[redacted]
Power Capital Renewable Energy
86-88 Lower Leeson Street
Dublin 2
D02 A668

Email: [redacted]

22nd August, 2025

By Registered Post and Email

RE: FUNDAMENTAL FAILURES IN STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT – IMMEDIATE REMEDIAL ACTION REQUIRED

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your email of 19th August. We note your explanation regarding the cancellation of the 14th August consultation event, however this does not address the significant deficiencies in Power Capital Renewable Energy's (PCRE) approach to stakeholder engagement to date.

Breach of Commitments to Galway County Council

We must draw your attention to serious discrepancies between PCRE's stated commitments and actual performance. In your presentation to Galway County Council on 10th June, you explicitly stated that "neighbouring residents will be contacted by letter to be notified of the event."

This commitment was reiterated in Gravis Planning's letter to the Council on 30th May, which referenced "public consultation to understand the views of local residents and businesses."

We can confirm that none of the residents we have contacted who are directly impacted by this proposal received a letter from PCRE notifying them of the 26th June consultation event. This includes residents whose properties are shown within the proposed development site boundary. Despite our extensive community engagement, no residents have come forward to confirm they received direct written notification from PCRE. This suggests a significant failure in your notification process and represents a clear breach of the assurances given to the planning authority, calling into question the adequacy of your consultation methodology.

Consultation Standards Requiring Improvement

The approach taken for the 26th June event falls short of contemporary standards for meaningful stakeholder engagement:

- Generic newspaper advertisements rather than targeted stakeholder notification
- Selective mailing drops that excluded those directly affected parties
- Over-reliance on website access rather than proactive engagement
- Incomplete identification of the full spectrum of impacted stakeholders

Directing residents to a website cannot substitute for direct engagement. This approach assumes universal internet access and technical capability whilst placing the consultation burden entirely on the community rather than the developer.

Stakeholder Identification Gaps

Your consultation process appears to have overlooked numerous categories of affected parties beyond immediate neighbours, including those within visual impact zones, emergency service personnel, agricultural service providers, tourism operators, and other community stakeholders whose livelihoods may be affected. This suggests the need for a more comprehensive stakeholder mapping exercise.

Pattern of Concerns

Several issues have emerged that warrant clarification:

- Venue bookings made and subsequently cancelled without adequate notice
- Commitments to elected representatives that were not fulfilled
- Notification procedures that appear to have missed directly affected residents
- Reliance on passive information provision rather than the proactive, two-way engagement required by contemporary stakeholder engagement standards

When Will Meaningful Consultation Occur?

Given that the 26th June event cannot be considered a meaningful consultation due to the fundamental notification failures identified above, we require confirmation of when PCRE will conduct its first fit-for-purpose public consultation that meets contemporary stakeholder engagement standards.

Path Forward

We seek clarification on how PCRE intends to address these concerns before proceeding with future consultation activities:

- What methodology will be employed to comprehensively identify all affected stakeholders?
- How will direct engagement be ensured with those most significantly impacted?
- What steps will be taken to align consultation practices with modern stakeholder engagement standards?
- How will the consultation gaps identified to date be addressed?

The community expects transparent, comprehensive, and accessible engagement that reflects the scale and significance of this proposal. We believe there is considerable scope for improvement in PCRE's consultation approach and look forward to working constructively toward meaningful community dialogue.

We await your detailed response addressing these concerns within 10 working days. The community requires clarity on your consultation methodology before any planning application is submitted, and we expect PCRE's enhanced approach to demonstrate genuine commitment to meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Yours faithfully,

Brendan Cronin

Brendan Cronin
Chairman, AMASS

Copied: Mr. Liam Hanrahan, Director of Services (Planning), Galway County Council lhanrahan@galwaycoco.ie
Mr. Seán Canney, Minister of State and Teachta Dála for Galway East sean.canney@oireachtas.ie
Mr. Albert Dolan, Teachta Dála for Galway East albert.dolan@oireachtas.ie
Mr. Louis O'Hara, Teachta Dála for Galway East louis.ohara@oireachtas.ie
Mr. Peter Roche, Teachta Dála for Galway East peter.roche@oireachtas.ie
Cllr. Sean Broderick sbroderick@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cllr. James Charity jcharity@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cathaoirleach David Collins davidcollins@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cllr. Peter Feeney pfeeney@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cllr. Tomas Grealish tgrealish@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cllr. Cillian Keane cilliankeane@cllr.galwaycoco.ie
Cllr. Martin McNamara mmcnamara@cllr.galwaycoco.ie