

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Anne Cunningham

Hillsbrook

Barnaderg

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 14 November 2025

Re: Observation/Submission to proposed wind energy development at Cooloo Wind Farm

Location: Cloondahamper, Cloonascragh, Elmhill, Cooloo, Lecarrow, Dangan Eighter, Lissavally, Slievegorm
- Co. Galway

Applicant: Neoen Renewables Ireland Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm living in Hillsbrook and three of the turbines are within 1.5km of my house, the closest is 1.38km. I experience dizziness and nausea when I'm close by to turbines and I experienced this recently when I was touring with friends in the Galway wind park. The thought of looking at this massive imposing development out my window every day is extremely worrying and traumatising. I strongly object to this development as it will be extremely bad for my mental health and ruin any aspect of security I feel in my home. The vibration and noise from these industrial turbines will ruin my tranquility and I definitely feel that it will impact on the foundation of my home, let alone the value of my property which could be devalued by up to 15% according to a study from university of Galway. I love the wildlife in my area and the decimation it will cause to the homes of the wildlife and especially birds in the bogland. I've personally witnessed the common newt in the area which is the only remaining lizard in Ireland now. I like to go for walks in the area and if this development goes ahead it will inhibit my personal freedom and I won't be able to enjoy the rural scenery. I'm also concerned about the disruption to our roads which are not built for heavy traffic and there's expected to be 120 loads to pour the foundation of just one turbine in 1 day. It will also cause disruption to my daily life and the roads will be closed restricting my access to essential services let alone emergency services should they be required. The access road coming from lissavally is directly passing my property in Dangan eighter, no one consulted me about the effect on my property and this road could lead to trespassers causing damage to

my property.

Community Consultation and Engagement

The basis that the community consultation process was carried out by Neoen and MKO for the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm has been fundamentally inadequate and does not meet the standards of meaningful public engagement required under the Draft Revised Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2019) or An Bord Pleanála's Strategic Infrastructure Development protocols.

The consultation was poorly publicised, using the Irish Examiner, a Cork-based paper with minimal reach in north-east Galway, for statutory notices instead of the Tuam Herald, the area's primary local newspaper. This choice deprived many residents of awareness and opportunity to participate.

Claims of engagement with "local groups, clubs and schools" are inaccurate. Key organisations such as Killenerin Community Council and Killenerin GAA received no correspondence or invitations to contribute. Furthermore, no public consultation meeting was held in Moylough, where seven of the nine turbines are proposed, further excluding the most affected residents.

Reported "door-to-door engagement" reached just 55 homes within 1 km of the turbines, yielding only ten written responses which is an unacceptably low level of participation for a project of this scale. Reliance on online materials was ineffective given poor broadband in the area.

Overall, the process was selective, poorly targeted, and misleading in its presentation of local engagement. These failings undermine the project's compliance with public participation standards and should be given significant weight in An Bord Pleanála's assessment.

Planning Framework and Guidelines

The continued reliance on the Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 is no longer appropriate or proportionate given the significant evolution of wind energy technology and the clear advancements in scientific understanding since their publication nearly two decades ago. The 2006 Guidelines were developed in an era when turbines were typically less than 100 metres in height and generated 1–2 MW of power. The turbines in this proposed development will be 180 metres and produce approximately 6 MW of power. This will result in greater visual, acoustic, and environmental impacts than those contemplated in 2006.

The fact that the Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 has been acknowledged in the Dáil many times by many different people. In 2013 Deputy Michéal Martin told, the then Taoiseach, Enda Kenny that the guidelines were outdated and were never framed in the context of the new technology. Yet in 2025 Tánaiste Simon Harris is still saying in the Dáil that he acknowledges that the guidelines are outdated and that there is a specific commitment from the Government to prioritise the publication of new guidelines.

It is therefore unreasonable and contrary to the principles of proper planning and sustainable development for An Coimisiún Pleanála to continue to rely solely on the 2006 Guidelines. An Coimisiún Pleanála must make sure that any decision made is not based on outdated standards.

Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme

I use the water from Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme as my main source of drinking water for my household. The water is of excellent quality and I am very concerned that pollution of various types such as silt, sediment and other contaminants will enter the water source, causing me and my family harm. With the location of two Turbines within the Source Protection Area (SPA) I believe the Cooloo Windfarm should not be granted permission whatsoever, especially in such a highly karsified and hydrologically sensitive area.

