

Case Number- ACP-323761-25

Rebuttal to MKO Response

Having read the documents provided I have noticed that MKO has responded to a number of issues under broad thematic headings, but many of the specific concerns raised in my submission remain unanswered. Their response largely refers back to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) and other application documents without addressing the individual circumstances of my home, family and farming enterprise.

1. Impact on My Home and Family

My submission explained that my home is located approximately 1km from Turbines 1 and 3 and approximately 250 metres from the proposed substation and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). I outlined the cumulative effects that these elements would have on my family's quality of life through noise, shadow flicker, visual intrusion and the proximity of major energy infrastructure.

MKO refers generally to **Sections 2.5 (Population & Human Health), 2.11 (Landscape & Visual) and 2.4.1 (Grid Connection)** but does not assess the cumulative impact of turbines together with the nearby substation and BESS on my individual property.

2. Property Rights and Future Family Use of Land

My submission raised constitutional concerns under **Article 43 of Bunreacht na hÉireann** together with rights protected under **Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights**. I explained that the development would significantly restrict future residential development on family lands and undermine the practical ability to transfer land to future generations.

MKO does not address these legal arguments.

Instead, **Section 2.5.3 (Community Impact)** discusses general research concerning property values. It does not consider the constitutional issues raised, nor the practical sterilisation of my family lands for future housing of my children and future generations.

3. Property Devaluation

My submission referred to research from the University of Galway demonstrating reductions in property values near wind farms and explained that my recently constructed family home has already been adversely affected, and will continue to be affected if this planning is granted.

MKO's response relies upon broader literature regarding property values but does not engage with the University of Galway research specifically referenced in my submission or explain why

its findings should not be afforded weight. They acknowledge that a devaluation will happen but use international literature to offset the impact.

Any impact on my home is too much impact.

4. Farming Impacts

My submission explained that farming is both my livelihood and my family's way of life. I described the likely impacts arising from construction traffic, road disruptions, cattle movements, ongoing maintenance activities and the enjoyment of farming lands affected by noise, shadow flicker and visual intrusion.

MKO provides general commentary regarding construction management but does not specifically address the practical consequences for farmers using local roads daily or the cumulative operational impacts on nearby agricultural activity. They make note about diversions but diversions within farming are not always possible or feasible.

5. Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme

My submission expressed concern regarding the protection of the Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme, particularly given that two turbines are proposed within the Source Protection Area in highly karstified geology.

Although MKO refers generally to hydrogeological assessments and environmental management measures, it does not directly explain why locating turbines within the Source Protection Area poses no unacceptable risk to this important drinking water supply.

6. Community Consultation

My submission detailed several shortcomings in the consultation process, including:

- my property being omitted from consultation maps;
- representatives being unable to answer questions regarding road alterations at Dangan;
- the absence of meaningful follow-up after concerns were raised.

In **Section 2.2.1 (Community Consultation & Engagement)** MKO simply lists consultation activities undertaken.

However, it does not respond to these specific deficiencies or explain why affected residents were not provided with complete or accurate information.

7. Project Splitting

My submission objected to the applicant seeking permission for the turbines while postponing planning applications for the substation, BESS and grid connection, despite these forming integral parts of the overall development.

MKO addresses this issue in **Section 2.1.4 (Project Splitting)** by stating that the associated infrastructure has been assessed within the EIAR.

This does not answer the principal concern that the public cannot assess or make submissions on the final design and planning application for infrastructure located approximately 250 metres from my home before a decision is made on the turbines.

8. Fire Safety and Emergency Response

My submission also raised concerns regarding the proposed substation and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), particularly in light of questions raised in relation to similar developments elsewhere.

MKO refers to **Section 2.15 (Major Accidents and Natural Disasters)** and states that fire risks are considered low and that appropriate management plans will be prepared.

However, this does not address whether:

- Galway Fire & Rescue Service possesses specialist training for lithium-ion battery fires;
- local retained fire stations have the equipment required to respond to prolonged thermal runaway events;
- emergency response times have been assessed;
- nearby residents have been considered in emergency planning; or
- the Fire Authority has confirmed that existing resources are adequate.

These important public safety concerns remain unanswered.

Conclusion

Overall, MKO's response relies heavily upon generic references to the EIAR rather than engaging with the specific issues raised in my submission.

My principal concerns have not been directly addressed.

I ask that An Coimisiún Pleanála see that much of MKO's response is merely repeating general statements contained within the EIAR without responding to the specific evidence and concerns submitted by affected local residents.

Sincerely,

Shane Stone