



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Record of 2nd Meeting ABP-323038-25

Case Reference / Description	Proposed Development of 24 no. wind turbines, associated hardstands, electrical cabling, site development works, and an onsite 110kV substation and grid connection located in the townlands of Ballyguiry, Carronadavderg, Carronahyla, Carronbeg and others in County Waterford		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th Meeting	2 nd Meeting		
Date	24/02/2026	Start Time	11:30am
Location	Virtually	End Time	1:00pm

Representing An Coimisiún Pleanála
Una Crosse, Assistant Planning Director
Susan Clarke, Senior Planning Inspector
Emmet Smyth, Scientist
Paula Kearney, Ecologist
Sinead White, Executive Officer

Representing the Prospective Applicant
Ronan Dunne, MKO
Sean McCarthey, MKO
Natalia Stolarska, MKO

Eoin McCarthy, MKO
Emily Fair, MKO
Corey Cannon, MKO
Aran von der Geest Moroney, MKO
Susan Doyle, MKO
William O'Connor, Turnkey Development Limited
Daniel Feury, Turnkey Development Limited

Introduction

The Commission's representatives referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant requesting a second pre-application meeting and referred to the first meeting held on 16th October 2025.

Presentation:

The prospective applicant set out their presentation, which is attached to the file.

Discussion:

Update on Development Proposal/Development Description

- The Commission's representatives requested that the Prospective Applicant submit a revised detailed development description.
- The Commission's representatives advised the Prospective Applicant to consult with the Local Authority's Transportation Department with respect to works to local roads and new sight entrances.
- The Prospective Applicant stated that the turbine model and delivery route are yet to be confirmed.
- The Commission's representatives advised the Prospective Applicant to consult with ESB/EirGrid in relation to grid connection works in advance of submitting an application.

- The Prospective Applicant advised that there is no BESS proposed as part of the application.
- The Commission's representatives highlighted the requirement to seek landowners' consent, where relevant, to make the planning application.
- The Prospective Applicant advised that all construction material for access tracks, hardstanding areas, etc. will be locally sourced from borrow pits.

Biodiversity & Ornithology

- Commission's representatives highlighted recent revisions in NatureScot guidelines with respect to Collision Risk Modelling (CRM), *Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore windfarms* (NatureScot, 2025). The Commission's representatives requested that the rationale for determining which species are included/excluded from CRM analyses be provided. The Commission's representatives recommended discussing the findings and potential mitigation measures with the DAU prior to the lodgement of the planning application.
- Commission's representatives advised that a robust methodological approach is required to address the potential impacts on birds within the proposed wind farm site, including cumulative and in combination effects from all relevant developments for the appropriate area, using best practice techniques and scientific knowledge, to include population level references for assessment and context of magnitude of impact.
- Commission's representatives advised that a comprehensive evidence base is required to validate the effectiveness of the site's specific mitigation measures for ecological receptors in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy.
- Commission's representatives advised that a detailed and scientifically robust evidence base is required to substantiate the effectiveness of the proposed site specific mitigation measures, ensuring they are capable of avoiding, or reducing to negligible levels, any adverse effects on the qualifying interests and special conservation interests of European sites.

- Commission's representatives advised of the need to provide a robust evidence-based assessment on potential impacts on Freshwater Pearl Mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*), a critically endangered species highly sensitive to siltation, nutrient enrichment, and hydrological changes, which requires integrated coordination between the Prospective Applicants' ecologists, hydrologists and engineers. Commission's representatives advised that the assessment has regard to relevant site-specific conservation objectives (SSCOs) and up to date regulatory guidance.
- Prospective applicant outlined that baseline aquatic ecology surveys will be completed upstream and downstream of the proposed river crossings. The results will be used to characterise existing conditions and to inform the scope and design of ecological monitoring during the construction phase.
- Otter, bat and breeding bird surveys are also to be conducted, in accordance with best practice guidelines, at water crossings within the wind farm site, and on the turbine delivery and grid connection routes.
- If required, Regulation 54 derogation licences for Annex IV species are to be obtained in advance of submitting the application.
- Commission's representatives advised that where possible, the removal of linear vegetation on the turbine delivery route and grid connection route should be minimised. Vegetation management to be conducted outside the Bird Nesting Season.
- Commission's representatives stated that an invasive species survey and management plan to include the wind farm site, turbine delivery route and grid connection route should be prepared.
- Commission's representatives advised that the impact assessment should address how habitats altered by the wind farm construction and biodiversity enhancement measures may affect future wildlife use of the site and identify measures to enhance biodiversity under postconstruction conditions.
- Commission's representatives outlined that biodiversity enhancement measures should include management proposals, monitoring and adaptive measures

covering short, medium and long term. Evidence of enhancement measurements' effectiveness should also be provided where relevant.

Hydrology and Land & Soils

- Commission's representatives recommended that a robust evidence basis for the sizing of the settlement ponds and demonstrates adequate settlement and retention times for settlement of particulates.
- The Commission's representatives advised that detailed proposals should be provided with respect to the borrow pits and spoil storage areas with respect to dewatering, water management and pollution control. Detailed hydrological assessments required to assess potential alteration to groundwater flow regimes and any potential impact on receiving waterbodies.
- Commission's representatives queried the proposal to remove the clay pan and rerouting of the drains in areas of construction and potential for alteration to ground water flow patterns across the site and how this could infringe on hydrology features across the site.
- Prospective applicant outlined that there are springs and flushes in the west of the area. Clay pan (impermeable layer) was observed close to Borrow pit 1.
- Regarding the borrow pits and the potential elevated groundwaters and groundwaters, the Commission's representatives queried what kind of water management is proposed and if there be a discharge from said pits.
- The prospective applicant outlined that clear felling is likely, including within the Goish_10 sub-catchment. The Commission's representatives advised that significant pressures pertaining to forestry and Anthropogenic have been identified within this sub-catchment. In addition, the Bricky, which borders the site to the north, is also under pressures from Hymo, Ag and unknown sources.
- The Commission's representatives advised of the requirement to provide robust evidence based WFD Assessment.

Appropriate Assessment

- The Commission's representatives advised that:
 - EIA and AA reporting should employ most up to date guidance for survey and assessment, with clear and concise reporting.
 - Set out survey methodology guidelines followed including assumptions, limitations, timings, duration, detailing any deviations from guidance and include justifications/rationale for same.
 - Clearly identify ecological receptors and provide detailed rationale as to the selection of KERs brought forward to assessment.
 - Outline how 3rd party submissions are addressed in the reporting.

Conclusion:

The Commission's representatives advised that the onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Commission's representatives advised that the record of the 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.

The Meeting concluded at 1:00pm.



Una Crosse

Assistant Director of Planning