Right to Own/Transfer Property

Article 43.1.2 of Bunreacht na hÉireann provides that “the State accordingly guarantees to pass no law attempting to abolish the right of private ownership or the general right to transfer, bequeath, and inherit property.” Granting permission for this wind farm development would effectively undermine this constitutional protection. Landowners and farmers within the affected area would face significant restrictions, as land situated near turbines would become unsuitable for residential development. This would prevent families from transferring land for the purpose of building homes for future generations, thereby eroding their practical rights of ownership and inheritance.

Furthermore, Article 43.2.1 acknowledges that the exercise of property rights must be regulated by the principles of social justice. However, this proposed development cannot be regarded as socially just. It disproportionately burdens local residents while providing little to no direct benefit to the community. Those of us living in the area would experience substantial and lasting impacts — including increased traffic and road closures during construction, ongoing noise pollution, shadow flicker, and significant visual intrusion on our landscape. In addition, there remains insufficient scientific evidence to conclusively demonstrate that large-scale wind farms pose no long-term health risks to nearby residents. In these circumstances, permitting this development would be neither fair nor consistent with the principles of social justice recognised under Article 43.

Right to Peaceful Enjoyment of Property

Article 1, Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) safeguards every individual's right to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. It provides that: “Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.”

Approval of this proposed wind farm would constitute a clear interference with this right. If the development proceeds, I will be deprived of the peaceful enjoyment of my home and property. The construction and operation phases would bring significant and continuous disturbance — including persistent noise pollution, low-frequency noise (LFN), shadow flicker, and heavy vehicle movements. The tranquillity and visual amenity of my surroundings, which form an intrinsic part of my home environment and well-being, would be irreversibly diminished.

During construction, the constant flow of heavy machinery and associated noise would cause ongoing disruption and stress, further impacting daily life. Once operational, the presence of industrial-scale turbines dominating the landscape would permanently alter the character of the area, stripping residents of the quiet enjoyment of their homes and lands. This level of intrusion cannot be considered proportionate or justified in the public interest, and therefore conflicts with the protections afforded under Article 1, Protocol 1 of the ECHR.

Property Devaluation

A study from the University of Galway and international research indicates that homes within 1 km of wind turbines experience adverse effects on property value, with reductions of up to 14.7%. My home falls within this range, and I am deeply concerned about the financial and emotional impact this will have on my family and our future prospects. The planning application does not appear to address or mitigate this issue.

<https://www.universityofgalway.ie/media/researchsites/ceris/files/WP-2023-01.pdf>

Noise

Planning permission for the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm should be refused on the basis that it poses a clear

and foreseeable risk of substantial interference with the normal use and enjoyment of nearby homes. In *Byrne & Moorhead v ABO Energy* [2025] IEHC 330, the Irish High Court found that wind turbine noise—specifically low-frequency and amplitude-modulated sound—constituted a private nuisance under common law, as it significantly disrupted residents' ordinary domestic life. The Court held that such noise amounted to an unreasonable and continuous intrusion, preventing the quiet occupation of the home and resulting in the permanent shutdown of three turbines in County Wexford.

The Cooloo proposal relies on outdated ETSU-based noise criteria that fail to account for the same low-frequency and modulated noise effects found to cause substantial nuisance in the Wexford case. Given the proposed turbines' greater height and rotor size, the likelihood of these harmful acoustic effects occurring at Cooloo is even higher. Approving this development under obsolete standards would disregard the High Court's findings and expose local residents to predictable and legally recognized interference with their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes. Planning permission should therefore be refused in full on these grounds.

Shadow Flicker

Chapter 5 of the EIAR ('Population and Human Health') states that the nearest residential property is 720 metres away from the closest wind turbine (T8). However, there is no mention of a house (Eircode H53 FF64) that is 530 metres away from Turbines 4 and 5 and 600 metres away from Turbine 8. This property is not accounted for at all in the EIAR.

The Wind Energy Guidelines of 2006 advise a setback distance between a wind turbine and a house of 500 metres. These guidelines are almost 20 years old and outdated.

