numerous, need many times more infrastructure in pylons and substations, necessitate more cost and industrial activity, increase resource usage and habitat destruction, cause more harms and pollution, do more harm to the environment, and disrupt the grid and the energy market. Nuclear power is the most reliable and efficient, cleanest, most sustainable, safest and least environmentally harmful way to generate the base load of demand for electricity, while gas is the best way to meet the variable demand. Intermittent inefficient generation such as wind and solar power does not fit in to this best-case scenario at all. Developers only do wind and solar because of the massive subsidies, preferential pricing arrangements and tax breaks.	No. Reading about wind projects suggests that protections are woefully inadequate and policing of regulations is insufficient. Wind turbines are disruptive to a grid, but also barely able to produce enough power to justify the energy that goes in to producing and implementing this kind of technology. A useful energy return should be at least 7 to 1 (seven parts energy return for one part energy expended), but wind power gives a return in energy which is more like 2 to 1 (including massive usage of fossil fuels for mining, processing, construction and maintenance, especially at sea), not nearly enough to keep a modern society functioning. This does not seem like sustainability to me.	No. Offshore (so-called)renewable energy industrial sites can only be harmful and an unnecessary danger to life and activities in the seas. But the wind turbines themselves are not just unnecessary (intermittent technology cannot replace anything) but they are also a mass of extra cost and industrial activity, with all the extra harms, dangers, environmental damage, pollution, resource and habitat usage that comes with that activity.	No. It seems to be that the meagre economic and employment gains are outweighed by the extra costs and overall loss of business competitiveness that increased electricity prices incur. Also, the more intermittent generation you have in the grid supply mix the more destabilised the power supply becomes, leading to load shedding and black-outs. More expensive less reliable power does not seem like economic sense to me.
35	Yes I do I think this is a great idea	Yes I do and also think this is a great idea as I feel we need to look forward and due to the constant prevailing wind , it's so wise to use this green power	Yes I feel there is good research done here and we can only try our best	Yes
36	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
37	They are too close to the shore and will affect tourism and general wellbeing of people living in the area	For environment, yes, but I don't believe the impact of windmill less than 20km off shore has been properly considered and the additional cost to the developers of putting them further out seems to be the only consideration	No, again, they need to be at least 20km out to better co-exist	No, having the windmills so close to shore will be detrimental to the beautiful coastline and tourism in the southeast
38	NO, ALL AREAS BUT IN PARTICULAR AREA A WILL INTERFERE WITH MIGRATING FISH STOCKS MOVING INSHORE DURING SURVEY, CONSTRUCTION AND ONGOING	YES	NO, MANDATORY PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS WILL BE USED AGAINST FISHING VESSELS UNDER THE GUISE OF SAFETY OR OTHER EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES. THIS WILL CAUSE MAJOR ISSUES WITH DISPLACEMENT OF FISHING VESSELS FROM 1 AREA TO ANOTHER AND ALSO FROM 1 FISHERY TO ANOTHER AS VESSELS STRIVE TO MAKE UP FOR LOST INCOME, THIS WILL HAVE A HUGE KNOCK ON EFFECT AND WILL AFFECT EVEN VESSELS WHO HAVE NEVER FISHED IN THE DESIGNATED AREAS	YES, BUT IT WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE AFFECT ON FISHERIES EMPLOYMENT ALSO EVERY EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO ENSURE QUALIFICATIONS AND CERTIFICATES OBTAINED IN FISHERIES TRAINING COLLEGES CAN BE USED IN THE OFFSHORE WIND INDUSTRY
39	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
40	No, from the review of the EIA there inadequate up to date data in relation to marine mammals and migration birds which rely on the south east coast of Ireland for food and migration. Also under current EU policy off shore wind farm development are required to be a minimum of 25kms from 6nm mark. These only 12kms from the shore and are falling short of legislation.	No, as it has been proven that off shore wind farms drastically changes the marine habitat and has a long lasting effect on the marine ecosystems. One change one marine habitat to another. For example a sediment habitat to reefs impacts the native population of mammals living in the area. Two: the rotation of the blades will stick birds on the feeding and migrating paths. Three: the noise and vibrations will affect marine mammals that rely on sound to communicate and feed. Four: migration of crustaceans will be altered from electronic interference from underwater cables to and from the wind farm. Which will have an economical impact on local fishing communities. Finally science research in the North Sea Wind Turbines it was observed only 1% of the farms had a positive effect on marine life where in greater numbers 10% had a negative impact on marine life especially for marine birds and mammals.	No, as with other off shore wind farm they a no go areas and to consider fishing or recreational activities in or around the wind turbines would be an act of Negligence on before of the master of a vessel and would put life at risk. So, the statement is so far from the truth it's dangerous to even consider maritime activities around them.	No, as many of the proposed areas will be to the exclusively for the companies who influence and invest in these areas which many are of not of this state. We will see another natural resource being exported for other nations benefit. It will have a negative effect on coastal communities the rely our sea for economical growth for small towns and villages.

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
41	No I do not agree with the areas. Particularly the unreasonable proximity of the area identified as A.	No as there is no clear mechanism as to how a project of this scale will prevent excessive noise during undersea drilling or piling operations. Due to the scale of the turbines suggested it is also not clear how impact from ongoing electromagnetic signals will be mitigated for marine species sensitive to such interference.	no the proximity of these wind turbines is excessive and the area covered unfairly inhibits the shared usage for all other stakeholders.	No there will be a limited benefit to very few and select individuals and their private enterprises only. Sharing of the benefits for such projects is a myth and local community funds serve as a pay out to a limited number of people who are bound by Non disclosure agreements relating to their potential opposition or concerns with such projects.
42	Area A is too close too shore. Should be at least 22km out. Having seen some environmental surveys, some of which only appears to include two species of large resident mammals (seal and porpoise), no migratory ones (ie whales and dolphins) and none of the myriad of smaller creatures, I dont believe there has been a comprehensive review of impact on the marine environment and inhabitants. The washing up of deep diving species 1-2 Sowersby Beaked Whales and the near stranding of a pod of pilot whales (also deep sea) in the Waterford estuary while the survey vessel was out suggests the impact will be great.	I find the questions leading and the documentation dense and its hard not to feel this is purposefully to deter the common citizen from engaging. The best solution would have been to incorporate wind generators in housing. But that wouldn't make any money.	No. I believe the intended developments while hugely impact other marine activities including fishing and leisure for what is only a short term capitalist solution to energy issues.	See question 3. Also not really. A more sustainable way to create employment would have been to create a coastal walk along Waterford and Cork Coasts. Current plans encourage short visits by people in cars and campers. Not great.
43	Area A is too close too shore. Should be at least 22km out. Having seen some environmental surveys, some of which only appears to include two species of large resident mammals (seal and porpoise), no migratory ones (ie whales and dolphins) and none of the myriad of smaller creatures, I dont believe there has been a comprehensive review of impact on the marine environment and inhabitants. The washing up of deep diving species 1-2 Sowersby Beaked Whales and the near stranding of a pod of pilot whales (also deep sea) in the Waterford estuary while the survey vessel was out suggests the impact will be great.	I find the questions leading and the documentation dense and its hard not to feel this is purposefully to deter the common citizen from engaging. The best solution would have been to incorporate wind generators in housing. But that wouldn't make any money.	No. I believe the intended developments while hugely impact other marine activities including fishing and leisure for what is only a short term capitalist solution to energy issues.	See question 3. Also not really. A more sustainable way to create employment would have been to create a coastal walk along Waterford and Cork Coasts. Current plans encourage short visits by people in cars and campers. Not great.

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
44	No. Designated areas are too close to the coastline and will cause irreparable damage to the environment as well as marine life. They can be viewed by up to 30kms offshore which will adversely affect property values as well as the natural beauty of the coastline.	No, these are too close to the coastline, they should be moved further out as is the case with other countries. The arguments to protect marine life are not adequate. The turbines will affect near shore marine ecosystems and migratory patterns of certain species. Noise pollution will disorientate species and leave them vulnerable to predators.	No, there is not enough substantive research and evidence to support these proposals. Turbine noise and potential hazards to navigation will interfere with fishing activities affecting the livelihoods of fishermen. Offshore turbines are known to cause 500k of bird deaths annually.	No. It has the potential to reduce tourist numbers due to impact on the coastline. The statement re. increase is emotive and lacks substance, it does not offset against the risks. Where is the economic benefit to communities such as Tramore? The overall economic benefits are poorly stated and do not outweigh the risks. Floating wind turbines are becoming expensive hobby horses due to damage caused by wave action, high winds, installation of cables is expensive, they are known to become less efficient over time, this is not addressed. Dances parts can cause landfill pollution due to low recyclability rates. Overall they are known to be more expensive than on-shore options. The initial costs exceed that of land based turbines making the cost per joule higher - who stands to benefit from these proposals? Not the consumer, not the environment and not local communities
45	I agree with the identified areas which were selected after careful consultation	I agree that the proposed approach will support and guide sustainable and coherent implementation of the plan. Time is of the essence now to commence the works. We are falling behind our European colleagues in terms of offshore wind development.	I agree that the draft includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities. It is time to see wind turbine equipment and other construction activity in our harbours	I agree that the framework will drive economic opportunities and provide significant job opportunities in diverse areas including construction and marine science
46	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
47	Yes I do agree.	Yes I do agree.	Yes I do agree.	Yes I do agree
48	No I have fished some of these area's for years	No	No The company's behind this don't care about anything but there bottom line	No most workers will be from overseas
49	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
50	I agree with the process and trust that the four areas identified are the most appropriate taking all the various known factors into account.	I agree generally with the objectives and the governance approach - provided that the approach is properly resourced leading to the best decisions and implementation in a timely manner. These resources include the required number of expert personnel and the adoption of the best technology for installation and maintenance and monitoring for both the turbines/cables and their sphere of influence (sea, land, air).	It's not my area of expertise but I trust that 'sufficient provisions' have been identified to date and will be made in the future.	I agree with the 'plan-led' framework' approach. I also hope that this approach will help accelerate the much needed additional renewable energy to the grid as soon as possible.
51	No I don't agree with them firstly the wildlife in these areas will be wiped out birds whales and dolphins to name but a few	There is nothing substantial about this just because ████████ lives in Dublin doesn't mean that the rest of the country doesn't enjoy wide open spaces with amazing views and amazing scenery and wildlife all going to be destroyed because of these	There is no co existing with this the fishing industry is being pushed out slowly but surely no consultation with the fishing industry whatever	No it is all lies the don't create employment locally more big industry and investors gaining huge profits from the community they destroying in little return
52	I agree	Yes I Do. We cannot ignore such a valuable energy source when our need for renewable energy is so great.	Yes	Yes
53	yes -	yes	yes	Yes
54	Based on the above selection criteria. Reviewer assumes only two selection criteria used which are a) Impact to ecosystem and b) technology maturity to 80m water depth. Reviewer believes there should be more than two selection criteria drivers. Examples are wind resource, marine traffic, visibility from shore, UXO and port location proximity. Reviewer has worked on many offshore fixed jacket gravity and piled foundation structures that are well in excess of 80m. Is there a hierarchy of selection criteria that drives the DMAP conclusion?	In the pursuit of sustainable and a supply of indigenous energy for Ireland it would be useful to understand if shallow offshore water LCOE actually is with respect to onshore wind. Ireland also has an indigenous supply of gas that can be provided by Corrib, Slyne basin tied back to Corrib and Barryroe. These developments would be more advantageous to Ireland with a lower carbon footprint and impact to the environment than fixed offshore wind. The mandatory use of carbon capture, sequestration and use of existing already built facilities would be of greater benefit compared to green fixed offshore platforms.	Fixed offshore wind require no go zones in particular during maintenance intervention due to RAM requirements. Fixed offshore wind areas should be designated marine sanctuaries to support marine breeding grounds and increased sustainable regeneration zones. Offshore oil and gas and subsea structures have proven to be beneficial to marine life. Allowing marine traffic between structures creates safety issues and potentially marine warranty issues. DECC and subsequent industry should be transparent to the fact that exclusion zones need to be demonstrated as early as possible.	Yes there will be benefits with the following caveats. Ports are not suitable and require deep water capability to provide the fabrication facilities on the south cost. Currently Harland & Wolff is the only suitable port but requires towing fixed structures from Belfast to south coast. Bantry Bay is suitable but requires a multi-million euro expenditure and requires scale of projects to be feasible. Lack of creation of new port mean it may come from south west UK. Recommend a joined up thinking in the supply chain from land to sea with Government assistance similar to Norway model.

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
55	No. 12km is too close to the shoreline and it's completely unnecessary to be that close. The area thrives on tourism and fishing is also important. Many countries insist offshore wind farms are located at least 20km from the shore – beyond the horizon, while floating structures can be anchored in operation and removed when decommissioned. Planning for a floating wind farm further offshore could be fast-tracked. The current plan in the south east of 12km from shore is horrific and the one in Galway is nothing short of catastrophic for sea life. We can fast track wind energy without causing irreversible damage.	No, it's clearly not a coherent plan when 300foot turbines are 5km and 12km from Ireland's most historic and globally recognized beautiful coastlines when there is absolutely no need for such close proximity.	Absolutely not. How can you fish successfully when the turbines are so close to shore? How can you promote leisure boat activities such as sailing? How can we continue to see basking sharks and so on choose our shores?	Absolutely not. Keep them further than 15km away, beyond the horizon for a start. This will be like the fish farm licenses where we are told there will be long term employment and then there isn't and also the data centres? Keep the turbines beyond 15km.
56	No. Anything closer than 15km to the coast is wrong and irreversible. GIG are not transparent. Turbines beyond 15km or ideally 20km are fine. The only reason they are proposed to be so close is to cut costs, it's scandalous.	No, again, GIG are not transparent. It is impossible to align turbines so close to the shore with sustainability. Keep the turbines 20km away.	No. I do not agree. Keep the turbines 20km away from shores. Stop cutting costs.	Absolutely not.
57	No. Keep turbines more than 20km away from the shore. Also, drilling 60 boreholes into the seabed in an important marine area cannot be without impact. How can any of the documents associated with the foreshore licence application be taken at face value if the independent trustees [redacted] tasked with ensuring [redacted] delivers truly impactful and effective green infrastructure projects are highlighting a lack of transparency across multiple key areas of [redacted] work?	No, I don't agree. Where is the governance and regulation in terms of the distance from the shore. Again, how can any of the documents associated with the foreshore licence application be taken at face value if the independent trustees [redacted] tasked with ensuring [redacted] delivers truly impactful and effective green infrastructure projects are highlighting a lack of transparency across multiple key areas of [redacted] work?	Is this a joke? Maximise co-existence? It's obvious costs will be cut from the beginning and as little effort as possible made to co-exist. Turbines closer than 20km to the shore is not an example of peacefully co-existing either.	Maximizing economic investment is obviously the goal, along with cutting costs and ignoring the need for both humans and animals to co-exist here. It is disgraceful to force 300ft turbines onto the coast within 20km of the shore.
58	No. less than 20km from shore is a clear sign of cost cutting, neglecting the maritime life needs and also neglecting the opinions of people who wish to live or visit the coastlines impacted by the "close to shore" turbines. I am lost for words.	no.	no.	no.
59	YES	YES	YES	YES
60	yes	yes	yes	yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
61	No I do not agree with ANY offshore windfarms off the coast of Waterford. None of the areas are suitable. In fact the validity of using windfarms to generate green electricity is a misnomer in itself. They are not sustainable , will have nothing but a detrimental impact on marine and bird life , no amount of studies you do will disprove that fact .	No i dont because studies already show there will be negative impact on marine life . I will personally object to every and any infrastructure planned for the Waterford Coastline that enables any development to continue. Where are ye getting enhancing marine biodiversity from?? I have zero faith any such studies will be done in a sincere and truthful manner. Windfarms the world over have shown ZERO enhancing of anything other than profits for the owners and shareholders of these company's.	No . I don't. Again there are zero examples of these farms being built and operated in a sustainable manner . They will ruin eco systems and livelihoods and will have no positive impacts on the local area . I find your wording of these questions condescending and expectant of me to acquiesce to the fact a decision has already been made to implement construction these so called farms	No I don't believe the local communities will any way benefit from this framework. How will they exactly? Saying it "could" benefit localities effected ... what does that mean exactly? The fact of the matter is a small handful of highly skilled individuals will operate these monstrosities which will no doubt not be given to any locals . Foreign and domestic companies are paid bribes in the form of incentives to offer any jobs these days to non locals . Our government will literally pay anyone except Irish people more to operate these farms. I have zero faith a single person living in the southeast will benefit at all. Not with cheaper electricity prices and certainly not with jobs. What about the loss of jobs in the fishing sector??
62	No. I believe area A is too near the Waterford coast.	Yes, for the further out areas.	There should be minimal disruption to fishing in the area.	I would be concerned it would affect tourism economy in Waterford, which is a massive part of our economy.
63	I agree	Yes I applaud the planning process which was led by the Department officials in consultation with the various interested parties .	Yes I believe the wind farm area when completed will be a refuge and conservation area for the sea flora and fauna.	Yes I believe that there are many opportunities for local involvement in the installation and maintenance of the wind farm and the further development of the energy sector.
64	I do not agree, as I believe it will have a major effect on biodiversity and the environment as a whole. I also believe and know surveys are not being carried out correctly. Also one area to close to shore and will affect me directly.	I hope so but do not believe it will. As ██████████ carried out a survey outside helvick head. No proper environmental survey carried out before and none carried out after. Giving no answers to anyone. And at the time all sealife vanished from the area.	No. It is very one sided	I do not, as contracts have allready been promised to big companies including foreign ones.
65	No Visual catastrophe for tourism for A Fishing. Grounds impacted for the rest	No no no If you destroy a commercial Fishing ground and all the ancillary industry cultural and economical whilst backing a ridiculously co2 investment to eventually reduce co2 whilst introducing nuclear energy by the interconnector back door at hook head area	Absolutely false statement	No no no You are destroying communities and the best shepherds of the sea

