



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of 1st Meeting ABP-322258-25

Case Reference / Description	ABP-322258-25		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th Meeting	1 st		
Date	15/05/2025	Start Time	11:00 a.m.
Location	Virtually	End Time	12:15 p.m.

Representing An Bord Pleanála
Staff Members
Una Crosse, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)
Paul Kelly, Senior Planning Inspector
Fiona Patterson, Senior Ecologist/Environmental Specialist
Raymond Muwaniri, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant
Sarah Moore, Project Manager, Jenning's O'Donovan
Kathlyn Feeney, Assistant Project Manager, Jenning's O'Donovan
Breena Coyle, Senior Planner, Jenning's O'Donovan
Niall Galvin, Carraigin Power Ltd
William O'Connor, Carraigin Power Ltd

Introduction

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant on the 8th of April 2025, requesting pre-application consultations under section 37B of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and advised the prospective applicant that the instant meeting essentially constituted an information-gathering exercise for the Board; it also invited the prospective applicant to outline the nature of the proposed development and to highlight any matters that it wished to receive advice on from the Board. The Board's representatives mentioned the following general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process:

- The Board will keep a record of this meeting and any other meetings, if held. Such records will form part of the file which will be made available publicly at the conclusion of the process. The record of the meeting will not be amended by the Board once finalised, but the prospective applicant may submit comments on the record which will form part of the case file.
- The Board will serve notice at the conclusion of the process as to the strategic infrastructure status of the proposed development. It may form a preliminary view at an early stage in the process on the matter.
- A further meeting or meetings may be held in respect of the proposed development.
- Further information may be requested by the Board and public consultations may also be directed by the Board.
- The Board may hold consultations in respect of the proposed development with other bodies.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Board in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in any legal proceedings.

Presentation made by the prospective applicant:

The presentation, which is on file, outlines the prospective applicants (Carraigin Power Ltd) is experience in design and operation of wind energy developments across Ireland.

The development proposes the erection of 12 no. wind turbines with an overall ground to blade tip height of 185m, rotor diameter of 163m, hub height of 103.5m, and generating up to 7MW. Associated developments include the construction of an onsite 110kV substation and a 110kV grid connection, site access roads, drainage network, turbine foundations etc.

The presentation outlines the ongoing community liaison and consultation and the scoping undertaken.

Preparation of the EIAR is ongoing with biodiversity surveys to include; habitat, protected species, aquatic, bat activity, ornithology, landscape and visual, archaeology and cultural heritage, noise, hydrology and geology. The site is not located within a Natura 2000 site or a natural heritage area, and the nearest site Cloonshanville Bog SAC is 235m from the closest turbine. The examination of susceptibility to landslides and peat stability is proposed to be assessed in line with the current guidelines with the proposed layout proposing to avoid areas of deep peat and till deposits.

A cumulative assessment of other developments within 3km to assess cumulative effects of noise is proposed. The prospective applicant is hoping to submit for planning permission in the 3rd quarter of 2025. The proposed output of the windfarm is estimated at 84MW, exceeding the 50MW threshold set out in 7th Schedule, therefore constituting SID.

Discussion:

- The Board's representatives began the discussion by seeking clarity on the approach to the grid connection, i.e. whether it is proposed to lodge within a single application or two separate applications. The prospective applicant set out their proposed intention to submit one application under Section 37E.

- The Boards representative enquired whether the applicant would propose to seek Design Flexibility (DF) with the prospective applicant advising that DF was not being considered at this stage. The Boards representative noted the position and advised that assessments must therefore be based on a specified turbine & characteristics.
- The Board's representatives queried whether the application boundary had been finalised and were informed this was in progress.
- The Board's representatives also enquired about the nature of the proposed upgrade works required to the Turbine Delivery Route (TDR) with the prospective applicant outlining the likely requirement for temporary accommodation works.
- The Board's representatives queried the number of site accesses to be proposed, and national roads policy and/or the policy and technical standards of the local County Development Plan. The prospective applicant noted that access points are still being discussed with Roscommon County Council.
- The prospective applicant clarified that the construction of the N5 road project would most likely be complete by the time the proposed development would be likely to commence, with traffic management etc. to be addressed in the EIAR.
- The Board's representatives enquired as to whether a borrow pit would be proposed and if material would be sourced onsite or elsewhere with the prospective applicant noting that investigations onsite are ongoing
- The Board's representative noted forestry near the site, and outlined the need to consider replanting if felling is proposed.
- In response to a query on engagement on the grid connection, the prospective applicant outlined that no meaningful response from the initial engagement was expected until the project progresses.
- The Board's representative advised that pNHAs/NHAs should be considered in the impact assessment.
- In response to queries on the presentation of measures related to habitat enhancement, the Board representatives outlined the need to differentiate between enhancement and mitigation.

- An outline of the scoping undertaken was provided.
- In relation to biodiversity, the Board's representatives outlined the importance of robust surveys and specialist surveys as required.
- The consideration of Annex IV species and derogation was outlined.
- In relation to ornithology, considerations in relation to collision risk assessment, disturbance, habitat loss, impacts at different population levels and connections to SPAs were outlined.
- The Board's representatives noted that whilst Cloonshanville bog, the closest SPA is approximately 235m to the nearest turbine, the proposed development boundary is closer with ancillary infrastructure (site roads etc) close to bog habitat.
- The prospective applicant outlined that flood risk and determining the appropriate level of Flood Risk Assessment required is ongoing.

Conclusion:

The Board's representatives advised that onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Board's representatives advised that the record of the instant meeting will be issued in the meantime and that the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting.



Una Crosse

Assistant Director of Planning