The 2019 Draft Wind Energy Development Guidelines suggest a mandatory minimum setback distance of 500 metres between a wind turbine and the nearest residential property, and 4 times the tip height, whichever is greater.

Shadow flicker, caused by the rotating blades of wind turbines casting intermittent shadows, can have a significant impact on nearby residents. Prolonged exposure to these flickering shadows can cause visual discomfort, headaches, and even trigger migraines in susceptible individuals. Adequate setback distances and screening measures should be implemented to minimize the potential health effects associated with shadow flicker.

National Schools

The presence of wind turbines near schools can have a range of impacts on students, staff, and the overall learning environment. Wind turbines produce both audible noise and low-frequency infrasound, which can be noticeable inside buildings, which can cause a distraction. This constant distraction will interfere with children's attention and overall cognitive performance, making it more difficult for students to focus on learning.

- Cooloo NS is 1.59km away from the nearest wind turbine.
- Brierfield NS is 1.35 km away from the nearest wind turbine.
- Barnaderg NS is located approximately 3.49 km from the nearest wind turbine.

Shadow flicker caused by rotating turbine blades can create intermittent light in classrooms, which can be distracting and, in some cases, uncomfortable or stressful for children. The noise and shadow flicker will also greatly impact on the children in the school who have an additional need. There is a lack of research to state the impact on these children.

In addition to the above, during the construction phase and while laying the cabling, the roads will experience increased traffic and road closures. This will impact children travelling to and from school. While the severity of these impacts depends on distance from the turbines, it is clear that wind turbines in close proximity to

schools have the potential to disrupt learning, reduce student wellbeing, and interfere with the overall educational experience.

Barnaderg National School

Barnaderg National School is located approximately 3.49 km from Turbine No 1.

The turbines being this close to the school will no doubt have an impact on the education of the children in Barnaderg NS. The school will suffer from noise pollution and infrasound. In addition to this, during the construction phase and while laying cabling the roads to and from the school will be impacted by road closures, traffic, additional noise and dust. Again, all of this will impact on the children of the school.

I am also concerned that if t planning permission is granted less people will be moving to or building in the area of Barnaderg. This will lead to fewer children in the community and may lead to the school losing teachers, and ultimately the school closure.

Biodiversity impact

I object to the proposed development on the grounds of its significant and permanent impact on biodiversity, including legally protected habitats and species.

The project's Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) acknowledges a residual adverse effect on Degraded Raised Bog (habitat 7120), a habitat of County Importance with capacity for natural regeneration (EIAR Ch. 6, p. 142). Construction of the proposed floating access road between turbines T7 and T9 will directly remove approximately 0.18 ha of this sensitive peatland and disrupt its hydrological balance (EIAR Ch. 6, Sec. 6.5.2.1.1). This is contrary to the conservation obligations set out under the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC).

The site supports cutover bogs (PB4) and Marsh Fritillary (*Euphydryas aurinia*), an Annex II species protected under European law. Breeding webs were recorded near turbine T5 within metres of proposed construction works (EIAR Ch. 6, Sec. 6.4.3.3). The disturbance, dust, and drainage changes associated with turbine and road construction threaten the species' survival locally, directly conflicting with Ireland's duty to maintain favourable conservation status for Annex II species.

The EIAR highlights potential effects on hydrology and connected wetland systems that could degrade otter (*Lutra lutra*) habitat and aquatic fauna (EIAR Ch. 6, Sec. 6.5.2.1.1 and 6.2.2). Otters are also protected under Annex II of the Habitats Directive, and any degradation of their habitat represents a breach of Ireland's legal obligations.

These outcomes are inconsistent with the objectives of the National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023–2030, which seeks to prevent net biodiversity loss. Allowing this development to proceed would contradict national policy commitments and international conservation obligations.

Given the acknowledged residual adverse effects on protected habitats and species, I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for this development. The permanent loss and degradation of biodiversity cannot be justified, particularly where protected species and habitats are involved.

References:

- EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)
- National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023–2030
- EIAR Chapter 6 (Biodiversity)
- An Coimisiún Pleanála Case 323761

Biodiversity Impact - Bats

I object on the grounds that the assessment of bat mortality risk is inadequate and fails to meet current scientific standards for acoustic monitoring and mitigation.