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
66	No Visual catastrophe for tourism for A Fishing. Grounds impacted for the rest	No no no If you destroy a commercial Fishing ground and all the ancillary industry cultural and economical whilst backing a ridiculously co2 investment to eventually reduce co2 whilst introducing nuclear energy by the interconector back door at hook head area	Absolutely false statement Corporate gains only	No no no You are destroying communities and the best shepherds of the sea
67	No Visual catastrophe for tourism for A Fishing. Grounds impacted for the rest	No no no If you destroy a commercial Fishing ground and all the ancillary industry cultural and economical whilst backing a ridiculously co2 investment to eventually reduce co2 whilst introducing nuclear energy by the interconector back door at hook head area	Absolutely false statement Corporate gains only	No no no You are destroying communities and the best shepherds of the sea
68	No. Site A is too close to the coast.	No. It's too vague. Too many future unknowns to be able to covetr in policy-making	We don't know how these will affect the biodiversity. EM fields may affect migratory species. Fishing may be wiped out. But there should be no restrictions on entering the areas for fishery as this industry was in place first.	No. Only the executives and shareholders will benefit. There will be no benefit to local communities as tourism will suffer due to the ugliness of these wind farms ruining the coastline
69	No, area A is needlessly close to the shore. I have no issue with the farshore areas	Yes	Yes	Yes
70	Yes	Yes.the coastline needs protection and to be oversees		Yes
71	No, area a to close to cost line	No	No	No
72	Yes I agree with the areas selected	Yes	Yes	Yes
73	Area A is too close to shore and will adversely affect views and inshore fishing	There is inadequate provision for local consultation	No	There are no obvious benefits for us who have to look at the structures every day
74	No I think site A is too Close to shore	I agree they think that but am uncomfortable and uncovinned that it won't have an impact on sealife	Not sure	No do not think the economic benefits will be realised
75	I'm all for developing such maritime areas, but to put one 12km from one of only 3 UNESCO geoparks in the country will be one of the biggest blunders of all time. Other countries that are ahead of us in this space are increasing the minimum distance from shore for these sites. We meanwhile, in a typically Irish decision, will offer the tender on a price only basis and permanently damage the landscape of a globally recognised area of significance, when there are multiple alternative sites a bit further out. It is quite frankly a terrible decision.	I have no evidence to the contrary on this point.	Of course tourism would be impacted by placing these merely 12km from UNESCO global geopark. That's not even a question.	If there are such economic advantages, why cant one of the sites 22km be utilised? It sounds like the economic benefits will more than cover any oncost and we have the bonus or not permanently damaging the coastline of a UNESCO site. Sounds like a win win and something that might even constitute forward thinking?

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
76	No. I do not agree with the 4 areas. The area closest to shore will be problematic. The wind strength and direction will send noise to shore. The Tramore shoreline is heavily residential and the beaches are used year round. Noise is not acceptable. Tramore has the seasonal noise of the amusements, which is acceptable, but the turbine noise will be a constant. The sea is big, so the area used should be as far from land as possible. The least affect possible to those living and visiting tramore should be the way forward.	Yes I agree with draft objectives etc .	Yes I agree. The further away from shore is sufficient provision for coexistence.	Yes. I agree.
77	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, get on with it. Get it done.
78	I am not against the idea of wind energy and realise that we have to have alternative energy sources. However I do not agree with the proposed sites, in particular the one off the the coast of Waterford. The visual impact will be awful! I understand that we are promised the second highest turbines in the world!! Higher than the Eifel Tower. I have seen the Eifel tower I have also seen the visual impact of "normal" turbines off the north coast of Wales and off the coast of Holland. These things can be seen for miles. The proposed turbines off the Waterford coast should be sited somewhere well over the horizon!	As a fisherman I find it hard to have any faith in anything I am told by anyone these days. The proposed area will benefit more by being left alone. Sustainable and coherent implementation sounds lovely but I doubt if that would be the case.	As a fisherman for many years now I can assure you that we will be the first casualty of the mix. Yet again our industry will be expendable!	A nice idea....
79	I am not against the idea of wind energy and realise that we have to have alternative energy sources. However I do not agree with the proposed sites, in particular the one off the the coast of Waterford. The visual impact will be awful! I understand that we are promised the second highest turbines in the world!! Higher than the Eifel Tower. I have seen the Eifel tower I have also seen the visual impact of "normal" turbines off the north coast of Wales and off the coast of Holland. These things can be seen for miles. The proposed turbines off the Waterford coast should be sited somewhere well over the horizon!	As a fisherman I find it hard to have any faith in anything I am told by anyone these days. The proposed area will benefit more by being left alone. Sustainable and coherent implementation sounds lovely but I doubt if that would be the case.	As a fisherman for many years now I can assure you that we will be the first casualty of the mix. Yet again our industry will be expendable!	A nice idea....
80	No. Please do not destroy Tramore strand with any eye shot of rotating turbines. Go far off shore. Please leave people in peace to enjoy nature undisturbed. You know the way traffic counters are used on roads, do that on Tramore and see how many people you will be distressing. It is media hype by Wind Energy lobbyists who try to tell government agencies that people like rotating blades of death.	"will provide for the sustainable development of offshore wind through consideration of environmental protection, while maintaining, and where possible, enhancing marine biodiversity" a this is absolute nonsense. [REDACTED] Your rhetoric is completely at odds with the Biodiversity Crisis. Can we have a Public Accounts Committee Enquiry into the farce that is the NATIONAL biodiversity Plan? 200m diameter rotating steel blades in bird flight paths and massive amounts of steel and concrete into the ocean? Please stop.	No	No. Are you off your trolley? Was that independent study done by an introvert who hates the beach and has no dog?

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
81	No absolutely not. Some A is too close to the coast and will have an adverse environmental, scenic and economic effect on those living near or visiting this coast.	No. The history of big business governance in Ireland is shameful e.g. look at previous governance of the Banking sector.	No. Mapping of WW1 and WW2 Martine war graves is regret poor in this area..The Cruise Liners who regularly visit Waterford will no longer be interested in visiting as they will be unable to see the beautiful coastline clearly - only an industrial environment of Turbines.	No. The proposed turbines are so large the blades will not fit into Waterford port.These will be delivered and brought from the specialist port currently under construction in Wales.
82	I don't agree with area A. It's too close to our coastline. This area should be scrapped.	No. But there is some positive information in it. It needs to be re thought properly	Definitely not	Yes . But at a huge cost to the fishing sector
83	No. Could create a barrier for fish migrating inshore to summer grounds. E.g. crabs and lobster moving inshore during the summer. Could have a serious impact for inshore fishermen.	No	No	No
84	No, area A is to close to land and will takeaway from our beautiful coastline	No	No	Yes
85	No I believe area A is too close to the coast and will create a visual eyesore in an area that depends on tourism and is also a unesco heritage site. I'm horrified that this area was chosen so close to the shoreline. Economics is the prime driver for this area cheaper to build due to topography with little or no long term thinking to the impact on area in particular Tramore and surrounds	It's too late once area A comes up. It can't be a test case to see how it affects we have dolphins whales a sign of really healthy biodiversity that comes very close to beach this cannot be good for the species that frequent this area.	Again Area A is way to close to the shoreline which will impact leisure craft future tourism initiatives in area	There will be a short term benefit for highly specialised people not local people in area when the development is up it can only harm economy due to the severe visual impact on an area dependent on tourism especially in area A
86	No firstly it's too far inshore 7 miles from Waterford coastline is way too near ..lobster ,crab ,herring and cod spawning grounds	No	No far from it	No
87	No, I do not agree with the area closest to shore. It is too close to the shoreline. Aside from visual impact, it has a significantly detrimental impact on the local enviroment and biodiversity so close to the shoreline.	I do not agree it will do so, and I fear we will go ahead and implement it, see the destruction and loss and do nothing about it.	I think there will be a significant negative impact on tourism, recreation, maritime environment and biodiversity from these windfarms	I think these opportunities are over-inflated. Employment creation directly related to the SC-DMAP will not account for potential loss of econmic and employment opportunities from tourism and fisheries.
88	No, section A is too close. I don't agree with these offshore at all as it will disrupt the sea life and the sea ground. Plenty of land to build them on	No	No	Yes but will it lower our electricity costs ??

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
89	<p>It is noted that four areas have been identified through screening studies and that all four areas are designated for "fixed offshore wind development", on the basis that this is established technology which can be installed at a reasonable cost. However, based on the timings indicated for development (DMAP Report p17), this may not be the situation in the future: Area A is for development by 2030 Areas B, C and D are for development in the "next ten-year period" presumably 2030 to 2040. Given this timescale it is not reasonable to limit Areas B-D to fixed developments as it is extremely likely based on the current rate of deployment that floating offshore wind will be a viable and technically qualified technology by this time and insisting on fixed developments may actually be imposing an outdated and sub-economic development concept. The strategy should be altered to allow the developer to propose the most economic form of development for the areas concerned, based on appropriate survey information - this would appear to be a logical strategy to allow potential developers to propose schemes at the lowest cost, using the most cost-effective technology. On a technical level, it is not clear that the screening exercise has been detailed enough to confirm that installing wind turbines with fixed seabed foundations is in fact the most economic or technical solution for Areas B, C or D: -the water depths in these areas extend up to 70m, making tower heights extremely high and expensive - there is limited geotechnical information (e.g. sub-seabed coring, soil characterisation etc.) to confirm that all of these areas are suitable for (economic) foundation installation - given the water depths, tower sizes and possible seabed conditions, the offshore construction period to install dozens of turbines would be excessive, involving multiple vessels over several years; this would necessarily increase the amount of associated marine noise and disturbance. One of the main drivers for the development of floating offshore wind technology is to streamline the offshore installation process and thereby reduce the time and cost, along with minimising the environmental and societal impact of extended offshore operations. It would appear therefore that restricting Areas B-D to fixed turbine installations is short-sighted and not supported by sufficient technical data. DECC should carry out further more detailed screening studies on proposed sites identifying in particular data gaps which need to be filled by additional survey/site data e.g. geotechnical assessment and taking into account the timetable for the deployment of field-proven floating wind technology, based on ongoing international developments.</p>	<p>Further to comments above, it is not clear that the total impact of possible fixed turbine deployment in the deeper waters of Areas B-D has been sufficiently assessed, either in terms of economic viability (i.e. will this be the best technology in the 2030's) or in terms of environmental impact (i.e. actual field installation time for dozens of fixed turbines vs floating units). Further and more detailed technical studies should be carried out to inform decision making using best international practice. It may be appropriate to widen the pool of consultants engaged for studies to include some with direct experience in other more mature markets e.g. Denmark, Scotland.</p>	<p>No Comment</p>	<p>It was stated at the consultation event in Cork that local experience and expertise built up in installing and maintaining fixed bottom turbines in Area A will be "recycled" to facilitate and leverage deployment of fixed bottom turbines in Areas B-D.....this may well be possible but there is also the risk that fixed bottom turbines will be obsolete/unsuitable by the time it comes to develop Areas B-D, leaving the "fixed bottom" expertise as a sort of "stranded asset". It may be better to focus on specific areas of expertise that are more translatable from one form of installation to another.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
90	No, whilst energy security is an important consideration in the development of wind farms I do not believe adequate consideration has been given to food security of the state when proposing these developments. The proposed wind farm developments overlap with important fishing areas that are used by the Irish fishing fleet and present their use for same thus compromising our national food security.	No. Recent newspaper articles suggest a link between whale and dolphin stranding and offshore wind farm installations. Impartial studies need to be completed to disprove any links before proceeding.	No Refer to point one above	Partially. Short term employment benefits associated with construction and longer term benefits associated with operation and maintenance need to be balanced with job losses in traditional sectors such as fishing and processing
91	I agree with 3 that are located 20km plus from shore. I do not agree with the proposed siting of a wind farm 12km from shore. This is contrary to EU policy and will have a huge visual impact on an unspoilt part of the Waterford coastline.	No, I have no confidence that the projects will support environmental protection. It is inevitable that they will have a huge impact on marine life.	No, it does not. It underplays the environmental impact and it will be too late when the full repercussions are felt.	No, some small monetary gain is a poor trade off for the overall loss to the Waterford community. We cannot be bought and allow future generations to live with the consequences of our actions.
92	Yes, I agree.	I cannot agree or disagree as I don't know: it remains to be seen. I hope the approach will support the sustainable and coherent implementation the draft SC-DMAP polict objectives but that is, of course, subject to both how the governance structure is established, funded, and resourced, and how it functions.	Yes, I agree.	Yes, I agree.
93	No, I agree with 3 of them but block A is unnecessarily close to mainland. Technology exists to have it further offshore so it will be less of an eyesore to the county Waterford ciastline	No	No	No - very vague statement without any substance. Don't believe local people / businesses will see any benefit from this development, but will see a reduction in tourism
94	No. Area A is too close. Other maritime countries recommend over 40km for offshore wind. At 20 to 30km there is significant visual impact. This is along the copper coast UNESCO park area and such visual intrusion should be taken extremely seriously. The potential negative effect on tourism will cost the region significantly more than the cost of longer cables to the energy company.	Yes. With the caveat that the oversight provided must not have any commercial bias.	Possibly	No. The tourism and fishing industries will be affected significantly. Any jobs gained are likely to be at the expense of others.
95	We do not agree with the location of Area A Tonn Nua. The proximity to Tramore Bay at the proposed 12.5 kilometers is far to close to the shoreline. Also the proposed height of the turbines at 300 metres is too high and the amount of them is too many. We strongly object to the first proposal on the grounds that this is an area of natural beauty and attracts many visitors to this area. Tramore Bay has an exceptional horizon and is a great source of relaxation and well being to thousands of residents and visitors to the town. We feel that the proposal would interfere with the natural beauty of Tramore Bay and the Copper Coast area. The proposal for areas B C and D is more acceptable.	It seems that the policy objectives and governance for environmental protection, are adequate, but these are unknown factors. We would like to see some research figures in support.	Tramore is a very popular area for maritime activities including swimming, sailing and surfing etc. What kind of survey has been done to ensure that these activities will not be affected.	We accept that this is the case and welcome the economic and employment opportunities that the proposal will bring. We do have a concern that because of the proposed proximity of 12.5k, that this would in fact deter visitors to this area and have the opposite effect. Tourism is an important employment opportunity in this area and should be encouraged rather than reduced.

