Our Case Number: ABP-318446-23

# **Planning Authority Reference Number:**



Patrick and Denise Cullinan **Bleantis** Ballinamult Co. Waterford

Date: 26 January 2024

Re: Proposed construction of Coumnagappul Wind Farm consisting of 10 no. turbines and associated infrastructure.

In the townlands of Coumnagappul, Carrigbrack, Knockavanniamountain, Barricreemountain

Upper and Glennaneanemountain, Skeehans, Lagg, Co. Waterford.

(www.coumnagappulwindfarmSID.ie)

Dear Sir / Madam,

An Bord Pleanála has received your recent submission in relation to the above mentioned proposed development and will take it into consideration in its determination of the matter. Please accept this letter as a receipt for the fee of €50 that you have paid.

The Board will revert to you in due course with regard to the matter.

Please be advised that copies of all submissions / observations received in relation to the application will be made available for public inspection at the offices of the local authority and at the offices of An Bord Pleanála when they have been processed by the Board.

More detailed information in relation to strategic infrastructure development can be viewed on the Board's website: www.pleanala.ie.

If you have any queries in the meantime, please contact the undersigned officer of the Board or email sids@pleanala.ie quoting the above mentioned An Bord Pleanála reference number in any correspondence with the Board.

Yours faithfully,

Niamh Hickey **Executive Officer** 

Direct Line: 01-8737145

**PA04** 

Patrick and Denise Cullinan Bleantis Ballinamult Co. Waterford 22nd January 2024

The Secretary An Bord Pleanala 64 Marlborough Street Dublin 1

An Bord Pleanála Case reference: PA93.318446
Proposed construction of Coumnagappul Wind Farm consisting of 10 no.
turbines and associated infrastructure in the townlands of Coumnagappul,
Carrigbrack, Knockavanniamountain, Barricreemountain Upper and
Glennaneanemountain, Skeehans, Lagg, Co. Waterford.
Fee of €50 enclosed

Dear Sir/Madam.

This submission is in relation to the development of Coumnagappul Wind Farm, which we strongly object to.

## Waterford City and County Council Development Plan 2022 - 2028

The Development Plan was established after a long process of consultation with the people of Waterford and the elected Councillors, which then was signed off by Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage and the Planning Regulator. Coumnagappul Wind Farm has applied for planning permission in an area which is classed as an **exclusion zone** for wind energy development. The County Development Plan must be at the centre of the Boards decision.

As the Board is aware, a precedent has been set regarding County Development Plans. An Bord Pleanala refused planning permission for Ballynagare Wind Farm, Co. Kerry, in September 2023. The reason the Board gave for the refusal is as follows:

"The Board was not satisfied that, notwithstanding the benefits of renewable energy proposals and the support at a national level, the proposed development would in this instance be plan led as it would not be in accordance with the stated objective of the Development Plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area".

We urge the Board to have the same perspective on Coumnagappul Wind Farm and to refuse the development.

### Water Supply

The mountain where this development is proposed is the source of the water supply to my farm and to my elderly mother who lives in the farmhouse. I have spent nearly 60 years in this area and there has never been a problem with the water supply. From reading the documents submitted by the Applicant in relation to water, it is clear that the assessment has not been completed to a high standard. From my own knowledge of the mountain, and research on the GSI website it is very clear that this development is planned for an area that is unsuitable. The majority of the area is covered in blanket peat which in turn makes the groundwater extremely vulnerable to contamination. The "mitigation measures" in the application are unsatisfactory, particularly silt fencing. We must be allowed to continue living with our clean water supply and not subject my elderly mother and farm animals to contaminated water.

#### **Photomontages**

Assessment of Visual Impacts at Viewshed Reference Points pg 11 of 15 View Point 21

Values associated with the view	V916	VP17	VP18	VP19	VP20	WP21	W22	WPZ3	VP24	W25	WP26	V927	VP28	WP29	W30
Susceptibility of viewers to changes in views															
Recognised scenic value of the view															
Views from within highly sensitive landscape areas															
Primary views from residences					THE STATE OF		278			103		-24			
intensity of use, popularity (number of viewers)								21							18
Viewer connection with the landscape		hill												9 7	
Provision of vast elevated phnoramic serve of remotioness /															
tranquility at the vewing location															
Degree of perceived naturalness				STIE											
Presence of striking or noteworthy features							4						1		
Sense of Hutorical cultural and / or spiritual significance															
Parity or uniqueness of the view															
integrity of the landscape character within the view					F H						100		10-1		196
Sense of place at the viewing location															
Sense of awe														-	0
Overall sensitivity	нм	84	FAR.	м	м	N.	HM	нм	н	HM	нм	нм	#CPM	м	**

The image seen in Viewpoint 21 was taken from the road outside my home. As can be seen from the grid below the box for "Historical, cultural and / or spiritual significance" remains blank. I am disappointed that during the "thorough" assessment of the area the Applicant failed to notice the stone erected at the home I grew up in, which I might add is only 100m from Viewpoint 21.



It is presumed the Applicant purposefully omitted this historical landmark as the photographer would have passed the monument to take photographs at Viewpoint 19. The Applicant also would have driven passed the road sign for the monument located at Scart Bridge, which is a protected structure (RPS number WA751040). This road sign was erected by the Waterford City and County Council as guidance for the many tourists who come to see the monument and visit the place Eamon De Valera took refuge.



In the grid above the space for "Recognised scenic value of the view" is also blank. I would like to point out to the Board that is area is also the route of the Comeragh Drive, as can be seen in the photo attached. It is unacceptable that the Applicant blatantly withheld important information from this assessment and it should not be accepted by the Board.

#### **Underground Grid Connection Route C**

### 110kV Grid Connection Feasibility Study page 17

"The second option is to progress UGC Option C [Magenta] as the preferred grid connection option for the project. UGC Option C is the shortest of the three routes options. Option C is required to cross 6 bridges along the route. However, the success of this grid connection option is highly dependent on landowner consent for the off-road UGC sections of the route. Landowners should therefore be engaged at an early outset given the potential resistance to a new UGC outlined above. This route has obvious objectors to the wind farm and there could be a potential risk for a cable route."

As a farmer who owns land on both sides of the road, I will **not** give permission to the Applicant to use my land for the underground cable route. This route also passes through Scart Bridge, pictured below.



Figure 7 - Bridge C6 towards Dungarvan Substation

As mentioned above Scart Bridge is a protected structure listed in the Waterford City and County Development Plan-RPS number WA751040. Once again the Applicant has shown a very poor level of assessment for this proposed development.

#### 110kV Grid Connection Feasibility Study page 13

"It is proposed the UGC would then pass through a private agricultural access track which leads to the windfarm."

This "private agricultural access track" is in fact the L51162.

"The UGC would pass through Folios WD9242, WD5865 & an unregistered folio for approx. 2,270m".

The section of unregistered land is part of Bleantasour Mountain commonage that a number of farmers hold a right in common for We most definitely will

our property which will facilitate this development.

It is clear that due care has not been given to this application. This is extremely worrying for the residents who will be forced to live underneath this colossal development. We ask the Board to refuse this application and to protect our water, animals and land and to allow the Comeragh Mountains to remain in its current unspoiled state.

Patrick Cullinan

Denise Cullinan