Wind turbines are well-documented sources of bat mortality through collision and barotrauma. Recent peer-reviewed research by Behr et al. (2023, *Mammal Review*, 53: 65–71) confirms that bat fatalities can be reliably estimated only where standardised, referenced acoustic monitoring protocols are applied. The Cooloo Wind Farm EIA does not demonstrate compliance with these standards.

- No evidence of standardised, referenced acoustic monitoring at nacelle level
- Ground-level acoustic surveys and short-term transects are insufficient and cannot predict turbine-specific collision risk
- The proposed tall, large-rotor turbines increase collision risk and monitoring uncertainty
- No commitment to validated curtailment systems (such as ProBat) which have been shown to substantially reduce bat mortality
- Absence of site-specific validation and continuous monitoring means bat fatalities may be severely underestimated

Under the EU Habitats Directive (Articles 12 and 16) and the Wildlife Acts 1976–2018, all Irish bat species are strictly protected. Developers and planning authorities have a legal duty to ensure projects do not result in deliberate killing or disturbance of bats or deterioration of their breeding or resting sites. The absence of scientifically robust, standardised acoustic monitoring represents a significant procedural and ecological shortcoming.

I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála require:

- Standardised, referenced acoustic monitoring following international best practice
- Nacelle-mounted, calibrated detectors to monitor bat activity continuously throughout operation
- Validated curtailment systems (e.g. ProBat) to automatically shut down turbines during high bat activity
- Independent review and public reporting of all monitoring protocols and data
- Precautionary curtailment during high-risk seasons until adequate local reference data are available

Reference:

- Behr, O., Brinkmann, R., Mages, J., Niermann, I., Korner-Nievergelt, F., & Voigt, C. C. (2023). Standardised and referenced acoustic monitoring reliably estimates bat fatalities at wind turbines. *Mammal Review*, 53(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12302>

Biodiversity Impact - Earthworms

I object on the grounds that the Environmental Impact Assessment fails to address the impacts of wind turbine-induced vibrational noise on soil biodiversity and ecosystem function, particularly earthworm populations.

Recent peer-reviewed research by Velilla et al. (2021, *Oikos*, 130(7), 1033–1047) demonstrates that wind turbines generate continuous low-frequency vibrations (< 500 Hz) that travel considerable distances through soil. Key findings include:

- Vibrational noise decreased by only 23 ± 7 dB over 200 metres, meaning measurable vibration extends well beyond turbine bases
- Earthworm abundance declined by approximately 40% near turbines compared to sampling points further away
- Soil compaction and crop type were ruled out, confirming vibrational noise was the primary cause
- The impact is body-size-dependent, especially harmful to earthworms and other large soil invertebrates

Earthworms are critical "ecosystem engineers" essential to soil health and agricultural productivity. A 40% decline in their populations can lead to:

- Reduced soil aeration and water infiltration, increasing flooding and erosion risks
- Disruption of nutrient cycling and carbon sequestration, undermining soil fertility and climate regulation
- Deterioration of soil structure and microbial balance, impacting crop performance and long-term land viability

These impacts are especially concerning in productive agricultural soils. The Cooloo site shares characteristics with the farmland studied by Velilla et al. (2021) — organically managed, rural, and composed of active agricultural soils.

The Environmental Impact Assessment submitted for Cooloo does not address subsurface vibrational noise or its potential to degrade soil ecosystems. This represents a significant omission in the assessment of environmental and agricultural impacts.

I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála require:

- Comprehensive assessment of soil-borne vibrational noise impacts
- Evaluation of effects on soil macrofauna, especially earthworms
- Protective buffer zones of at least 200–250 metres from turbine bases to high-value agricultural soils
- Vibration-dampening measures in turbine design and foundations
- Soil biodiversity indicators in post-construction monitoring

Reference:

- Velilla, E., Collinson, E., Bellato, L., Berg, M.P., & Halfwerk, W. (2021). Vibrational noise from wind energy turbines negatively impacts earthworm abundance. *Oikos*, 130(7), 1033–1047.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08166>

