



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-319676-24

Case Reference / Description	Proposed Wind Farm development at Cahermurphy, Knocknahila More South, Carrownagry South, Caheraghcullin and Drummin, Co. Clare.		
Case Type	Pre Application Consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th Meeting	2 nd Meeting		
Date	02/12/25	Start Time	11:00am
Location	MS Teams	End Time	12:15pm

Representing An Coimisiún Pleanála
Stephen Kay, Assistant Director of Planning, Chair
Donogh O'Donoghue, Planning Inspector
Maeve Flynn, Senior Ecologist
Emmet Smyth, Senior Environmental Scientist
Lauren Murphy, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant
Adrain Moran, MKO
Alan Clancy, MKO
Michael Cahill, MKO
Eoin McCarthy, MKO

Patrick Manley, MKO
Padraig Desmond, MKO
Juliet Ryan, FuturEnergy
Sinead O'Malley, FuturEnergy
David Heelan, FuturEnergy

Introduction

The Commission referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant on the 9th October 2025, requesting pre-application consultations under section 37B of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The Commission's representatives outlined that the purpose of the pre-application meeting was as follows:

- To facilitate the Commission in determining whether the proposed development comes within the provisions of s.37A such that an application for approval should be made to the Commission under s37E.
- To provide the Commission with an opportunity to give advice regarding the procedures around the making of any application and what considerations relating to the proper planning and sustainable development and the environment may have a bearing on a decision.

At the outset, the Commission's representatives noted that this was the second pre application consultation meeting on this case, with the first meeting held on the 11th August, 2024. The Commission's representatives further noted that since the first meeting was held the REDIII Directive has been transposed into Irish legislation by way of SI274 of 2025 and came into effect on 7th August, 2025.

The Commission's representatives noted that having regard to the changes brought about by the transposition of REDIII, the prospective applicant has received an agenda which will be followed during the meeting. It was also stressed by the Commission representatives that the consultation process being undertaken does not constitute any consideration of the merits of the proposal or any assessment of the application documentation.

The Commission's representatives referred to the general procedures in relation to pre application consultation meetings which were read into the record at the 1st meeting, and which remain applicable.

Presentation

The prospective applicant's presentation, which is attached to the file, set out the following items and generally reflected the agenda which was circulated by the Commission in advance:

- Site Location and Selection,
- Proposed wind farm overview,
- Proposed grid connection route,
- Policy context,
- Transposition of REDIII, Renewable Energy Regulations,
- Planning policy context including.
 - European,
 - National and,
 - local policies,
- Consultations,
- Scoping exercise,
- Environmental Impact Assessment,
- Biodiversity,
- Designated Sites,

- Key ecological receptors,
- Ornithology,
- Concerns raised by the DAU,
- Hydrology,
- Geotechnical and Peat Stability Assessments,
- Noise and shadow flicker,
- Landscape and visual assessment,
- Cultural heritage,
- Material assets,
- Turbine delivery route,
- Cumulative assessment,
- EIAR supporting documentation,
- Natura Impact Assessment,
- Planning documents,
- Planning drawings and scales,
- The completeness check,
- Proposed development timeline.

Discussion

- The Commissions representatives opened the discussion by seeking clarification on the minimum export capacity. The prospective applicant clarified that all design options have an export capacity of over 50MW. They advised that the minimum export capacity would be between 51-52MW and it is their intention that the total export capacity of the proposed development would be c.57MW.
- Following a query raised by the Commission's representatives the prospective applicant clarified that they have reached out to the NPWS in terms of scoping to discuss topics such as collision risk modelling and methodology, however

they have received no feedback to date. They advised that they have used information and feedback gained from the NPWS which was received in relation to the previous Cahermurphy 2 project.

- The prospective applicant advised that the DAU and NPWS responded to their scoping document which was issued to them in 2024 and issues raised in these observations pointed back to issues raised on the Cahermurphy 2 project.
- The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant that on foot of the consultation meetings undertaken, when they receive a SID determination from the Commission, they will also receive a schedule of information which will inform the completeness check.
- Following a query raised by the Commission's representatives the prospective applicant clarified that there is one proposed wind turbine located in an area designated as an area acceptable for wind energy developments while the remaining wind turbines are proposed to be located in a strategic area for wind energy development. They advised that this has not been amended since the previous meeting.
- The Commission's representatives raised a query in relation to the green area of land located on the right-hand corner of the site location map which was presented. The prospective applicant advised that this land/ landowner is not involved in this project, but it has been included as part of their overall EIAR assessment.
- The prospective applicant advised that the Cahermurphy 1 project was carried out by MCRE and this development consists of 4 wind turbines. They advised that their site boundary will not include any of those wind turbines. One of those turbines is located within their EIAR boundary.

- On foot of a query raised by the Commission's representatives the prospective applicant advised that they have received feedback from the IAA in terms of the project but have not received feedback from Shannon Airport. The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant to reach out to them again prior to submission of the planning application.
- The Commission's representatives advised that biodiversity enhancement area issues are raised quite often in submissions received from the DAU. The prospective applicant advised that these issues were raised previously by the Commission, and they will be including a Hen Harrier management plan within their red line boundary, and they are currently working up legal agreements in respect of this land.
- The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant to ensure that surveys are undertaken using best practice methodology and using local, regional or county level methodology rather than national level as it is not site specific. Any gaps in methodologies should be closed off e.g. nocturnal surveys. Evidence from other studies should be included to back up the efficacy of any measures proposed.
- Following a query raised by the Commission's representatives the prospective applicant advised that no golden plover was located on site.
- The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant to focus on key ecological issues and not on less significant species that aren't relevant to this type of development when carrying out their assessments.
- The Commission's representatives note that peat has been identified on this site and asked the prospective applicant if water impacts have been assessed. The prospective applicant advised that water impacts have been assessed as

part of their peat stability assessment and has been a key consideration throughout the design process. They advised they are using best practice to carry out this assessment. The prospective applicant also advised that a fluctuating water table and how it responds to precipitation will also form part of the planning application. In response to a query from the Commission's representatives, the prospective applicant stated that the potential impact of forestry felling on water quality would be assessed in the application.

- The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant to ensure a complaints procedure in terms of amplitude modulation and tonal noise be included as part of the planning application.
- The Commission's representatives note that there are two borrow pits located on the proposed development site and asked the prospective applicant to clarify if it is their intention to include any water management proposals. The prospective applicant clarified that as part of their planning application they are including a detailed site drainage management plan which will address drainage around peat areas on site. It is their intention to divert water away from the borrow pits and this will be included as part of the application.
- The prospective applicant advised that they will have a water framework directive assessment as a standalone document which will be a supporting document to the hydrology chapter of their EIAR.
- The Commission's representatives advised that the assessment and presentation in any application of the cumulative impact of noise, visual and ornithology is very important and needs to be robustly considered.

- The Commission's representatives advised that a schedule of mitigation measures should be included and the wording around mitigation measures should be clear.
- The Commission's representatives advised the prospective applicant that they can submit their proposed drawing scales prior to submission of the planning application for the Commission to review.
- The prospective applicant advised that the Cahermurphy 2 application is currently with the Commission for decision, and that it is their intention to only implement one application if approval is granted for both.
- The Commission's representatives concluded the discussion by advising the prospective applicant that it is not general practice to request closure of the pre application process before the meeting record has been circulated, however they can request closure once the record of the meeting is received.

The meeting concluded at 12:15pm.



22/12/2025

Stephen Kay

Assistant Director of Planning