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
96	No we do not agree to the proposal to erect 300 metre wind turbines 12.5 kms from the shoreline in Tramore. Tramore is a tourist area with a fantastic view of the horizon, this will be totally spoilt. Tramore residents and visitors get a lot of benefit from the beach amenities, any impediment to the view will have a negative effect. Tramore and the Copper Coast is an area of natural beauty. We also disagree to the amount of turbines that will be visible. Tramore has excellent maritime leisure sports including swimming, surfing and sailing.	It is not conclusive that the policy objectives and governance approach will not have a negative affect on environment protection. The department should seek information from other EU members on their policies.	We are unclear what effect the provisions will have on maritime activities, it is unlikely to be positive.	We agree and welcome that the plan-led framework will support and drive economic and employment opportunities. However what consideration has been given to the negative affect the construction of 300 metre wind turbines in such close proximity to Tramore will have on the tourist industry in this area. Tourism is extremely important to this region and creates many jobs.
97	If none of the Maritime Area are too close(at least) 10 km to the coastline, they may be acceptable	No	No	No, any employment opportunities are short-term, and the energy may in time be exported to mainland Europe. They, along with suppliers, get the benefits. Irish people, living along the coastline, are looking out at these edifices and deriving no benefits whatsoever
98	Strongly agree with 3 of the areas however circa 12km is simply to close to the coast line	Yes for 3 of the areas (outer)	There will be an impact on other maritime activities for the are identified at circa 12km. I don't agree with this location	Yes
99	Do not agree with the A area it is to close to shore would agree to B it looks at least over 22km off shore 12km is way to close .	Do not trust the government to do this right. all seems rushed not enough consultation with the people that's have to live with this.and know protection of the sea in the south .	Don't agree with putting too many farms in one area is good for marine life or human life	I can't see the benefits of have a lot of wind turbines 12km off our shoreline they should be at least 25km I am not against them just the one too close to shoreline please put they in area B .
100	Do not agree with the A area it is to close to shore would agree to B it looks at least over 22km off shore 12km is way to close .	Do not trust the government to do this right. all seems rushed not enough consultation with the people that's have to live with this.and know protection of the sea in the south .	Don't agree with putting too many farms in one area is good for marine life or human life	I can't see the benefits of have a lot of wind turbines 12km off our shoreline they should be at least 25km I am not against them just the one too close to shoreline please put they in area B .
101	Do not agree with the A area it is to close to shore would agree to B it looks at least over 22km off shore 12km is way to close .	Do not trust the government to do this right. all seems rushed not enough consultation with the people that's have to live with this.and know protection of the sea in the south .	Don't agree with putting too many farms in one area is good for marine life or human life	I can't see the benefits of have a lot of wind turbines 12km off our shoreline they should be at least 25km I am not against them just the one too close to shoreline please put they in area B .

