



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Addendum Report ABP-308244-20

---

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Development</b>                  | 7 Wind Turbines, substation and ancillary infrastructure  |
| <b>Location</b>                     | Derreendonee, Curraglass and Cappaboy Beg, County Cork  |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Cork County Council   |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 20/350  |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | Wingleaf Limited  |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Permission  |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Refuse  |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | First & Third Party   |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | Wingleaf Limited<br>Tadhg Ó Duinnín & Others  |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | Macrom District Environmental Group<br>Fáilte Ireland<br>Tim & Kate Baker<br>Brídín Ashe & Others |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 11 <sup>th</sup> & 12 <sup>th</sup> May, 2021   |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Kevin Moore   |

## 1.0. **Introduction**

1.1. The following addendum to my original report is provided in response to the Board's request.

## 2.0. **Applicant's Response to Section 132 Notice**

2.1. The Board's Section 132 Notice sought confirmation of the nature and extent of the proposed development and clarity on whether permission for a range of options was being sought.

2.2. The applicant's response to the request may be summarised as follows:

- The plans and particulars submitted with the application are specific and measurable and are in accordance with the appropriate certain limited degree of flexibility referenced in the Derryadd Wind Farm judgement.
- Detailed plans and particulars concerning the proposed turbine configurations and elevations are included as part of the response, as well as additional detailed plans and particulars concerning the proposed turbine configuration and elevations.
- The layout plans originally submitted detail the location of all of the proposed infrastructure and are entirely accurate with grid co-ordinates shown in relation to the location of the subject turbines.
- The submitted plans and particulars set out the minimum parameters of the critical turbine components which were described and considered within the application documentation, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Natura Impact Assessment. The assessments comprehensively considered and assessed the worst case scenarios within each relevant discipline. As such, the planning application documentation, including the EIAR and NIS, are comprehensive, robust and objective in their assessment.

2.3. Appendix 1 of the applicant's response includes drawings setting out the upper and lower ranges of the proposed turbines and layout drawings. Table 2-1 of the response indicates the range of turbine parameters being sought. These are as follows:

- Turbine Tip Height: 175m (minimum) – 178.5m (maximum)
- Hub Height: 103.5m (minimum) – 120m (maximum)
- Blade Length: 58.5m (minimum) – 75m (maximum)
  
- Permanent meteorological met mast height: 100m (minimum) – 112 (maximum)

2.4. The applicant's response also refers to sections of the EIAR and NIS where turbine configuration assessment of the proposed development was carried out and the worst case scenario was considered.

2.5. Additional comparative photomontages with four originally submitted photomontages are included to demonstrate the minimum and maximum turbine dimension range.

### 3.0. **Planning Authority Response**

3.1. The planning authority referred the Board to the technical and planning reports on the file and the recommendation to refuse permission. It reiterated concerns relating to the scale and height of the turbines and adverse landscape impacts. The planning authority's position has not changed following the Section 132 submission.

### 4.0. **Third Party Responses**

#### 4.1. **Response from Tim and Kate Baker**

The Observers submitted that turbines should not be built on the site and raised concerns about turbine colour, presentation of photomontages, shadow flicker, and

wind farm developer non-compliance with permission requirements. An alternative use for the site for carbon storage was suggested.

#### 4.2. Response from Brídín Ashe & Others

The Observers, in response to Item 1 of the Board's request and the applicant's submission, alludes to the move towards increased turbine scale, comparison with the previous turbines on the site, European Commission guidance on wind energy development and nature legislation, and the judgement set out in 2021 IEHC 390(2020 No. 557 JR) *Peter Sweetman v An Bord Pleanála*. In response to Item 2 of the Board's request and the applicant's submission, reference is made to impacts on bats at turbines and risk of fatality and the impact on White-tailed Eagle and the concerns raised by Dr Allan Mee who has managed the Irish White-tailed Eagle reintroduction project to Ireland. In the conclusion, reference is made to the establishment of grossly disproportionate wind turbines in one of the most scenic locations in West Cork.

#### 4.3. Response from Coiste Forbartha Béal Átha 'n Ghaorthaidh CLG

This response is from the third party appellant Tadhg Ó Duinnín and others. Reference is made to the Board's role in determining the application for the proposed development, public participation, noise assessment and the permission duration. It is considered that the detail of the proposed development is wholly inadequate, that the presentation of information at this stage cannot cure the invalidity of the planning application lodged with the planning authority, and that the new information would have had to have been made available to the public at the application stage who would have a right to comment. Reference is made to the judgement in 2021 IEHC 390(2020 No. 557 JR), i.e. the Derryadd case. Inadequacies in the treatment of noise issues are referred to. The Board is asked to refuse the application.

## 5.0 **Conclusion and Recommendation**

The applicant's response to the Board's Section 132 Notice confirms and clarifies the details provided in the planning application documentation. My original assessment fully considered the nature and extent of the proposed development in terms of the scale, layout, configuration, form and character of the proposed wind farm development. Considerations and assessment of the proposed development appropriately gave due regard to the maximum parameters being sought in this application and to the planning and environmental impacts arising from the development proposed.

Regarding the response to the Section 132 Notice, I acknowledge the minimum and maximum parameters being sought as set out in Table 2-1 of the applicant's response and shown in Appendix 1. In terms of physical, visual and environmental impacts, there would not be significant differences arising from the range of parameters being sought. I am wholly satisfied to concur with my original recommendation to the Board. The applicant's response to the Board's Section 132 Notice reinforces the conclusions of my assessment on the landscape and ornithological impacts. This is a development that would have significant adverse environmental and visual impacts and is not sustainable at this highly sensitive location.

I recommend that permission is refused for the reasons set out in my original report of 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2020.

---

Kevin Moore  
Senior Planning Inspector  
12<sup>th</sup> January, 2022.