

The Secretary,
An Coimisiún Pleanála,
64 Marlborough St.,
Dublin 1
D01 V902.

8th July 2026

Re: **Further Planning submission:**
An Coimisiún Pleanála - Case reference: PAX07.323761
Applicant: Neoen Renewables Ireland Limited
Details: Construction of wind energy development and all associated works.
Location: Cloondahamper (Blake), Cloonascragh, Elmhill, Cooloo, Lecarrow, Dangan Eighter, Lissavally and Slievegorm in County Galway.
My client: John Fahy of Coolwoneen, Moylough, Ballinasloe, Co. Galway,

Dear Sirs,

I refer to my Planning Submission dated 6th November 2025, submitted on behalf of Mr. John Fahy.

Following the invitation issued by An Coimisiún Pleanála dated 5th June 2026, I have reviewed the Applicant's Response to Third Party Submissions together with the Applicant's Response to the Report of Galway County Council.

I am of the opinion that the Applicant has not materially addressed the planning concerns raised in my original submission on behalf of Mr. Fahy.

Instead, the Applicant's response largely consists of references back to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR), the Planning Report and specialist technical appendices originally submitted with the application.

While this may explain the basis upon which the Applicant relies, it does not adequately rebut the specific planning concerns raised by Mr. Fahy as an immediately affected neighbouring resident.

Accordingly, my client's objections remain substantially unchanged, and I wish to add the following details:

1. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

My original submission highlighted the exceptional proximity of Mr. Fahy's dwelling to the proposed development, with two turbines located within approximately 800 metres of the dwelling and Turbine T4 approximately 750 metres away.

The Applicant's response places significant reliance upon compliance with ETSU-R-97, the 2006 Wind Energy Development Guidelines and various international studies regarding wind turbine health effects.

However, these responses are generic in nature and do not specifically address the effect of this development on the residential amenity of Mr. Fahy's dwelling.

In particular, the Applicant has not demonstrated why turbines of up to 180 metres in height can be accommodated at such close proximity to an existing family home without materially affecting the peaceful enjoyment of that property.

Compliance with guideline noise limits should not automatically be interpreted as demonstrating that residential amenity will remain unaffected.

2. NOISE

My original submission referred not only to overall noise levels but also to concerns regarding:

- amplitude modulation;
- tonal characteristics;
- low frequency noise;
- long-term nuisance; and
- sleep disturbance.

The Applicant's response largely consists of technical discussion regarding noise assessment methodology and references to published literature.

However, the response does not satisfactorily address the cumulative effect of noise experienced by a resident located approximately 750 metres from a turbine within an otherwise quiet rural environment.

The appointment of a Community Liaison Officer and the investigation of complaints after commissioning cannot properly be regarded as mitigation of an impact which should first be avoided through appropriate siting and design.

3. ALTERNATIVE SITING

My original submission stated that alternative, more remote siting locations should have been explored.

The Applicant responds by referring to the overall site selection process and planning constraints.

However, no meaningful explanation is provided as to why Turbines T2 and T4 could not have been repositioned further from existing occupied dwellings.

In the absence of such justification, I remain of the opinion that the proposal has failed to demonstrate that the current layout represents the least intrusive design available.

4. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

The Applicant relies primarily upon the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment contained within the EIAR.

While the LVIA assesses visual effects using accepted methodology, it does not alter the practical reality that structures up to 180 metres in height represent an industrial-scale intervention within a predominantly agricultural rural landscape characterised by dispersed family dwellings.

The Applicant has not satisfactorily addressed this fundamental planning concern.

5. TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY

My original submission questioned whether the existing rural road network was capable of safely accommodating the transportation of turbine components together with the associated construction traffic.

The Applicant's response concludes that traffic effects will generally be slight and temporary.

However, this conclusion is principally derived from traffic modelling. It does not adequately address the practical difficulties associated with transporting abnormal loads on narrow rural roads regularly used by local residents, agricultural vehicles and school transport.

It is also noted that Galway County Council itself raised concerns regarding aspects of the traffic proposals and recommended further road safety measures and conditions in the event of any grant of permission.

This demonstrates that the traffic implications are not as straightforward as suggested by the Applicant.

6. HYDROLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RISK

The Applicant's response to concerns regarding groundwater, private water supplies and environmental impacts consists primarily of references back to the original EIAR and specialist reports.

While these documents may form part of the application, they do not conclusively address the concerns previously raised regarding the potential consequences of excavation, drainage works and construction activities within peatland and agricultural environments.

Given the precautionary principle which applies in environmental assessment, I remain of the opinion that these concerns have not been satisfactorily resolved.

7. PROPERTY IMPACT

My original submission referred to the likely decrease in the residential attractiveness and practical enjoyment of Mr. Fahy's dwelling.

The Applicant has not responded to this issue.

While property value itself is not generally a planning consideration, the planning consequences which give rise to any loss of value—including diminished residential amenity, increased visual dominance, noise and disturbance—are unquestionably relevant planning matters.

Accordingly, this aspect of my original submission remains unanswered.

8. PLANNING POLICY

The Applicant places considerable reliance upon Galway County Council's observation that the principle of wind energy development may be acceptable subject to proper planning and sustainable development.

My submission has never disputed the principle of renewable energy development.

Rather, my concern relates to the appropriateness of this particular development, in this particular location, having regard to the proximity of existing dwellings, the scale of the turbines proposed and the cumulative impact upon the surrounding rural environment.

The existence of national renewable energy policy cannot remove the obligation upon the Applicant to demonstrate that this proposal represents proper planning and sustainable development at this location.

9. CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the Applicant's Response to Third Party Submissions and the Applicant's Response to Galway County Council, I remain of the opinion that the concerns raised in my original submission have not been satisfactorily addressed.

The Applicant's responses rely upon references to the original EIAR and supporting technical documentation but do not materially rebut the planning concerns raised by my client as an immediately affected neighbouring resident.

Accordingly, I respectfully submit that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development can proceed without giving rise to unacceptable impacts on residential amenity, landscape character, road safety and the rural environment.

For these reasons, and for the reasons set out in my original submission dated 6th November 2025, I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the proposed development.

I trust this is in order.

Yours faithfully,



Daniel Melia, B.eng., C.eng., M.I.E.I.,