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
102	<p>No, it is hard to comprehend how public funds have been assigned to a project that will so clearly have a devastating impact on the natural beauty of the Waterford coastline. Under the premise of sustainable energy, the entire coastline of Waterford and natural horizon will be replaced with industrial windmills. The proximity of these turbines will have a severely negative impact on our local tourism industry and local businesses who are finally enjoying increased footfall from tourism. After years of work for the Cooper Coast to finally gain recognition as a UNESCO Geopark, it is hard to believe that the departments' plan is to place 60 turbine windmills just 12.5km directly offshore. This is not in the interests of Waterford people and certainly not in the interest of conserving Ireland's natural beauty. Personally, if this department does not listen to the local people and proceeds with its own commercial objectives, I will have to move home again, having only been able to move back to Waterford a view years ago, as I could not watch or beautiful coastline be destroyed.</p>	<p>No, this project only serves the few and there is insufficient evidence to show that the environment will not experience a negative impact. It is also clear by the development of this plan that the department is not concerned about the local area and cannot be trusted to oversee its governance.</p>	<p>If the department was genuinely concerned about the impact on this area as a whole it would afford the same opportunity to Waterford as to counties in the West of Ireland and wait for the development of floating platforms.</p>	<p>No, this report is completely biased and speculative, there is no evidence to suggest it will benefit the Waterford people. I have visited several areas with wind turbines and spoken to local people in different communities. They all have the same thing in common, once the commercial developers and energy companies had fulfilled their goals, the local people were left with the negative effects on the local environment and local businesses. Waterford City has always suffered from lack of development and investment, therefore making our natural coastline an even more precious asset to be protected at all costs. This project is reactionary and comes at too high a cost to the local communities and environment. I would suggest a more mature approach to sustainable energy including, no more development of data services, the immediate development of a sustainable public transport system and increased funding for retrofit solar energy solutions for Irish households.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
103	<p>I disagree with Site A. There is no consideration to seascape and local access to the area which is only 12k from shore. I have fished in these areas for years and there a number of wrecks within site A. The location of site A is contrary to off shore planning in other European countries. Site A must be removed from the final map. It is apparent that there is no plan or a contradiction of what the plan is, the 3 other sites are more than enough for the SE coast. If the Minister is claiming that the technology is not in place for these sites, then they should also be removed. The map needs to consider the long term impact on the coastal communities not be lead by the commercial interests of the investors. The DMAP proposal should have included a 3D representation of what the type of infrastructure would look like. SITE A will have to be removed at a minimum.</p>	<p>Absolutely not, How can a draft plan be drafted without the environmental assessments been completed? The 1st objective should have been to complete and publish the environmental assessments. Sustainable development and environmental protection should not be investor-led, it is apparent that the inclusion of Site A is not for the benefit of SC coastal communities. We recognize that there are energy challenges and climate considerations however I fundamentally disagree with the Ministers proposal to sacrifice the ecosystems, and users of Site A through generations solely to onboard commercial investors at any cost. Ireland needs to review experience from other European countries to ensure there is a cohesive sustainable development and environmental plan.</p>	<p>The term co-existence is totally misleading, As mentioned previously Site A is an area that is actively used commercially, and recreationally, the marine activity above and below the waterline can be seen in every season. There is no co-existence in where the plan claims to "The draft Plan provides that mandatory permanent exclusions" to all of site A. I support the term for co-existence in the Celtic Sea, but permanently sterilizing the area of Site A is not in the interest of the inshore SC communities and the people who currently are in existence.</p>	<p>I agree that there is an opportunity for employment in the construction phase and as per other offshore projects, a limited number of jobs thereafter. There will be minimal local economic benefit which will be localised to the dedicated onshore hubs. There is no evidence or outline in the SC-DMAP how or if there is an economic drive. Surly if this question is to be evaluated on its own merit, the estimated value and drive economic including employment opportunities should be outlined in the plan.</p>
104	<p>I disagree with Site A. There is no consideration to seascape and local access to the area which is only 12k from shore. I have fished in these areas for years and there a number of wrecks within site A. The location of site A is contrary to off shore planning in other European countries. Site A must be removed from the final map. It is apparent that there is no plan or a contradiction of what the plan is, the 3 other sites are more than enough for the SE coast. If the Minister is claiming that the technology is not in place for these sites, then they should also be removed. The map needs to consider the long term impact on the coastal communities not be lead by the commercial interests of the investors. The DMAP proposal should have included a 3D representation of what the type of infrastructure would look like. SITE A will have to be removed at a minimum.</p>	<p>Absolutely not, How can a draft plan be drafted without the environmental assessments been completed? The 1st objective should have been to complete and publish the environmental assessments. Sustainable development and environmental protection should not be investor-led, it is apparent that the inclusion of Site A is not for the benefit of SC coastal communities. We recognize that there are energy challenges and climate considerations however I fundamentally disagree with the Ministers proposal to sacrifice the ecosystems, and users of Site A through generations solely to onboard commercial investors at any cost. Ireland needs to review experience from other European countries to ensure there is a cohesive sustainable development and environmental plan.</p>	<p>The term co-existence is totally misleading, As mentioned previously Site A is an area that is actively used commercially, and recreationally, the marine activity above and below the waterline can be seen in every season. There is no co-existence in where the plan claims to "The draft Plan provides that mandatory permanent exclusions" to all of site A. I support the term for co-existence in the Celtic Sea, but permanently sterilizing the area of Site A is not in the interest of the inshore SC communities and the people who currently are in existence.</p>	<p>I agree that there is an opportunity for employment in the construction phase and as per other offshore projects, a limited number of jobs thereafter. There will be minimal local economic benefit which will be localised to the dedicated onshore hubs. There is no evidence or outline in the SC-DMAP how or if there is an economic drive. Surly if this question is to be evaluated on its own merit, the estimated value and drive economic including employment opportunities should be outlined in the plan.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
105	<p>I disagree with Site A. There is no consideration to seascape and local access to the area which is only 12k from shore. I have fished in these areas for years and there are a number of wrecks within site A. The location of site A is contrary to off shore planning in other European countries. Site A must be removed from the final map. It is apparent that there is no plan or a contradiction of what the plan is, the 3 other sites are more than enough for the SE coast. If the Minister is claiming that the technology is not in place for these sites, then they should also be removed. The map needs to consider the long term impact on the coastal communities not be led by the commercial interests of the investors. The DMAP proposal should have included a 3D representation of what the type of infrastructure would look like. SITE A will have to be removed at a minimum.</p>	<p>Absolutely not, How can a draft plan be drafted without the environmental assessments been completed? The 1st objective should have been to complete and publish the environmental assessments. Sustainable development and environmental protection should not be investor-led, it is apparent that the inclusion of Site A is not for the benefit of SC coastal communities. We recognize that there are energy challenges and climate considerations however I fundamentally disagree with the Ministers proposal to sacrifice the ecosystems, and users of Site A through generations solely to onboard commercial investors at any cost. Ireland needs to review experience from other European countries to ensure there is a cohesive sustainable development and environmental plan.</p>	<p>The term co-existence is totally misleading, As mentioned previously Site A is an area that is actively used commercially, and recreationally, the marine activity above and below the waterline can be seen in every season. There is no co-existence in where the plan claims to "The draft Plan provides that mandatory permanent exclusions" to all of site A. I support the term for co-existence in the Celtic Sea, but permanently sterilizing the area of Site A is not in the interest of the inshore SC communities and the people who currently are in existence.</p>	<p>I agree that there is an opportunity for employment in the construction phase and as per other offshore projects, a limited number of jobs thereafter. There will be minimal local economic benefit which will be localised to the dedicated onshore hubs. There is no evidence or outline in the SC-DMAP how or if there is an economic drive. Surely if this question is to be evaluated on its own merit, the estimated value and drive economic including employment opportunities should be outlined in the plan.</p>
106	<p>Block A is much too close to shore and will cause irrevocable and unnecessary damage to the seabed in this area. Fishing will be unsustainable and the cost to too many families dependent on fishing and tourism cannot be overstated. This is an area of extraordinary beauty. Would placing 60 1,000 ft high wind turbines 12.4km around the Aran Islands be considered?</p>	<p>I don't believe it. Too many variables are being discussed and evidence of clarity is doubtful.</p>	<p>Absolutely not.</p>	<p>The numbers being quoted of potential employment are not supported with actual figures.</p>
107	<p>No, there is very little info saying how many turbines. These are very near a herring fishery and many other species as outlined in the SEA. What about bird migration patterns also in the area and management of maintenance and reduction of transport of invasive species? The areas are simply too close to the nursery and little info given.</p>	<p>No. Who will enforce the permission given for the development? Construction impacts? The SEA has included a good range of info but marine data is often inconsistent and often flawed in its methodology e.g. migrating birds at night time, impacts of turbines on signals of fishing vessels etc.. There are always loopholes put in for economic interests. Can you assure us this wont happen again?</p>	<p>It depends if you have consulted adequately with them and listened to them.</p>	<p>Initially perhaps at construction stage? But then there will be little employment offered. Do you offer the local community lower price electricity as they will be impacted by these developments e.g. potential noise, aesthetics, potential impacts on marine biodiversity, invasives etc.?</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
108	I am not qualified to comment on whether the chosen MAs are the most suitable from a ecosystem-based approach, but I agree that to use that approach is appropriate. Any submission that objects to these areas but cannot present ecosystem-based objections should be ignored	Yes and this is the appropriate approach	Yes	Yes, but I also believe that there is the potential for targeting of specific areas for development that would increase buy-in from local communities. The harbour at Helvick Head, the channel to Dungarvan, the port of Dungarvan, have all fallen in to varying states of neglect and disrepair over the years and would be perfect candidates for localised, targeted investment. Make local communities central to the project, rather than have something "imposed" on them
109	<p>Tá Limistéar A i bhfad róghar don chósta agus beidh sé i bhfad rófheiceálach. Ní ghlacaim leis gurb é seo an t-aon rogha amháin. Tá feirm ghaoithe i Morven na hAlban beartaithe níos mó ná 60 km ón gcladach in uiscí idir 64 agus 75 méadar ar doimhneacht agus beidh sí ag feidhmiú faoi 2030. Más féidir leo é seo a dhéanamh, ba cheart dúinn. Creidim gur féidir agus gur chóir gach feirm ghaoithe amach ó Phort Láirge a fhorbairt thar 25km ón gcladach i ndoimhneacht uisce 65 – 75 méadar, rud a laghdóidh an tionchar amhairc agus comhshaoil. Ba chóir go gcuirfeadh suíomh na feirme gaoithe na cosáin eiltle atá ann faoi láthair agus atá beartaithe go dtí agus amach ó aerfort Phort Láirge san áireamh freisin, agus níor cheart go mbeadh tionchar aige ar a fhorbairt. Area A is much too close to the shoreline and will be much too visible. I do not accept that this is the only option. Scotland's Morven wind farm is planned over 60 km from shore in waters between 64 and 75 meters deep and will be operational by 2030. If they can do this, so should we. I believe that all wind farms off Waterford can and should be developed over 25km from shore in water depths of 65 – 75 meters thus reducing visual and environmental impacts. The location of the wind farm should also take into consideration the current and planned flight paths to & from Waterford airport, and should not impact on its development.</p>	<p>Bheadh imní orm go bhféadfadh tionchar diúltach a bheith ann ar bhithéagsúlacht mhuirí má bhíonn na feirmeacha ghaoithe forbartha agus lonnaithe chomh gharr den chósta. Bheadh imní orm go gcuirfeadh an torann isteach ar mhamaigh mhara agus go mbeadh tionchar diúltach aige orthu. Bheadh imní orm go mbeadh na muilinn ag cur isteach ar ghnáthóga, patrúin imirce, agus tailte pórúcháin speiceas mara éagsúla. Is féidir le truailliú torainn ó thógáil agus oibriú tuirbíní cur isteach ar mhamaigh mhara, agus féadann láithreach fhisiceach na dtuirbíní sruthanna uisce agus patrúin dríodrúcháin a athrú, rud a chuireann isteach ar phobail éisc agus ar shaol muirí eile.</p> <p>I would have concerns that developing and locating the wind farms so close to shore could impact negatively on marine biodiversity. I would be concerned that the noise would disturb and negatively impact on marine mammals. I would be concerned that the windmills could disrupt habitats, migration patterns, and breeding grounds of various marine species. Noise pollution from turbine construction and operation can disturb marine mammals, while the physical presence of turbines can alter water</p>	<p>Ní ghlacaim le seo i dtaobh an moladh atá ann faoi láthair.</p> <p>Tá imní léirithe ag iascairí áitiúla go sciosfaidh na feirmeacha gaoithe an tionscal éisc áitiúil. Faoi láthair tá thart ar 35 duine ag iascaireacht amach ó Bhaile na nGall agus Heilbhic i nGaeltacht na nDéise. Is oibreoirí beaga iad go léir. Tá dearcadh láidir ann go mbeidh céim na tógála ar an gceann is dúshlánaí, ní hamháin d'iascairí áitiúla, ach do ghnáthóga, mamaigh mhuirí, etc. Tá imní orthu, mar gheall ar an suaitheadh atá déanta ag tógáil na bhfeirmeacha gaoithe, nach mbeidh iasc ag sceitheadh ná ag pórú. Mar thoradh air seo, bliain ar bhliain, ní bheidh dóthain éisc le hiascaireacht sa limistéar, rud a chuirfidh deireadh le tionscal na hiascaireachta sa cheantar. Tá imní ann go gcuirfidh na feirmeacha gaoithe isteach ar phatrúin imirce éisc, sliogéisc, éin srl.</p> <p>Is minic nach ndéanfar iascach ar shliogéisc ach ½ km ón gcladach. Tá cúiseanna sonracha imirce ag sliogéisc agus tá imní mhór ann má chuirtear isteach ar na forais sin nach dtiocfaidh siad isteach chomh gar don chladach a thuilleadh.</p> <p>Taistealaíonn an fhuaim timpeall cúig huaire níos tapúla san uisce ná san aer</p>	<p>Rachaidh an Ciste Pobail a chruthaítear, a bheidh grúpaí pobail áitiúla agus deonacha ábalta cur isteach air, go mór chun tairbhe an cheantair. Ach d'fhéadadh tionchar diúltach a bheith ar thurasóireacht, agus ar na ghnólachtaí agus na daoine aonair atá ag brath ar thurasóireacht, de bharr tionchar amhairc na bhfeirmeacha gaoithe agus iad ró-ghar don gcósta. Ar bharr san, is é mo thuiscint ná go bhfuil an 35 duine áitiúil atá ag iascaireacht ó Heilbhic & Baile na nGall faoi láthair thar a bheith buartha faoin tionchar a bheidh ag na feirmeacha gaoithe ar a slí bheatha, sa ghearrthéarma agus san fhadtéarma, agus go mbeadh deireadh leis a slí beatha dá bharr.</p> <p>The Community Fund that is created, which local community groups and volunteers will be able to seek funding from, will greatly benefit the area. But tourism, and the businesses and individuals that depend on tourism, could be negatively impacted by the visual impact of wind farms being too close to the coast. In addition, it is my understanding that the 35 local people currently fishing out of</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
		<p>currents and sedimentation patterns, affecting fish populations and other marine life</p>	<p>(thart ar 340 m/s) toisc go bhfuil dlús an uisce níos airde, agus go laghdaítear níos lú freisin thar an achar céanna. Tá fianaise láidir ann go mbíonn tionchar diúltach ag torann ar gach saol muirí, sliogéisc san áireamh.</p> <p>I don't accept this in relation to the current proposal.</p> <p>Local fishermen have expressed concern that the windfarms will destroy the local fish industry. There are currently approximately 35 people fishing out of Baile na nGall and Heilbhic in Gaeltacht na nDéise. All are small operators. There is a strongly held view that the construction phase of the ind farms will be the most challenging, not only for local fishermen, but for habitats, marine mammals, etc. They are concerned that, due to the disturbance caused by the construction of the wind farms, that fish will not spawn or breed. This, in consequence, year on year will lead to there being insufficient fish to be fished in the area, thereby eventually finishing the fishing industry in the area. There is concern that the wind farms will disrupt migration patterns of both fish, shellfish, birds, etc.</p> <p>Shellfish will often be fished only ½ km from shore. Shellfish have specific migration grounds and there is huge concern that if these grounds are disturbed that they will no longer come in so close to shore.</p> <p>Sound travels about five times faster in water than in air (ca. 340 m/s) because the density of water is greater, and also reduces less over the same distance. There is strong evidence that noise impacts negatively on all marine life, shellfish included.</p>	<p>Heilbhic & Baile na nGall are extremely worried about the impact the wind farms will have on their livelihoods, both in the short and longer term, and that there will be an end to their livelihood as a result.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
110	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes. I think that often these surveys are only filled in by those that have objections, so I just wanted you to know that this is brilliant and it will be so good for Ireland in terms of sustainability and our long-term energy security. I just wish we were about ten years further along in the process. Keep up the good work.
111	<p>No, I do not agree with Area A but I support areas B-D. I attended a consultation webinar and I found the answers given evasive and paying lip service to community engagement. During the 2023 engagement 1,397 responses were provided indicating concern with Area A given particular concern over the location 12km to shore at the closest. Given that the likely windmills will be up to 300m tall the visual impact is likely to be significant. During the consultation the response to visual impact questions was that this was not considered and not within the scope of the strategy as it was not a project. The response stated that the visual impact would be assessed during future project and planning applications. The fact the visual impact is being completely excluded from this assessment is a glaring gap in the assessment process. It is also indicating that the community engagement is a box ticking exercise with the concerns of the community noted but never addressed and the project proceeding in spite of valid concerns. Of the four areas Area A is also located in the area of highest environmental constraints and impact. When comparing the LCOE ORESS 2.1 it is clear that Area A is being selected as the lowest cost however Area B (or an alternative area to the south west would be in a similar LCOE zone.</p> <p>Also in the results from the public consultation it is clear that whilst there is broad support for ORE developments 22km from the coast there are serious and significant concerns with developments closer to the shore. Whilst ██████████ consider these matters for project consideration we are highly concerned that Area A as the initial proposed zone is entirely within the 22km distance that there is not community support for and the approval of Area A in this DMAP gives implicit approval for developments within 22km of the shore.</p> <p>In addition Area A is also primarily located in the spawning and nursery grounds for fish and shellfish as opposed to the other areas.</p> <p>As Area A is the cheapest and quickest to deliver it is clear that time and speed are being prioritised over the long term multi decade impact that these projects will have on the local community. It is another example of short-sighted decision making with uncomfortable data and facts being ignored in favour of expediting this process to the detriment of an entire</p>	<p>I do not. I believe that the decision to identify Area A as the first to be delivered without fully considering all the impacts will not lead to sustainable development and environmental protection. If only assessed on the impact of environmental protection, then Area A would be the last choice due to the environmental impacts. Therefore, this DMAP strategy is clearly prioritising short term cost and schedule over long-term environmental impact when the stated aim is sustainable long term environmental protection.</p>	<p>No, I do not agree that this will support and guide sustainable and coherent implementation. As was shared during the consultation process in this plan there is no consideration for the visual impact of the proposed areas nor any assessment of the impact on tourism in the area. Whilst the responses during consultation indicated that as this is not a project and no visual impacts would be considered the approval of the proposed areas gives implicit consent to future developers that these areas are acceptable for the construction of turbines giving the multiple references to environmental assessments being carried out. The owners of this strategy are therefore divesting themselves of any responsibility or ownership for the potential impact that future projects will have on tourism and recreation. This is a significant gap in the development of these proposals and indicates that there is a reluctance to commit to identifying the potential impacts.</p>	<p>I do not agree that this proposal adequately supports economic and employment opportunities. During the consultation there was no clearly explained rationale how the economic benefits would impact the community. Instead, the communicated benefits seemed to be limited to those companies who would be involved in the construction and operation of these facilities which would primarily involve companies and personnel from other locations, both within Ireland and from abroad depending on the skillsets required. The direct impacts to the actual communities not directly involved in the construction and operation of these facilities were not and have not been clearly communicated.</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>community. The failure of the government and strategy consultants to develop a viable plan to meet 2030 goals should not be a justification to push through a location that has undergone no visual impact assessment and will leave the community of Waterford with a development that has detrimental environmental, community and tourism impacts compared to the other proposed locations.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
112	<p>While I support the overall goal of identifying suitable maritime areas for offshore wind development, the current proposal does not sufficiently account for the significant public opposition to developments within 22km of the coastline. A more balanced solution that addresses these community-based concerns is needed. Therefore I do not agree with Area A in the draft SC-DMAP but find areas B-D to be more acceptable whilst still requiring additional visual impact assessments. The key concerns that have emerged are: Strong public preference for offshore wind developments to be located at least 22km from the coastline, expressed by numerous stakeholders including local government, industry groups, and a large number of individual respondents. This is due to major concerns over the potential visual impacts on sensitive coastal areas like the Copper Coast UNESCO Geopark and Hook Peninsula. Specific worries raised about the visibility and perceived visual impacts of the large-scale turbines (up to 300m in height), with calls for more detailed assessment of the impacts at different distances and weather conditions. The Irish Charter Skipper Association's preference for a "turbine-free zone" within the 22km boundary, further reinforcing the local community's opposition to developments in close proximity to the shore. Acknowledgement from some respondents that while visual impacts cannot be entirely avoided, they should be minimized "where possible" through appropriate siting decisions. Suggestions by developers that locating infrastructure further offshore, in deeper waters, could help mitigate visual impacts. The significant public response (1,397 individuals) generated by the Blue Horizon campaign, all focused on the visual impact concerns and calling for a 22km minimum distance from shore. Given this overwhelming feedback from the public consultation process, I cannot fully agree with the four maritime areas as currently identified, particularly in the case of Area A. The failure to adequately address the community's clear and consistent concerns about visual impacts, especially for the area closest to the shore, is a significant shortcoming. Unless these visual impact concerns can be satisfactorily resolved through a more thorough landscape and visual impact assessment, as suggested by some respondents, I do not believe the four maritime areas should be approved in their current form. A revised approach that gives appropriate weight to the public's preferences and concerns would be warranted before finalizing the SC-DMAP.</p>	<p>No I do not. Given the shortcomings of this process that excludes any assessment of visual impact and the prioritization of cost and schedule over environmental impacts I do not believe that this strategy results in a sustainable solution.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised by the fishing community as well as the local community I do not believe this proposal adequately addresses the concerns of these stakeholder groups by not including any actions to address their feedback.</p>	<p>I have not seen the details about how these economic benefits will support the most impacted communities. There is a lack of detail and the use of large numbers without any breakdown means I cannot agree with this statement.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
113	<p>Not really as I am not a fan of these turbines to be situated in waters already in trouble as fish stocks decline and the seas around our coasts are already suffering from pollution from environmental problems.</p> <p>Also as winds can vary quite often between speeds to doldrums, wind energy is not possibly going to increase our energy supply by as much as is being promoted by the companies who design, supply and may in future control the supply and cost of electricity to consumers.</p>	<p>No for some of the reasons given above at 1. In addition some of our sea creatures such as whales ,sharks etc communicate by underwater sound signals and there is no reason to believe that noise pollution from these wind turbines will not disturb these sea creatures around our coasts.</p>	<p>Again the establishment of these wind turbines could further the disturbance of our sea fishery community and general sea traffic in the areas where they are placed.</p>	<p>It may increase employment .Yes ,only if it will not cause more problems than it will solve in the long term such as shown above.</p>
114	<p>No. These will be the deepest in the world and at their full height, 12km from the shore is not commonly found off any European coast. Australia has pitched the idea of turbines 15km off shore but these are half the height of the proposed turbines here. These are permanent fixtures so it would make sense to allow more consultation for site A off the south east.</p>	<p>No. Firstly the depth has never been attempted before. The consultation is fast tracked. There is the usual scare mongering about electricity costs while the government continues to plan for data centres. There has been no marked planning for behaviour changes when it comes to personal data storage...let's just go mad and build more data centres and sure we'll just flood the country with wind farms to deal with that.</p>	<p>Obviously not. You have a UNESCO site on the Copper Coast that will now be overlooked by the tallest and deepest turbines in the world.</p>	<p>Ireland's planning in terms of housing, infrastructure and decentralised employment has never been good. The turbines are no different. The government might get away with the likes of Site A now because the coastal communities are so small but it will be an environmental disaster in the long run to have them so close to shore.</p>
115	<p>Yes - I agree that they appear to be in most appropriate areas in respect of biodiversity, fish stocks, shipping and marine activities.</p>	<p>The design of the policy is consistent with the needs and aspirations of energy providers and users and allows for a methodological approach to the issues that are required to be addressed.</p>	<p>As the country is surrounded by over 140k square kilometres of ocean, the amount taken up by this energy plan is a very small percentage of the whole. While it will have some impacts on fishing, shipping and marine activities, these are not insurmountable and work arounds can be made to accommodate any issues that might arise in the future.</p>	<p>It is very important to bring to everyone's attention that this is a 'must do' project to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels, assist in meeting our targets in the climate change crisis (and it is a crisis), provide energy security for Ireland and to exploit the energy export market to the UK and Europe via the various inter-connectors that will be place when this project comes fruition.</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
116	<p>I do not agree with the identification of Maritime Area A for future offshore wind development within the draft SC-DMAP. There are several reasons for this, primarily revolving around its proximity to the shore and the greater environmental impacts compared to other identified areas.</p> <p>Proximity to Shore: Maritime Area A is located between 12 to 22 kilometres from the shore, making it significantly closer to the coastline compared to Maritime Areas B, C, and D. This close proximity raises several concerns related to visual impact, potential disruption to coastal recreational activities, and higher likelihood of conflicts with existing coastal marine uses.</p> <p>Environmental Impact: The environmental assessments indicate that Maritime Area A has a greater potential for adverse environmental impacts. It is noted that the area may interact with sensitive marine ecosystems and species, including those protected under the EU Natura 2000 network. The presence of marine mammals and other protected species in the area increases the risk of negative ecological impacts. Specifically, the SEA Environmental Report highlights the potential for significant disturbance to marine mammals and fish species due to underwater noise and physical presence during construction and operational phases. Additionally, there are concerns about habitat loss and changes to seabed morphology.</p> <p>Public Consultation Findings: The public consultation process has revealed considerable concern from local communities and stakeholders about the impacts of development in Maritime Area A. Issues raised include the visual impact on coastal landscapes, potential disruption to tourism and recreational activities, and the proximity to important fishing grounds. Moreover, the feedback indicated a preference for locating wind farms further offshore to mitigate these impacts, as reflected in the general support for Maritime Areas B, C, and D, which are situated further from the coast.</p> <p>Technical and Economic Considerations: While Maritime Area A may present some logistical advantages due to its proximity to existing grid infrastructure, the overall benefits must be weighed against the higher potential for negative environmental and social impacts. The Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) analysis also suggests that while costs may be lower for nearer shore projects, the long-term sustainability and acceptability of the project are at risk if environmental and social impacts are not adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Consistency with Environmental Objectives: The ecosystem-based approach used in the SC-DMAP emphasises the importance of avoiding and minimising adverse environmental impacts. Given the identified risks and the feedback from public consultations, it appears that the designation of Maritime Area A may not align well with these environmental objectives, particularly concerning biodiversity and protected areas.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly recommend reconsidering the inclusion of Maritime Area A in the final SC-DMAP. Instead, further emphasis should be placed on developing the more offshore areas (B, C, and</p>	<p>I do not agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will sufficiently support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation. Here are the key reasons for my disagreement:</p> <p>Inadequate Environmental Protections: While the SC-DMAP includes provisions for environmental assessments, there are concerns about the thoroughness and effectiveness of these measures. The SEA and AA processes, although comprehensive, may not fully capture the long-term and cumulative impacts of offshore wind development on sensitive marine ecosystems, including Natura 2000 sites and other protected areas, particularly with regard to Area A which is located in an area of greater environmental impact.</p> <p>Proximity to Shore: The identification of Maritime Area A, which is located just 12 to 22 kilometres from the shore, raises significant concerns. This close proximity poses potential risks to coastal ecosystems, visual impacts, and disruption to local communities and existing marine users such as fisheries and tourism.</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Concerns: Although the plan emphasises stakeholder and public engagement, the actual implementation of these engagements has shown significant gaps. Feedback from local communities and stakeholders during the public consultation period indicates that their concerns have not been adequately addressed, particularly regarding the environmental impacts and proximity of the proposed maritime areas.</p> <p>Lack of Clear Enforcement Mechanisms: The governance structure, while detailed, lacks clear enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance with environmental protection measures. Without stringent enforcement and</p>	<p>I do not agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities, particularly with regard to Area A.</p> <p>Proximity to Shore: Area A is located just 12 to 22 kilometres from the shore, significantly closer than other designated areas. This proximity poses substantial challenges for co-existence with existing coastal activities such as tourism, recreation, and small-scale fishing operations. The visual impact of wind turbines, noise pollution, and potential navigation hazards can detrimentally affect these activities, which are vital to local economies and communities.</p> <p>Greater Environmental Impact: Environmental assessments indicate that Area A has a higher potential for adverse environmental impacts compared to the other designated areas. This area is situated in environmentally sensitive zones, which include critical habitats for marine species and important bird areas. The increased risk of disturbing these habitats undermines the plan's objective of maintaining and enhancing marine biodiversity.</p> <p>Inadequate Mitigation Measures: The draft SC-DMAP lacks specific and robust mitigation measures tailored to address the unique challenges posed by the development of offshore renewable energy projects. The current provisions do not provide clear guidelines on how to minimise conflicts and ensure the protection of sensitive marine environments and coastal activities.</p> <p>Stakeholder Concerns: Feedback from the public consultation highlights significant concerns from stakeholders, particularly those involved in tourism, recreation, and local fishing industries, about the development of Area A. These stakeholders have expressed that their concerns regarding the impacts on their livelihoods and the coastal environment have not been adequately addressed, leading to a lack of confidence in the</p>	<p>I do not agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast.</p> <p>Potential for Limited Local Benefits: While the plan aims to generate regional and local economic benefits, there is a risk that the majority of the economic gains could be captured by large, external companies involved in the development and operation of offshore wind projects, rather than by local communities and businesses.</p> <p>Insufficient Support for Local Workforce: The local workforce may lack the necessary skills and training required for jobs in the offshore renewable energy sector. Without targeted training and education programs, these jobs might go to workers from outside the region, thus limiting the local employment benefits.</p> <p>Economic Displacement: There are concerns about potential negative impacts on existing industries, such as fishing and tourism, which are vital to the south coast's economy. The development of offshore wind farms could disrupt these activities, leading to economic displacement and job losses in these sectors.</p> <p>Uncertain Long-Term Benefits: The long-term economic benefits of offshore wind projects are uncertain and dependent on various factors, including market conditions, technological advancements, and policy changes. This uncertainty may affect the sustainability of the economic opportunities promised by the SC-DMAP.</p> <p>Lack of Clear Implementation Strategy: The SC-DMAP lacks a detailed and clear strategy for implementing the economic and employment</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
	<p>D) which present fewer conflicts with coastal and marine environments and align better with the sustainable development goals of the plan. This approach will ensure that Ireland's transition to renewable energy is achieved in a manner that is both environmentally responsible and socially acceptable.</p>	<p>penalties for non-compliance, there is a risk that developers might not adhere to the required standards, leading to potential environmental degradation Potential for Conflicting Interests: The involvement of various stakeholders in the governance framework, including industry representatives, may lead to conflicts of interest. There is a risk that economic and development priorities could overshadow environmental and community concerns, undermining the plan's sustainability objectives Insufficient Consideration of Cumulative Impacts: The SC-DMAP does not adequately address the cumulative impacts of multiple offshore wind projects over time. The focus on individual project assessments may miss broader, landscape-level impacts on marine biodiversity and ecosystems, which are crucial for maintaining ecological integrity In conclusion, while the SC-DMAP aims to provide a framework for the sustainable development of offshore renewable energy, its current policy objectives and governance approach fall short in several critical areas. The environmental protections are inadequate, stakeholder concerns have not been fully addressed, and there are significant risks of non-compliance and conflicting interests. These shortcomings need to be urgently addressed to ensure the plan's sustainable and coherent implementation.</p>	<p>coexistence framework Ambiguity in Safety and Exceptional Circumstances: The plan's provisions for mandatory exclusions on additional activities within Maritime Areas only under safety or exceptional circumstances are vague. This ambiguity could lead to inconsistent enforcement and inadequate protection for other marine users, particularly in Area A where the risks and impacts are more pronounced due to its proximity to the shore and environmentally sensitive areas Potential Cumulative Impacts: The draft SC-DMAP does not sufficiently address the cumulative environmental impacts of offshore renewable energy projects in Area A. Given its higher environmental sensitivity, the cumulative effects of multiple projects could exacerbate negative impacts on marine biodiversity and coastal ecosystems, which are already under stress In conclusion, the draft SC-DMAP does not provide sufficient provisions to ensure the co-existence of offshore renewable energy with other maritime activities in Area A. The close proximity to shore, higher potential for environmental impacts, inadequate mitigation measures, and unresolved stakeholder concerns highlight the need for a more comprehensive and specific approach to manage co-existence effectively. Addressing these issues is critical to ensuring that offshore renewable energy development is sustainable and does not come at the expense of other vital marine and coastal activities.</p>	<p>initiatives. Without a robust implementation plan, it is difficult to ensure that the economic benefits will be realised and distributed equitably among the local communities In conclusion, while the SC-DMAP has the potential to drive significant economic and employment opportunities along the south coast, there are concerns about the extent and distribution of these benefits. Ensuring robust local engagement, targeted workforce development, and mitigating potential negative impacts on existing industries are crucial for maximising the positive outcomes of the plan.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
--	--	--	--	--

117	<p>The draft SC-DMAP demonstrates a strategic approach to marine planning, with the SEA providing a comprehensive overview of potential environmental concerns associated with the future designation of Maritime Areas A-D within the DMAP area. While I do not disagree with the proposed locations of these areas, there are still challenges, particularly with Maritime Area A. Its proximity to the coast and the overlap with crucial spawning and nursery grounds of fish species continue to raise concerns from the public and the fishing community. Not only that, but also the heat map provided in the SEA (Figure 7-5) does show that the area where Maritime Area A has been proposed, is an area with high cumulative constraints. Given the targeted deployment of Maritime Area A by 2030, ahead of the other sites, more careful environmental evaluation and attention should be given to make sure that all possible environmental scenarios are considered before moving ahead with it. Despite the robust baseline information provided in the SEA, it is unclear how the pressures from future projects and their interactions with other existing pressures such as fishing, will affect valued components within the proposed plan area. Although future projects will need to undergo an EIA on a case-by-case basis, at this early stage, there is an opportunity to improve methods for evaluating cumulative effects. This would help ensuring that all of the concerns are addressed as comprehensively as possible and inform and support the subsequent deployment of Maritime Areas B-D.</p>	<p>The SC-DMAP demonstrates a good effort in in adopting policy objectives and a governance structure that addresses social, environmental, and economic factors. The ecosystem-based approach taken in the SC-DMAP is noteworthy for promoting sustainable growth of maritime economies, the development of marine areas, and the protection of resources. However, the SC-DMAP's provision for "enhancing marine biodiversity" is not entirely clear. The first ecosystem-based approach principle mentioned in the SC-DMAP relates to the capturing of the integrity, functioning and dynamics of marine ecosystems. However, it's hard to understand how this will be achieved without data that addresses these characteristics of ecosystem components in the proposed DMAP area. Without this information, it is also challenging to understand how cumulative pressures from the projects arising from this plan will affect these ecosystem components. Despite the inclusion of groups to represent marine biodiversity within the governance, it must be recognised that future development will add to the disturbance of important marine habitats, even with mitigation measures in place. An evidence-based approach is crucial in this aspect. It is essential that the plan prioritises integrating wind energy technologies with a clear understanding that initial negative impacts on habitats will be inevitable. It should be demonstrated, through evidence-based studies, how long it will take for disturbed habitats to recover and eventually yield positive effects, such as the creation of artificial habitats. Additionally, if numerous wind energy projects are proposed in the same area, the cumulative effects may hinder habitat recovery and delay or prevent the</p>	<p>I acknowledge that the draft SC-DMAP governance structure makes a concerted effort to address co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities. The plan aims to comply with policy and NMPF objectives, which emphasize co-existence. However, it seems there are still dissatisfied groups, including the public, concerned about environmental and visual impacts, and fishers, worried about being displaced by this plan. While many provisions for co-existence are included in the draft, it appears that more needs to be done to address the concerns of all stakeholder groups, particularly the fishing community, who are likely to be most affected by the implementation of this plan. Without detailed information on how individual projects resulting from the plan will be structured, it is difficult to provide specific reassurances to these stakeholders about how their activities will be impacted. Therefore, while I agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes significant provisions for co-existence, it is crucial to continue engaging with and listening to the concerns of all affected groups, especially the fishing community. Addressing their concerns more thoroughly, perhaps through a consultation strategy accompanying the DMAP implementation, will be essential for ensuring a balanced and sustainable implementation of offshore renewable energy projects.</p>	
-----	---	---	--	--

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>anticipated positive outcomes. Therefore a clear, evidence-based strategy should be key to the SC-DMAP to ensure that the integration of future wind energy projects are managed in a way that balances immediate negative impacts with long-term environmental benefits. This will require setting up a strong communication strategy in the governance structures that facilitates ongoing and transparent communication across sectors and agencies so that evidence is shared and understood by all.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Therefore a clear, evidence-based strategy should be key to the SC-DMAP to ensure that the integration of future wind energy projects are managed in a way that balances immediate negative impacts with long-term environmental benefits. This will require setting up a strong communication strategy in the governance structures that facilitates ongoing and transparent communication across sectors and agencies so that evidence is shared and understood by all.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
119	<p>No. Area A is a) too close to shore, which will negatively impact local community tourism and environment b) located in a yellow zone for environmental impact. Having participated in a public consultation webinar I was stunned to see how almost 1500 stakeholder concerns, regarding the location of Area A, raised during the initial public consultations held in October 2023, were completely disregarded. Of particular disappointment was [REDACTED]'s grossly inadequate responses to repeated questions regarding the visual and environmental impacts of Area A including the reasoning for the lack of availability of visual representations indicative of the potential visual impact of Area A. The response being that as this was a proposal and not a project images could not be provided. I would argue that this is not the case as his slide show presentation referenced 60 15MW turbines making up a 900MW wind farm installation in Area A which should allow a proposal team to prepare at a minimum a best and worst case visual representation of the probable appearance of Area A once completed. In my opinion this was the proposal team washing their hands of any responsibility regarding the appearance from shore of Area A and an attempt to hoodwink the local community by not providing in advance, the aforementioned visual representations in an effort to reduce community opposition to the development of Area A.</p>	<p>No. In view of the decision to rush ahead with site A, located in yellow environmental impact area, due to ease of construction, faster implementation and cost concerns shows that the team leading this proposal are less concerned with environmental impact and are prioritising cost and time over protection of the local coastal environment including vital fish spawning grounds and marine mammal habitats.</p>	<p>No. Again area A's location within 12.4-22km from the coast is in an area of high maritime activity both in terms of recreational and close shore fishing and I don't believe adequate information has been provided to detail how the construction of this site will impact these activities in the local community.</p>	<p>No. Again information provided by the team during the public consultation webinar was at best sketchy, with no concrete details regarding employment and financial gains expected for the Waterford region which is the area that will be most impacted by the construction of the nearshore wind farm earmarked for area A. The investment discussed at the webinar was mostly related to specialist construction and wind energy operators as well as consultancies, how will this investment benefit the majority of the local community who do not possess the qualifications required to fill these roles. There was also mention of a paltry 5 million euro community compensation fund over the lifetime of the 4 proposed wind farms to be shared between all the south east coastal communities, this is in no way adequate to compensate the potential loss of revenue from impact on both tourism and fishing industries in the area.</p>
120	<p>no it takes in all fishing grounds for small fishing boats on se coast</p>	<p>no the government doesnt know the impact these turbines will have on the sea bed building turbines digging trenches for cables etc</p>	<p>no these areas will only affect small boat fishermen there is very little tourism or recreation in these areas and the goverment knows this</p>	<p>no this is rubbish there will be little or no local employment</p>
121	<p>No , it needs to be further offshore. There is too much wildlife at risk closer to the shore.</p>	<p>No I do not agree.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
122	<p>I'm concerned that the intention of the minister is to proceed with the area A , too close to the Waterford coast . I found it misleading that 4 areas are shown , when the the information meeting made it clear that 3 areas are not to going to be pursued .</p>	<p>How on earth will this development enhance marine biodiversity? I am especially worried about birds that nest in the cliffs and cross the local sea to feed . Rotating blades will decimate our precious seabirds .</p>	<p>No . The seascape will be impacted by the size , number and proximity of the windmills to our coastline</p>	<p>Our unspoilt coastline is at risk so there will also be a loss of economic and employment opportunities to be concerned about as our pristine natural environment is exploited.</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
123	I partially agree. I agree with blocks B, C and D, but disagree with block A, which has been designated too close to the shoreline and will be overly visually intrusive for inhabitants of a very wide swathe of coastline.	Yes, I agree that the policy framework and governance description, if - and only if - implemented according to their own directives, will provide for sustainable and coherent implementation.	I agree that the plan makes sufficient provision for co-existence between energy generation and other activities, but only for blocks B, C and D - Block A is too close inshore and will interfere greatly with the visual and amenity value of the south coast. Block A should be removed from the SC-DMAP.	Not particularly. The benefits from the wind energy will be firstly in terms of the wider environmental benefits of a transition away from fossil-fuel based generation, and secondly, economic benefits seen at macro-economic and corporate level. There is no particular evidence to indicate that local communities will derive any meaningful long-term or sustainable economic benefits, nor should this be a key consideration by decision-makers.
124	<p>The Sustainable Water Network (SWAN, a network of 25 environmental NGOs from across the Republic of Ireland) welcomes the ecosystems-based approach and that the four identified Maritime Areas have no exclusions and low environmental constraints, with the draft SC-DMAP not overlapping with any existing Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) or Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), as well as a buffer zone around the proposed Seas Off Wexford SPA. We support the stated objective "to avoid potential adverse impacts on biodiversity, EU protected sites, and future national protected site designations [in the preparation of the draft SC-DMAP]."</p> <p>It is positive to note that BVG's report on Maritime Area identification finds that "the [identification] process identifies areas of low environmental and technical constraint" and the combination of these ratings (with technical constraints) used to identify Maritime Areas disincentivises planning within the most environmentally sensitive areas. We recognise that areas of lowest levelised cost of energy (LOCE) were not selected for Maritime Areas, as they were found in areas with high environmental constraints, which took priority.</p> <p>Figure B.11 in the "South Coast Designated Maritime Area Plan: Maritime Area identification" report by BVG Associates shows significant marine mammal constraint across the Study Area. SWAN calls for assurances that underwater noise associated with construction and operation will be mitigated to lessen impacts on marine mammals, with particular emphasis on cetaceans which rely on sound for many of their critical natural functions. In the same report, Figure B.14 shows ornithology constraints. While these are shown as being concentrated by coasts (likely around colonies), we reiterate the need for ongoing monitoring and analysis through the process, based on species-specific characteristics, such as foraging radii and typical flying height of</p>	<p>Once implemented correctly, the DMAP process appears to feed into the UN's Sustainable Development Goals and be in line with the policy objectives of relevant EU Directives and plans and national legislation. It is vital that restoration of nature and biodiversity are at the heart of planning. By using sources of geospatial environmental data as inputs to constraint mapping from NPWS, Ramsar, UNESCO, EMODNet, Ireland's Marine Atlas and ObSERVE for designated sites, marine habitats, marine mammals, fish and shellfish, ornithology, we are encouraged that the process has a strong evidence base. We hope this and future DMAP processes will be adaptive, based on the most up-to-date data as it becomes available, including the ObSERVE II survey (due for 2025 completion). Monitoring of Maritime Area A should provide lessons for the use of subsequent Maritime Areas and future DMAPs.</p> <p>We are concerned that environmental attributes were not considered along the export cable routes. Through the DMAP process, constraints must also be considered in relation to construction (including the impacts of dredging or dumping and capacity of ports), the impacts outwith the designated areas, and the effects of</p>	<p>SWAN note the EPA's point raised in the Natura Impact Statement: "It should be clarified whether it is proposed to exclude the location of offshore renewable devices in Natura 2000 sites or sites or areas protected under other national or international instruments from development. The requirements of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive should be fully integrated into the environmental assessment." We recognise that existing SPAs and SACs have been avoided from the four Maritime Areas identified in the SC-DMAP and call for this to be set as a precedent for future DMAP processes, ensuring future DMAPs exclude future MPAs as areas for possible development. While "successful co-existence is a core objective of the draft Plan," we must see the prioritisation of nature restoration and biodiversity in Irish waters, avoiding co-location of ORE in areas identified for marine protection. Rather than avoiding activities which "might be in direct conflict with ORE," we call for avoidance of activities in direct conflict to Ireland reaching Good Environmental Status (GES) per the 11 descriptors of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD).</p> <p>Additionally, fish populations must be considered in their role in the marine ecosystem (for instance, as prey for seabirds, sharks and marine mammals), rather than just as commercial stock. The</p>	<p>SWAN's priorities are ensuring compliance with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, achieving and maintaining Good Environmental Status in the marine environment. We echo Seas at Risk's call for ORE to be developed in harmony with nature, addressing the triple crises of climate, energy and biodiversity equally, with impact on marine ecosystems and coastal communities kept to a minimum. The plan must demonstrate responsibility towards nature, not just the economy. As part of a just transition to net zero, the environmental sciences sector must be developed as part of the economic and employment opportunities associated with the project, with the capacity and skillsets of ecologists and marine biologists developed and utilised to deliver for the environment.</p> <p>We are strongly in support of a process that has stakeholder engagement throughout the planning, development and use of the area. The expertise of environmental NGOs and local input from coastal communities must be central to planning. As a coalition partner of Fair Seas, we join and strongly support their call for strong</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
	<p>resident and migratory seabirds in the area, to ensure that vulnerable species are not negatively impacted.</p>	<p>decommissioning in the future. Where there is unavailable data, or the impact of ORE development on an ecosystem is unknown, the precautionary principle must be applied.</p>	<p>identified areas include spawning and nursery grounds for fish species including haddock, herring, cod and pollock, which are important not just commercially, but also for their role in the marine food web. Ongoing monitoring via regional surveys is necessary, with reassessment of the most up-to-date data at project state and throughout development and implementation, as well as during decommissioning, with long-term impacts studied. Independent monitoring of areas of special interests and features for possible inclusion in future MPAs is also necessary.</p> <p>SWAN welcomes the intention of the plan-led approach to "identify the most appropriate maritime areas for future ORE development, through analysis of the local marine environment and engagement with local coastal communities," in response to the anticipated acceleration in ORE applications as Ireland seeks to reach important net zero targets.</p>	<p>environmental NGO representation on the Marine Ecosystems and Ornithology Working Group.</p>
<p>125</p>	<p>NO - I have not received sufficient information regarding the NEGATIVE impacts that these wind turbines will have. Can you advise if 1) each wind turbine will require 1,000 tonnes of concrete. 2) each wind turbine will require 1,400 gallons of oil to run them when there is little wind 3) the proposal is for somewhere between 250- 300 wind turbines. 4) the life span of each wind turbine is only 20-25 years 5) how will the turbines be removed/replaced after the 20-25 year life-span. 6) how will the oil be changed/ replaced without possible spillage into the sea. 7) that crustacean (lobster, crab etc) creatures will not cross over the power lines & will be detrimentally affected by the turbines. 8) fish & other marine life will likely migrate away from the areas where the turbines will be located having a detrimental effect on the local fishermen. Thank you</p>	<p>I need more information on the COST/BENEFIT of these wind turbines.</p>	<p>NO - I am concerned about the effect on fisheries, & fish migration away from the turbines.</p>	<p>Perhaps - but at what cost to marine sea-life & to our Tourism industry along the South coast ??</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
126	I disagree with those too close to the shore. I am also concerned re the upset to the seabed with regards to fish life and also the loss of birds on their way to Wexford sloblands of returning to Ireland.....geese etc. I	I have great worries.	No I do not.	No I do not.
127	No - one is far too close to the coastline and not clear on environmental impact	No - this is the problem	No	No - obviously it does provide opportunities for those in the renewable energy sector but local benefits for other sectors very questionable
128	<p>I do not agree with Area A. I agree with Areas B, C and D.</p> <p>Area A is too close to the Copper Coast UNESCO Global Geopark. As a resident of Dunabrattin / Boatstrand we will be directly impacted if site A is used. According to the map, we will be within 13km of a wind turbine. While I understand we need to move towards wind power and have more independence when it comes to energy, I believe, as a minimum all options available which are further offshore should be exploited firstly before even considering site A. The Copper Coast is an underutilized tourism resource for Ireland as it stands, short term the loss of tourism impacts may not be fully realized, but in decades to come the full effect of putting turbines that close to shore will be seen. The opportunity to use increased tourism to boost the economy of this regional area will be lost.</p>	<p>Yes, I do believe that the draft SC-MAP policy map and governance approach will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation. However, the key words here are 'support' and 'guide' which is not good enough when it comes to the potential environmental impacts. I am not a marine biologist, but from personal experience of watching the movements of larger mammals (E.g. Dolphins and Minke whales) along the coast site A is in the direct path of coastal movements. While i'm sure the best practice will be used, I don't believe it will be enough to 'enhance' marine biodiversity. This will only ever impact biodiversity, it cannot be a positive.</p>		<p>I think for the use of Sites B, C and D a focus should be put on upskilling of existing engineers, etc. to allow diversification into the new file for the South East. We are currently propped up by a big portion of workers in multinational manufacturing companies which may no be sustainable.</p>
129	<p>No. I do not agree with Area A - Tonn Nua being only 12.5km from the Unesco Copper Coast. I dontsee why these can be be minimum of 22km from the Shore.Area Area A - Tonn Nua is the closed area to the Shore which would ruin the Stunning Unesco Copper Coast. Why cant they all be out 29Km from the Coast like Area, B, C, and D</p>	<p>No. I believe local considerations have not being taken into account. As majority of respondents are happy with offshore wind development but not 12.5 km from the coast. A minimum of 29km would be better along with Area b,c, and D.</p>	Potentially	<p>No. I don't think people will have much interest in the south coast if the whole coat of Waterford is ruined by wind tuberine that are located just 12.5km from a coast line. The visual appeal and beautiful scenery would be compromised</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
130	<p>Now that the DMAP has been published showing the locations of the development areas, on behalf of Waterford Airport I make the following submission; The airport is supportive of the development and the potential energy benefits, however given the location and potential height of the turbines, (near to 1,000 feet amsl), the proximity of Tonn Nua (Area A) in particular being the closer of the four identified areas, would be of concern regarding the impact of the anticipated height of the proposed wind turbines which will be directly on the approach and take off areas for Waterford Airport. In order to ensure there are no adverse effects for Waterford Airport, the airport operator wish to outline that prior to any planning application for wind turbines in the proposed DMAP areas A, B, C and D the applicant should carry out appropriate assessments of potential impacts to current and future airport operations, including potential impacts on the operations of landing and navigational aids, routine airborne flight testing of landing and navigational aids, instrument flight procedures for both runways, airspace, and potential radar environments for Waterford Airport.</p>	Yes.	Yes,	<p>In principle, yes, however having spoken to various stakeholders in the southeast, and some service providers currently operating in this industry in other jurisdictions, the necessary infrastructure required to deliver and maximise that national and regional opportunity are not at the scale required to deliver and support the industry. Ireland appears to be very much behind the infrastructural development curve. Positive decisions on Government capital support is required now to develop the ports and other land infrastructure to deliver this project in a way that maximises Irish advantage, otherwise the opportunity will be taken and delivered by entities outside of the state</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
--	--	--	--	--

131	<p>Yes I do because they show a commitment by the department and MARA to pro-actively acknowledge that off-shore windfarms are vitally needed for the future security of Irelands energy needs. However I do believe that other areas should also be brought into scope so that a far wider area of Irish Coastal Maritime Resource. I also believe that there needs to be a proper timely planning framework put in place were all off-shore windfarm projects are treated as strategic planning projects.</p>	<p>Yes I do but I also believe that it needs to be strengthened as and updated with experienced personal who are well versed in the technology and development strategy behind these developments. Having a framework and a set of policies that are maintained by various teams that do not understand the technology has been the common ethos of the foreshore departments along with the local and national bodies. There has always been a lack of commitment and drive to develop the Maritime Resource off the Irish Coast and it is well known in the industry that delays and miss-understandings and little knowledge is common. It's not the fault of the Department but Government Policy. Hopefully with the establishment of MARA this will all change and again we see MARA finding its true home within the Department of Communications. It is my hope that the right people in responsible positions have the technical expertise and technical background so that the development of the SC-DMAP can proceed without delay. However there is another concern that troubles me. Is there any acknowledgement of future development of Subsea critical communications and power infrastructure being allowed to develop along side the proposed and future proposed windfarms. In essence there needs to be assigned routes and design proposals that need to be laid down and set in stone. Example: Cable crossing agreements with 90 degree crossing angles at a minimum, specific routes to access foreshore and agreed installation procedures where the seabed allows with cable protection being the utmost goal. Also maintenance agreements to access cables if damage is reported with the need to require licences etc, which will cause delays and ultimately disrupt</p>	<p>I I do not think that there has been enough emphasis or thought put into this. The seabed is owned by the state but is used by many parties such as the fishing industry, recreational and other commercial food based and aquaculture developments and industries. However as said above the need to make sure that other industries such as Subsea communications, Research and Power Transmission are not affected and allowed to develop alongside future windfarm developments is a priority. To develop Irelands Power Transmission and Communication Connectivity and develop Irelands Digital transition to a European Leader, then there needs to be an understanding that these developments need to be included in any priorities and commitments. For far to long there has always been issues with getting subsea communication connectivity established due to an unwillingness or lack of knowledge to push these projects as National Strategic Planning Projects. They are instrumental in developing Irelands Digital Infrastructure yet there has been a lack of willingness to see them as such. With the exception of state sponsored projects such as EWIC and Celtic Power Transmission Projects, all others have had to battle to get the acknowledgement and progress needed. Hopefully with the establishment of MARA, its new home and the experienced staff I do believe that the future development of subsea infrastructure (non-windfarm projects) should get the attention they deserve. There is one thing that needs to be acknowledged and that's the existing subsea heritage that exists on the seabed. Especially the out of service subsea cables that go as far back as the 1860s. These cables need to be recorded, mapped and research. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Yes totally agree with this statement. The only way to truly understand the success of a project is the financial generation for the local and national economy as well as the job creation that is involved in the initial design proposals, engineering designs, administration that comes along with it to the final installation and production capability etc. Yes subsea cables do have a capability that id described as the production capability and it's the ability to operate and generate financial rewards for the company and the state.</p>
-----	---	--	---	--

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>communications or power transmission.</p>	<p>████████████████████ ████████████████████</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
--	--	--	--	--

132	<p>Yes I do because they show a commitment by the department and MARA to pro-actively acknowledge that off-shore windfarms are vitally needed for the future security of Irelands energy needs. However I do believe that other areas should also be brought into scope so that a far wider area of Irish Coastal Maritime Resource. I also believe that there needs to be a proper timely planning framework put in place were all off-shore windfarm projects are treated as strategic planning projects.</p>	<p>Yes I do but I also believe that it needs to be strengthened as and updated with experienced personal who are well versed in the technology and development strategy behind these developments. Having a framework and a set of policies that are maintained by various teams that do not understand the technology has been the common ethos of the foreshore departments along with the local and national bodies. There has always been a lack of commitment and drive to develop the Maritime Resource off the Irish Coast and it is well known in the industry that delays and miss-understandings and little knowledge is common. It's not the fault of the Department but Government Policy. Hopefully with the establishment of MARA this will all change and again we see MARA finding its true home within the Department of Communications. It is my hope that the right people in responsible positions have the technical expertise and technical background so that the development of the SC-DMAP can proceed without delay. However there is another concern that troubles me. Is there any acknowledgement of future development of Subsea critical communications and power infrastructure being allowed to develop along side the proposed and future proposed windfarms. In essence there needs to be assigned routes and design proposals that need to be laid down and set in stone. Example: Cable crossing agreements with 90 degree crossing angles at a minimum, specific routes to access foreshore and agreed installation procedures where the seabed allows with cable protection being the utmost goal. Also maintenance agreements to access cables if damage is reported with the need to require licences etc, which will cause delays and ultimately disrupt</p>	<p>I do not think that there has been enough emphasis or thought put into this. The seabed is owned by the state but is used by many parties such as the fishing industry, recreational and other commercial food based and aquaculture developments and industries. However as said above the need to make sure that other industries such as Subsea communications, Research and Power Transmission are not affected and allowed to develop alongside future windfarm developments is a priority. To develop Irelands Power Transmission and Communication Connectivity and develop Irelands Digital transition to a European Leader, then there needs to be an understanding that these developments need to be included in any priorities and commitments. For far to long there has always been issues with getting subsea communication connectivity established due to an unwillingness or lack of knowledge to push these projects as National Strategic Planning Projects. They are instrumental in developing Irelands Digital Infrastructure yet there has been a lack of willingness to see them as such. With the exception of state sponsored projects such as EWIC and Celtic Power Transmission Projects, all others have had to battle to get the acknowledgement and progress needed. Hopefully with the establishment of MARA, its new home and the experienced staff I do believe that the future development of subsea infrastructure (non-windfarm projects) should get the attention they deserve. There is one thing that needs to be acknowledged and that's the existing subsea heritage that exists on the seabed. Especially the out of service subsea cables that go as far back as the 1860s. These cables need to be recorded, mapped and research. [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Yes totally agree with this statement. The only way to truly understand the success of a project is the financial generation for the local and national economy as well as the job creation that is involved in the initial design proposals, engineering designs, administration that comes along with it to the final installation and production capability etc. Yes subsea cables do have a capability that id described as the production capability and it's the ability to operate and generate financial rewards for the company and the state.</p>
-----	---	--	---	--

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
		communications or power transmission.	[REDACTED]	
133	No all areas should be over 22km from shore	No this development needs to be further from the shore. It will ruin the beautiful seascape of Waterford	No	No
134	I do not agree with the proposal as suggested. I feel it will spoil the natural beauty of our gorgeous coastline and this could be amended if they were moved further from the coastline.	The Copper Coast is a UNESCO Geopark and I feel this is not being protected with the planned proposal.	The draft plan while allowing for co-existence will undoubtedly will consequences on the marine environment.	Yes.
135			No its to close to shore	No its to close to shore
136	Yes. So long as the wind turbines are situated to reduce any potential for sonic pollution to coastal communities. I appreciate that the greater the distance, the greater the cost but I humbly ask that the procurement process factors in the optimum solution for lowest impact energy generation AHEAD of lowest cost energy generation.	Yes.	Yes, I believe so. I also believe that we need to adapt to new mechanisms for generating renewable energy as an absolute imperative to sustaining our economy and communities. Offshore wind farm have proven to be very successful in Scandinavia.	Yes.

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
137	<p>We have issues immediately with two areas. Area A and Area B. We own a fishing vessel operating out of Dunmore East. Area A is the area where we fish during the Autumn and Winter months, but not exclusively. We also operate/ fish in area B all year around weather permitting. So for us these two areas will be a major concern for us.</p>	<p>The socio economic impact on fishermen should be a priority for DECC and the government. Yes, the Environment is important to us; as is the impact on our fish and shellfish stocks with the proposed building of Windfarms. The fishing industry needs to be brought along in the journey to Offshore renewables, they are the experts when it comes to local knowledge of fishing grounds.If the SC-Dmap policy objectives and governance are done properly taking into consideration of what's written above, then yes.</p>	<p>How can you have co existence if you will exclude fishermen with historical track record fishing evidence in areas identified in the D-Map?We do not agree that commercial fishing activities should be permanently excluded from these areas. You should be identifying potential opportunities going forward for co existence. Passive fishing (Potting) would not effect a fixed based turbine, with a 50 mtr exclusion for safety.</p>	<p>While the opportunities for local employment is amazing, the fishing industry should NOT be sacrificed for Offshore Renewable energy. Much effort should be put into trying to keep fishermen fishing and continuing to support their crews and families. If DECC is serious about co existence then every possible effort should be made to keep our fishing communities.</p>
138	<p>Don't agree, the most scenic area in the country. It will ruin the view from the coast</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No</p>
139	<p>No one of them is to close to shore.12k?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Remains to be seen.</p>
140	<p>I do not agree that the area marked A in the maps is suitable for wind development. I attended a consultation in Tramore on 5 June when I first became aware of these proposals. Pleasant staff answered questions, but there was no illustration of the visual impact of the turbines from the waterford coast, particularly Tramore. I asked what was the height of the turbines, and was told that they were 300 m. Your representative was not sure if this was the height above the seafloor, or sea level, or to the hub or the top of the rotor. This was not really a satisfactory answer for a perfectly simple question. The horizon is 22.6 Km from the location of the consultation, the Old Coastguard Station (about 40 m above sea level), so the turbines would be visible in their entirety from this location and many other places on the Waterford coast.</p> <p>Having seen photographs of wind farms off the coast of UK and European locations ,(though nothing of the sort was presented at your consultation), I consider that the development of Area A, which was the only area being discussed on that occasion, is Totally Unsuitable for such a wind farm, even if the turbines were half the size.</p>			

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
141	<p>I do not agree with the outlined areas. I feel the areas in question are based on the economic requirements of the wind farms rather than the concerns brought forward by stakeholders in the limited previous correspondence. Speaking from a fishing standpoint Area A is a heavily fished area . This area is an essential part of my fishing year with crab/lobster pots for the majority and the remainder with Gillnets for whitefish.</p>	<p>A more proactive structure to gather up to date information on all relevant species/ fisheries should have been implemented before any and all decisions about placement of wind arrays. The state of the stocks is based on out of date information. This would not even be a question in any other industry , a full evaluation would have to take place .</p>	<p>I don't think sufficient data has been collected for anyone to say this for certain . Some basic factors have been considered like shipping and out of date fishing activities. Should there be a negative impact on these fishing grounds for the crab and lobster fishery I will be forced to move a large quantity of my gear. A. further inshore onto the already heavily fished inshore grounds , which may also suffer hugely if a migratory route of crabs is interrupted or a spawning ground for crab or lobster is destroyed , or B outside the line of the wind array. Putting me and my crew at risk having to travel greater distances in inclement weather. This also puts my gear at risk as we leave our pots behind for a minimum of 48 hours to fish. And now the displaced boats towing nets dredges and beam trawls all want to fish the much more limited ground</p>	<p>It may drive employment in other industries at the cost of the fishing industry in my area. Why would any young person who is carrying on a tradition of fishing which spans generations move forward in their career when there is such huge uncertainty and gaps in data surrounding the long term impacts of the wind farms in this area. A new set of jerseys for the GAA club in the far side of the county will be little consolation to my family if the inshore fishing is decimated and we lose our home and much less so should there be loss of life directly associated to the displacement by wind turbines</p>

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
142	<p>After assessing the available data, the Rederscentrale does not agree and raises significant concerns regarding the proposed sites for offshore wind development within the SC-DMAP. The proposed sites within the SC-DMAP area are critically important as spawning and nursery grounds for several commercially important species. And how those impacts will affect the fishing sector, raises doubts about the practicality of the co-existence framework outlined in the DMAP. It appears that the presence of designated sites such as SPAs and SACs was identified as a more important constraint than the presence of these areas, which are vitally important for various commercial species' biomass. This reinforces our concerns. Experience at sea has demonstrated that fishing within ORE developments is often challenging or even mutually exclusive due to various factors, including the type of fishing methods employed and safety concerns raised by fishers. It's essential that any potential development takes into full account the specific fishing practices and metiers currently operating within the development area. To prevent obstruction of access to important ports and mitigate the need for fleets to navigate around them, careful consideration of spatial planning is crucial. The identified areas for offshore developments should be strategically located to minimize interference with existing maritime routes and access to key ports. The Fisheries Management and Mitigation Strategy within the SC-DMAP requires refinement. This should include direct engagement with the fishing industry to address safety concerns and provide necessary training where needed. Without such refinements, the current provisions may not adequately facilitate the shared use of the sea as intended by the SC-DMAP. To truly maximize economic and employment opportunities, the SC-DMAP needs a more comprehensive approach that includes: detailed and transparent data on commercial fisheries, including Irish and international efforts, temporal periods, and metiers, consideration of the interactions and impacts on non-Irish fleets, and a thorough assessment of potential economic losses in sectors like fishing due to environmental impacts and reduced fishing areas.</p>	<p>While the SC-DMAP aims to promote the sustainable development and growth of maritime and coastal economies and the sustainable use of marine and coastal resources, Rederscentrale does not agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development. There are several areas of concern that need to be addressed to ensure the plan's success. Firstly, the proposed sites within the SC-DMAP area are critically important as spawning and nursery grounds for several commercially important species, including cod, whiting, haddock, and herring. The impacts from surveys and construction activities pose significant threats to these species, some of which are already under pressure. The latest ICES advice for cod in divisions 7.e-k is for zero catch in 2024, with recruitment diminishing over the past few years. Similarly, advice for whiting in ICES divisions 7.b-c and 7.e-k shows continually decreasing recruitment and low stock biomass. Both of these stocks have been struggling in the Irish Sea as well, and any impacts on these spawning and nursery grounds in the proposed SC-DMAP area could additionally negatively affect Irish Sea stocks. While these difficulties have been and are continuously being addressed through fisheries management in the Celtic Sea and Irish Sea (for example, via avoidance and technical measures), the stocks have been slow to recover. Any additional negative impacts that could further exacerbate these difficulties should be avoided. Furthermore, impacts from various project phases, including survey, construction, operation, and decommissioning, are not limited to the immediate area but can have wider-reaching and cumulative impacts in neighbouring areas. The importance</p>	<p>While the draft SC-DMAP indeed aims to maximize opportunities for co-existence between offshore renewable energy (ORE) and other maritime activities, Rederscentrale does not agree that the provisions included are sufficient. Experience at sea has demonstrated that fishing within ORE developments is often challenging or even mutually exclusive due to various factors, including the type of fishing methods employed and safety concerns raised by fishers. It's essential that any potential development takes into full account the specific fishing practices and metiers currently operating within the development area. Only by doing so can true coexistence be achieved in line with the objectives of the SC-DMAP. Moreover, the lack of thorough analysis regarding the impacts on spawning and nursery grounds for several commercially important species, and how those impacts will affect the fishing sector, raises doubts about the practicality of the co-existence framework outlined in the DMAP. Without a comprehensive understanding of these impacts, it's challenging to implement effective measures to ensure the compatibility of offshore renewable energy projects with existing maritime activities. To prevent obstruction of access to important ports and mitigate the need for fleets to navigate around them, careful consideration of spatial planning is crucial. The identified areas for offshore developments should be strategically located to minimize interference with existing maritime routes and access to key ports. By doing so, fleets will not be forced to navigate around ORE installations, thereby reducing unnecessary travel distances - with possible negative environmental impacts - and extra costs. Therefore, the Fisheries Management and Mitigation Strategy within the SC-DMAP requires refinement, with a focus on establishing realistic co-existence measures that address the</p>	<p>While the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP aims to support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including those along the south coast, Rederscentrale does not agree that it will effectively achieve these objectives. There are several areas of concern that need to be addressed to ensure the plan's success. First and foremost, there is a need for clarification regarding the commercial fisheries data used in the economic analysis. It is unclear whether the data includes Irish or international fishing efforts or if it is solely based on Irish landings. The temporal period of the data and the specific metiers included in the analysis should also be specified. This information is crucial for understanding the appropriateness and accuracy of the data used to predict economic benefits. Moreover, it is not evident how much interaction and data from non-Irish fleets operating in the proposed areas and their economic value have been taken into account. The fishing sector is an integral part of the coastal economy, and overlooking the activities of non-Irish fleets could result in an incomplete analysis of the potential economic impact. The SC-DMAP does not seem to adequately consider the environmental impacts or the potential loss of fishing areas due to the implementation of the plan. These factors could lead to economic disadvantages for the fishing community, which relies heavily on access to marine resources. This, in turn, will negatively impact the coastal economy. To truly maximize economic and employment opportunities, the SC-DMAP needs a</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>of spawning and nursery areas for any species cannot be overstated. Therefore, Rederscentrale requests clarification regarding the weighting of these layers in the constraints analysis, as proposed areas B and C overlap directly with the Celtic Sea Conservation Area (Council Regulation (EU) 2019/1241 Annex VI, Part C, Art. 2.1). It appears that the presence of designated sites such as SPAs and SACs was identified as a more important constraint than the presence of these areas, which are vitally important for various commercial species' biomass. This reinforces the sector's concerns. Though commercial fish species do not fall under environmental protection, they contribute directly to food security not only in Ireland but across the European Union. Additionally, the Marine Institute has noted the uncertainty in the data and recommended a "risk- and precautionary-based approach when planning ORE activities." The Marine Institute recommends that an updated detailed assessment of essential fish habitat and a risk assessment in relation to ORE developments be carried out for the DMAP area. Rederscentrale believes that this work should be conducted as part of the DMAP process as it covers the entire DMAP area and not as part of individual development applications. At no point did the Marine Institute report state that the "potential impact to these areas is unlikely to be severe to the stocks as a whole," as identified by DECC in their consultation documents from 03 May 2024. Rederscentrale would appreciate clarification as to why the Marine Institute report was not included as part of the publicly available consultation documents, particularly regarding the identified contradictions outlined above.</p>	<p>specific concerns and needs of all stakeholders involved. This should include direct engagement with the fishing industry to address safety concerns and provide necessary training where needed. Without such refinements, the current provisions may not adequately facilitate the shared use of the sea as intended by the SC-DMAP.</p>	<p>more comprehensive approach that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and transparent data on commercial fisheries, including Irish and international efforts, temporal periods, and métiers. • Consideration of the interactions and impacts on non-Irish fleets. • A thorough assessment of potential economic losses in sectors like fishing due to environmental impacts and reduced fishing areas. Without addressing these concerns, the plan may fall short of its objective to drive sustainable economic growth and job creation.
--	--	---	---	---

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
--	---	---	---	---

		Rederscentrale was only made aware of this through its NWWAC membership. In conclusion, Rederscentrale believes that without addressing these concerns, the SC-DMAP's policy objectives and governance approach will not adequately support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation.		
143	No, Area A is too close and will impact local fishing and tourism	No. AREA A is not supporting sustainability	No, Area A will have a detrimental effect on Tourism and local fishing	No, Area A will have a negative impact on the south east
144	I am from Sofrimar, a Seafood Processing company based in Kilmore Quay employing 150 people with another 350 people working on boats and in ancillary services such as transport and engineering. The proposed areas for these windfarms are lucrative fishing grounds for our shellfish and will have a major impact on our business and boats fishing these areas. There will be a loss of fishing grounds during construction and exclusion areas after completion will also effect the landings, many jobs and livhjooods will be lost both on land and at sea	There is nit sufficient consultation with the seafood and fishing sectors, liaison offices and public consultations are tick box exercises where the views of the seafood sector are not taken on board, the attitude of the ORE companies seems to be that they have a divine right to put wind farms in any area that they deem fit regardless of the impact for other sectors	This is certainly not true, the impact on fishing and seafood sector is totally disregarded and many local fishing communities face extinction if these wind farms go ahead. The whole fabric of coastal rural Ireland will be destroyed and intimate fishing ports which are also major tourist attractions will be lost. it is another nail in the coffin of rural Ireland.	The benefits from these ORE developments are only a fraction of what the seafood sector currently contributes to the rural economy in remote coastal regions, the only people who will benefit majorly from these ORE developments will be the major shareholders, most likely large pension funds from outside Ireland
145	I do not agree with 'A'. It's far too close to shore and will permanently destroy the landscape. This is not something that can be reversed.			
146	Yes, I agree.	Yes I do.	Yes I do.	Absolutely.
147	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
148	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
149		Yes.	Yes, and the rigorous process following application will include an EIA. Biodiversity of marine habitats must be protected.	Yes, it is vital that local population dependent on the sea for their livelihood not be impacted by this development. This should be at the core of any site identification.
150	Yes, wholeheartedly agree. This is a no brainer.	Yes, I agree.	Yes, I agree.	Yes, it definitely will.
151	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
152	Site A is too close to shore. The documentation claims that this is a plan-led and ecosystem based approach but this is clearly not true. The 'plan' is simply the developer-led approach repackaged. Site A, which should be removed, is the site on which a foreshore licence was given to Energia in 2021 as a settlement when Energia took the government to court because they were not categorised as a 'relevant' project so this is just a case of developers calling the shots again.	I agree that environmental protection should be the most important part of any approach and that marine biodiversity should be protected and enhanced. However, I do not believe the SC DMAP will actually achieve this. Huge swathes of data have not been considered in the environmental assessment. The actual objective appears to be to facilitate Energia's development of site A, as of the 4 sites mapped all the focus is on site A. This is the site that should not be included as it spans Tramore bay and is only 12km from shore (half that of the distance from shore recommended in other EU countries). The other sites which are much further from shore should be the focus but all environmental data should be reviewed and considered and genuine efforts made to protect and enhance marine biodiversity. This will require proper regulation and enforcement of works by the government.	Site A should not be included as it is not compatible with efforts to provide for co-existence.	A plan-led approach is required and it is positive to see some efforts being made on this but, as noted in my response to Q1 above, the SC-DMAP is not plan-led. It is simply a developer led approach by a different name and represents an underhanded attempt to present as moving to best practice when actually continuing with business as usual.
153	I do. The Tonn Nu site is the only viable site for immediate development due to water depth at the other sites and other factors, including shipping lanes	I do. The appropriate vigorous environmental assessment and considerations are embedded		I do
154	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
155	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
156	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
157	Yes. The detail set out in the DMAP assures me that the four areas chosen are the result of a rigorous process.	I agree with the approach, and I hope that the implementation of it would stay aligned with the policy objectives.	Absolutely. I am also greatly reassured that the essential wind power generation off our coast is being approach holistically and that this will produce far better results than the alternative ad hoc planning requests from developers.	I am very hopeful of this. One of the most prominent objections I have come across, apart from the NIMBY attitude of "spoiling the view", is the lack of benefit to the local communities. I really hope that this aspect of the framework will lead to local economic benefits along the coast where I live.
158	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
159	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
160	My suggestion is to put a 1km exclusion area around the turbines and preserve it as a fish/marine sanctuary	Exclusive fish sanctuary essential	Yes	Yes
161	My suggestion is to put a 1km exclusion area around the turbines and preserve it as a fish/marine sanctuary	Exclusive fish sanctuary essential	Yes	Yes
162	Area A is too close to the shoreline and will impact tourism, coastal activities and marine life in this area. The decision to prioritise a shallow sea bed site over a deeper site is unfair to the people living in the location and putting cost over all other considerations.	No	No	No
163	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
164	Yes, I agree wholeheartedly.	Yes. I have spoken to a UK academic who has studied the marine biology impacts of sea based wind turbines and has found them to be beneficial.	Yes.	Yes.
165	Yes	Yes	We need more protected marine areas	YES
166	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
167	No - ruining natural coastal lands scape	No I object	No it does not	No I object to this
168	Yes.	Yes	Yes.	Not without college courses and more accommodation it won't.
169	Yes, I agree	Yes, I agree	Yes, I agree	Yes, I agree
170	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
171	I do	yes I do agree	I do	I look forward to seeing the opportunities it creates
172	I do	yes I do agree	I do	I look forward to seeing the opportunities it creates
173	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
174	Yes on the basis that the area A is the most suitable for increasing wind power now instead of a theoretical time in the future. This needs to be clearly communicated with local communities.	I think it is of the utmost importance that this is done in the most transparent and consultative manner possible to ensure the community have faith in the process.		
175	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
176	No. Area A shown on the map, as indicated by a representative of the department, is entirely in a nursery and spawning area for cod and other species. These species are of great importance to the fisheries sector. It has already been demonstrated, in other offshore wind projects in other European regions, that the installation of wind turbines modifies the local ecosystem (by creating an artificial reef and displacing native species). This change in the ecosystem could result in the displacement of native species and affecting the fishing sector and the ecosystem in the future.	Yes. However, it is also important to take into account the point of view of other stakeholders, such the Advisory Council (NWWAC in this particular case).	Yes, coexistence is important and necessary. However, the installation of wind farms, being large fixed objects requiring cable infrastructures stretching from the location of the wind farm to the mainland, may prevent coexistence with other activities, mainly fishing activities.	Yes, the development of coastal communities is always beneficial (also taking into account the economic activities already taking place in the area, such as fishing).

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
177	I do not agree with the areas identified as they are too close to shore and will destroy the coastline visually and environmentally.	I do not agree. The consultation period has been very short. There is a lot of documentation to become familiar within a short time. There is prevailing narrative on climate change and objectives for decarbonization which i feel are not proven. Rebuttals to the climate change narrative are seldom given coverage.	I do not agree. The consultation period has been very short. There is a lot of documentation to become familiar within a short time. There is prevailing narrative on climate change and objectives for decarbonization which i feel are not proven. Rebuttals to the climate change narrative are seldom given coverage.	I do not agree. The consultation period has been very short. There is a lot of documentation to become familiar within a short time. It will be necessary to fully understand the strengths and weakness of the plan and hear from a range of subject matter aspects.
178	Yes. As I understand it, only Zone A is currently feasible as a site.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes. It is important that the economic and employment benefits to the local community are quantified and clearly communicated. The misinformation that is currently circulating needs to be addressed.
179	<p>iCRAG, the SFI Research Centre in Applied Geosciences, welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Draft South Coast Designated Maritime Area Plan for Offshore Renewable Energy (SC-DMAP). Offshore wind energy has the potential to make a significant contribution to Ireland’s renewable energy needs and meeting the nation’s stringent climate commitments. Given the urgency of the climate emergency and the need for secure, domestic sources of energy, the selection of these initial areas for potential development is a major, long anticipated, and positive step forward.</p> <p>While the Draft SC-DMAP has utilized available information and should be progressed, we note that understanding of all aspects of Ireland’s offshore territory must be greatly expanded in order to ensure that its development is managed sustainably. The process of selecting the four maritime areas illustrates the vital importance of comprehensive and accurate information to support evidence-based decision making, as illustrated in the report on South Coast Designated Maritime Area Plan: Maritime Area Identification.</p> <p>iCRAG commends this use of data in developing the Draft Plan and notes that the demand for more detailed geospatial information acquired by government agencies such as Geological Survey Ireland and the Marine Institute, academic groups such as the iCRAG research centre, industry actors, and civil society groups, will increase substantially as development progresses. A long-term commitment to adequately support scientific, environmental, engineering, and social science research, combined with rigorous requirements for long-term data collection and monitoring, is needed to ensure a solid foundation for essential sustainable development.</p> <p>iCRAG is hosted by University College Dublin and encompasses some 150 researchers across 10 Irish institutions, iCRAG’s broad research community focuses on three interrelated Challenges— Earth System Change, Earth Resources, and Earth Science in</p>	<p>iCRAG strongly endorses the Draft Plan’s emphasis on the importance of a robust evidence base for decision making, policy definition, and governance. The draft plan is based on the best currently available data. However, achieving the highest policy objectives and governance standards will require much deeper knowledge about the marine environment, offshore development, interactions between marine, biological, and human systems, and a greater understanding of the societal context of the offshore environment and renewable energy development. Expanded investment in research and long-term monitoring will be essential to ensure improved understanding of the many facets of offshore wind energy, which is a priority for Ireland’s renewable energy future. Such research and monitoring data will also help to identify the adjustments to policy and governance that may be needed to adapt to changing circumstances.</p> <p>Decisions on the maritime area should be informed by disciplinary research across all aspects of the Draft Plan including biodiversity, ecosystems, and fisheries and, importantly, by interdisciplinary research especially</p>		

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
	<p>Society. Established in 2015, iCRAG has established a network of industry partners across the geoscience sector and has strong relationships with several government bodies and agencies. Centre researchers are conducting research on many aspects of the marine environment and interactions between marine and human systems.</p>	<p>programmes that include the social sciences. In addition to technical and environmental excellence, the success of offshore wind development will depend on how the public responds to it. Increased research on the social dimensions of offshore wind energy would support the creation of policy and governance structures that take account of societal concerns and enable effective implementation of policy.</p> <p>iCRAG suggests that the research elements of the Draft Plan be expanded and funded at a robust level to ensure the necessary increase in knowledge and understanding of Ireland's multiple offshore assets to underpin evidence-based decision making by all stakeholders.</p>		
180	I do.	I do. Wind farms are crucial for environmental protection.	I do.	Yes.
181	I do.	I do. Wind farms are crucial for environmental protection.	I do.	Yes.

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
182	<p>No I don't. In general I would be in agreement with renewal energy and wind farms, however I really feel that Site A in particular is far too close to the coast. I attended the public information evening so have asked many questions and nothing I heard made me think that these would in any way benefit Waterford. If you look at the map the whole Waterford coastline is going to be impacted by the turbines. I realise there was studies done to find a suitable location, but Cork and Wexford have much longer coastlines. There will be nowhere on the Waterford coastline that these won't be visible from. 12km is such a short distance, especially for structures of their size. I recently held a full moon swim at our local beach and there was a really big turnout. So many different people, of all ages, coming together to enjoy nature at it's finest. Floating in the water watching the moon rise over the horizon would definitely not have the same impact if viewed through large steel structures.</p>	<p>The Copper Coast is a UNESCO site, was this taken into consideration when deciding on the location?</p>		<p>I feel these turbines being so close to the coast will negatively impact the economy along the Waterford coast. If I had the choice to surf in Tramore with turbines practically on top of me, or Lahinch where there's none, Lahinch would win every day. This just 1 example. I know that the community benefit fund will see money given back to the areas effected to help improve facilities, but it seems counter productive to ruin the vista and then try to make up for it. No jobs will be created locally, for the first few years of the development and I wonder if the employment impact will ever be sufficient to counter act the damage that will be done to our coast. I also note that energy bills could in fact go up and not down, with the turbines being installed. There is very little benefit to the normal person on the streets of Waterford from what I can see.</p>

	<p>Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?</p>	<p>Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?</p>
183	<p>Overall, Elver Wind Park Limited (50:50 joint venture [JV] between EDF Renewables and Fred. Olsen Seawind known as EWPL/Elver) agrees with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development within the South Coast DMAP, and the process undertaken to select them. This response will primarily focus on the Tonn Nua site; however, the principles of site identification and site refinement is applicable to all the sites. In previous consultation responses, the JV partners asked for the following to be considered within a heat mapping exercise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground conditions (the proposed foundation solution depends primarily on the type, thickness and complexity of soils and bedrock encountered) • Water depth • Grid capacity • Metocean conditions (including wind resource, wave and current) • Landfall constraints • Potential export cable route • Availability of essential infrastructure, such as ports, supply chain activity and storage locations • Proximity to demand centres and industrial opportunities. • Tow/transport time to site • Environmental considerations (including future Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)), visual impact/distance offshore. • Hard constraints such as existing development, cables, wrecks, etc • Socio-economic considerations such as commercial fishing and shipping • Proximity to other ORE developments <p>These factors and constraints were mostly considered and shown in the South Coast DMAP: Maritime Area identification report which was circulated by DECC as part of the South Coast DMAP consultation. Elver welcomes the area of 313km² allocated for the Tonn Nua site. In previous consultation responses the JV partners recommended a low site density of 2.5-3MW/km² to aid the site development process in the absence of additional site-specific surveys such as geophysical and geotechnical surveys. This has been taken on board with Tonn Nua having a site density of 2.88MW/km². However, it is still noted that the surveys are critical to further de-risk the Tonn Nua site. There are areas of the analysis where Elver would like to highlight potential omissions: For example, when conducting a multicriteria analysis in GIS, it is essential to provide an extensive list of all the exact datasets used, along with their spatial and temporal resolutions. This is important for several critical reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency and Reproducibility: Providing a detailed list of datasets ensures that the analysis is transparent. Others can see exactly what data was used, which is crucial for the reproducibility of the study. If other researchers or practitioners want to replicate the analysis or verify the results, they need to know the precise datasets and their characteristics. • Data Quality and Reliability: The quality and reliability of the analysis depend significantly on the quality of the data used. By listing the datasets and their spatial and temporal resolutions, other users can assess the appropriateness and reliability of the data for the specific analysis. High-resolution data might be needed for detailed local studies, while coarser data might be sufficient for broader regional 	<p>Based on the principles of a plan-led approach, the draft SC-DMAP objectives and governance approach are likely to support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation. Overall, Elver Wind Park Limited (50:50 joint venture [JV] between EDF Renewables and Fred. Olsen Seawind known as EWPL/Elver) broadly agree with the policies identified and welcome them, specifically on the following key policy objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and Direction: Clear policy objectives provide a roadmap for all stakeholders, ensuring that development aligns with the targets set by the Irish government. During previous DMAP consultation workshops, DECC have stated that the DMAP process would be reviewed every 6 years. This would be a major concern to the development of a project, given that project would be in planning at this stage and would then be faced with a risk of changes to the DMAP process. Elver would strongly recommend that once a DMAP is set and an auction has been undertaken on the site, no further alteration or change can be made to the ORE DMAP process. • Environmental Protection: Elver agree that environmental protection is essential and welcome that DECC has been working with NPWS to ensure environmentally sensitive areas are avoided. It is essential that the whole government approach to spatial planning is robustly considered to ensure the most suitable areas are chosen to maximise ORE potential whilst minimising environmental and socioeconomic impacts. These ORE sites must now be considered as areas for ORE in future spatial planning, such as MPA designation. 	<p>Elver Wind Park Limited (50:50 joint venture [JV] between EDF Renewables and Fred. Olsen Seawind known as EWPL/Elver) welcome DECC including opportunities for co-existence and co-location and agree that this should be an integral part of ORE planning. Elver note there are good examples in other markets, such as Portugal, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland and Belgium. The JV recognise the difficulties of balancing all stakeholder views on the optimum ORE development location and would note that although expanding into deeper waters may alleviate some impacts (e.g., fishing and visual), this could impact project deliverability in terms of technical solutions available and increase the costs of the infrastructure will adopting novel solutions in deeper water. This demonstrates the importance of all technical, physical, environmental, and socio-economic constraints being considered during initial site selection (see responses to Questions 2 & 3, above). Co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities must put safety first, ensuring that safety is considered at all points of the project life cycle. We note the following examples of co-existence and co-location in other jurisdictions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ørsted's research on lobster fishing within the Westernmost Rough Offshore Wind Farm off the NE coast of England, demonstrates that the local fishing industry can continue to thrive within the wind farm with no significant difference between catch rates pre- and post-construction. • Equinor and Marine Scotland recently undertook a safe fishing trial at their Hywind site, (off east coast Scotland), which tested creels, fish traps and jigging lines and indicated that under the right conditions and with the right information it is possible to safely deploy and recover these types of fishing gear within a floating offshore wind farm. The ability to co-exist can be more challenging for mobile gears (e.g., trawls, 	<p>Elver Wind Park Limited (50:50 joint venture [JV] between EDF Renewables and Fred. Olsen Seawind known as EWPL/Elver) agree that the plan-led framework set out in the draft SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast. Elver believes a robust plan-led framework will create benefits to consumers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost Savings: Streamlined planning and reduced delays, subject to a realistic programme, lead to lower project costs, which can translate into lower energy prices for consumers. This will help avoid high auction strike prices which would not maximise the benefits to the consumers. • Energy Reliability: Coordinated development pipeline ensures a stable and reliable supply of renewable energy. • Long-Term Price Stability: Renewable energy sources can help stabilize energy prices over the long term by reducing exposure to volatile fossil fuel markets. The plan-led framework will create benefits to the supply chain: • Predictable Demand: A structured approach provides clearer timelines and clarity on a pipeline of projects, leading to a more consistent demand, enabling better planning and investment by suppliers in local infrastructure on the south coast and more widely in Ireland. • Economic Growth: Increased and steady demand fosters job creation and growth in the local and national supply chain industries. • Innovation and Development: Consistent projects and funding encourage technological innovation and advancements within the supply chain. • Investment Security: Clear,

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
184	<p>analyses. Without the exact datasets used there lacks transparency for analysis to be conducted in parallel to the studies. For example, the 9 datasets used for commercial fisheries are not listed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution Consistency and Compatibility: Spatial and temporal resolution impacts the consistency and compatibility of different datasets. If datasets have different resolutions, it can lead to issues when overlaying or integrating them. Knowing the resolutions helps in understanding any potential misalignments or biases introduced by resolution discrepancies. Documentation for Future Reference: Detailed documentation of the datasets used, including their spatial and temporal resolutions, serves as a valuable reference for future studies. It helps in building a body of knowledge and ensures that subsequent analyses can build upon previous work without duplicating efforts unnecessarily. Stakeholder Communication: When communicating results to stakeholders, including policymakers, planners, and the public, it is important to convey the basis of the analysis clearly. Listing datasets and their resolutions helps in building trust and credibility, as stakeholders can see the foundation upon which decisions and recommendations are based. In summary, providing a comprehensive list of datasets along with their spatial and temporal resolutions is fundamental for ensuring the transparency, reliability, accuracy, and credibility of a multicriteria analysis in GIS. It facilitates the proper interpretation of results, allows for reproducibility, ensures that the data is fit for the intended analytical purposes and in turn this facilitates a clearer initial assessment of risk for potential offshore areas by developers. 		<p>dredges, and seines). However, fishing intensity data from EMODnet16 shows both static and mobile gear activity within numerous operating windfarms within the UK, such as Thanet. There is evidence of mobile gear fishing activity in UK offshore wind farms including, but not limited to Walneys, Hornsea, Beatrice and Moray East in addition to co-location, i.e., fishing within the same spatial footprint as ORE; programmes to expand other forms of sustainable fishing enhancements to allow for wider co-existence should also be considered. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Netherlands National Water Programme 2022-2027 notes that "the space available for trawl fishing will continue to decrease because of the expansion of nature conservation areas and wind farms. In order to use the space on the North Sea efficiently and in doing so create alternative forms of food supply, the focus will shift to aquaculture and passive fishing, in areas such as wind farms." The Whitby Lobster Hatchery in UK which aims to protect Whitby's fishing heritage by conserving the local lobster populations. The key to co-existence is proactive engagement with all stakeholders, notably here for fishing and ORE sectors. Furthermore, clarity is sought in relation to fishing co-location and compensation. As DECC have identified these sites and utilised fishing data to aid this selection, the onus for compensating fisheries should not fall solely onto the developer and this should be further investigated in the ORE-Seafood working groups alongside DECC to promote the most sustainable uses of our marine areas. 	<p>long-term planning signals a stable market, attracting more investments and financing options for supply chain companies. The plan-led framework will create benefits to the developers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory Clarity: Clear regulations, guidelines and expectations reduce uncertainties and simplify the consenting and permitting process. This should be underpinned by the location of the ORE site not being grounds for planning refusal and in principle the site is suitable for ORE development. Risk Mitigation: Early identification of potential risks enhances investor confidence and project stability. For example, again state led site selection should mitigate the risk of planning refusal. Infrastructure Optimization: Strategic site selection and integration with grid infrastructure optimize resource use and reduce development costs. Streamlined Processes: Coordinated efforts among stakeholders reduce administrative burdens and project delays. Market Stability: A plan-led approach offers a predictable and stable market environment, making it easier to secure funding and investment.
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Do you agree with the four maritime areas identified for future offshore wind development in the draft SC-DMAP? If not, why?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP policy objectives and governance approach, including for environmental protection, will support and guide its sustainable and coherent implementation?	Do you agree that the draft SC-DMAP includes sufficient provisions for co-existence between offshore renewable energy and other maritime activities?	Do you agree that the plan-led framework set out in the SC-DMAP will effectively support and drive economic and employment opportunities, including opportunities along the south coast?
185	Yes, I agree with them. I appreciate that some might want the areas to be further from shore, and may want to wait for floating offshore wind. However, time is not on our side. The important thing is to get going with offshore wind development now, using whatever technology is currently available, rather than waiting for future technology to develop.	Yes	Yes	Yes, wind farms can support coastal communities, and any community benefit funds should be used to invest in these communities. This should be planned in such a way that it benefits the Waterford Gaeltacht and fishing communities along the coast.
186	Bardex Corporation applauds the comprehensive approach that has led to the four areas.	In addition to an alignment between the generation, transmission, and demand for renewable energy, more consideration for the eventual decommissioning of offshore wind assets, such as the infrastructure which will be required for the task, should be included in this early planning phase. Globally, this type of long-term planning was not made in the oil and gas industries, and there is an opportunity today to not repeat that mistake in the case of renewable energy.	The coexistence of multiple activities is vital to the overall economic health and work-life balance of local communities. The workforce required for offshore wind to be successful needs a community that enables other marine industries flourish. Likewise, the health of marine environments is dependent upon the success of the energy transition. Choosing infrastructure that can support a diverse range of needs will provide ports with the means to stabilize cyclic economic trends, help maintain steady employment numbers, and facilitate the success of all who engage with the sea.	Bardex would like to add an additional consideration for future port planning. Port infrastructure, including launch and recovery systems (LARSs), could be planned as common user facilities over the life of the investment. Once offshore wind farms are installed, the marshalling facility can transition to vessel maintenance/sustainment for the fishing and tourism industries, and as defence vessel sustainment should the need ever arise. Similarly, the O&M port(s) can service those vessels in addition to offshore wind maintenance vessels. Investing into onshore infrastructure will not be an insignificant cost, but opening the range of stakeholders benefiting from it would make the public capital injection more palatable to a wider audience and maximise the local economic impact for generations to come.
187	No - Area A is too near the shore in an area of natural beauty - unnecessary.	No - developer led with no proper environmental assessment	No - will have a very negative effect on tourism in the area	No - Area A is not plan led, it is clearly developer led
188	NO,,AS A SENIOR CITIZEN i WISH SITE A TO BE REMOVED, AND BEST AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGY(WHICH IS IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW) WHICH MEANS A COMPANY CAPABLE OF B.A.T FOR FLOATING TURBINES DO NOT FORGET ARD NA CRUISE.FUNDS INVESTED WAS NEVER AN ISSUE,,NEVER CAUSED PROB.	NOT AT ALL	IF 1 IS SORTED POSSIBLE	IF GET THE FIRST 1 RIGHT WITH COMPANY COMPETENT USING B.A.T
189	No. The first site is too close to land. It should be sited below the horizon line so that it is not visible from land.			
190	yes	No The windfall should be further out to sea Otherwise they will affectc	yes	No The windfarms should be further out to sea Otherwise it could adversely affect tourism along the coast