Road disruption during construction

I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of significant traffic and road safety impacts during construction, particularly in relation to abnormal load deliveries. The Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 15-2) lacks essential detail, including the number, timing and routing of heavy goods and turbine loads, and commitments to off-peak scheduling. Without clear and enforceable mitigation, there is a risk of damage to narrow rural roads, verges and drainage, along with conflicts between construction vehicles, farm traffic and school transport. No robust plan has been presented for road strengthening, maintenance or reinstatement. The absence of detailed community-specific measures leaves local access, amenity and safety inadequately protected. Until comprehensive information and binding commitments are provided, the proposal represents an unacceptable risk to road infrastructure and rural community wellbeing. Having roads closed for a combined 210 days (at a minimum) is unacceptable. It is also unacceptable for locals to have diversions of up to 13.7km per journey for the duration of this project.

Climate impact

I object to the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm because it would damage Ireland's ability to meet its climate targets under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2021. By excavating peat and clearing mature forest, this project will release large amounts of stored carbon and increase emissions from the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) sector, which is already a major source of greenhouse gases. Under the law, all public bodies must act consistently with national carbon budgets. Allowing a development that worsens LULUCF emissions contradicts that duty and the EU 'no debit' rule under Regulation (EU) 2018/841. Renewable energy projects are important, but they should not come at the cost of destroying carbon-rich habitats or undermining Ireland's long-term environmental obligations.

Battery storage and substation safety risks

I object on the grounds of unacceptable risks to public health, fire safety, and water contamination posed by

the proposed substation and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS).

The developer's own Appendix 12-3 Battery Storage Noise Assessment (Sept 2025) identifies fifteen CATL EnerC+ battery containers containing lithium-ion (LiFePO₄) systems manufactured by CATL. Predicted operational noise levels reach up to 31 dB LAeq at nearby homes, representing an increase of +11 to +14 dB above background levels. The report itself classifies this as a "significant adverse impact" on residential amenity. Scientific research shows that chronic noise above 30 dB can raise risks of cardiovascular disease and sleep disturbance.

Lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) installations worldwide have experienced fires and explosions that release toxic gases such as hydrogen fluoride and hydrogen cyanide. Research shows that fire-water run-off from lithium-ion battery fires can contain hydrofluoric acid, dissolved metals, and fluorinated organic compounds, which may contaminate nearby soil and waterways if not properly contained.

This proposed Substation and BESS would have a major impact on The Lough Corrib Special Area of Conservation, as a nearby stream eventually flows into Lough Corrib, potentially harming aquatic life and drinking water sources.

Based on the absence of any Fire Safety Management Plan within Appendix 12-3, it appears that nearby fire services are not equipped or trained to respond effectively to large-scale lithium-ion battery fires.

In *Grace & Others v. An Bórd Pleanála* (2017), the Supreme Court ruled that a residence within one kilometer of a proposed development site had standing to argue against consent. This case emphasizes the significance of thoroughly evaluating related infrastructure such as the substation and BESS, which ought to be included in the same consenting procedure as the wind farm itself.

With homes, farmland, and livestock within a few hundred metres of the proposed site, this industrial-scale development poses an unacceptable risk to community health, safety, and environmental integrity. Until independent noise, fire-safety, and hydrological risk audits are completed and verified by competent authorities, I urge An Bord Pleanála to refuse this application in accordance with the Precautionary Principle.

References:

- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) (2020) Hazard Assessment of Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage Systems
- TNEI Ireland (2025) Appendix 12-3 Battery Storage Noise Assessment
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2018) Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region
- Irish Legal News (2017) Supreme Court: Challenge to wind farm development referred to CJEU

Major accidents and natural disasters

I object on the grounds that Chapter 16 of the Cooloo Wind Farm EIAR fails to provide a robust assessment of major accident and natural disaster risks.

The report's references to peat instability and raised-bog cutover are inadequate given the known susceptibility of peat landscapes to movement and sediment release during heavy rainfall or storm surge events. The EIAR's reliance on generic statements about low geological risk neglects the amplified high-wind, flood and peat-fire hazards forecast for County Galway under the local authority climate plan.

The lack of detailed modelling of flood-pathways or worst-case scenario storm events undermines the precautionary principle embedded in Irish planning law. This is a serious deficiency given the scale of the proposed development and the sensitivity of the peat landscape.

No explicit contingency or evacuation measures are detailed for the community along the grid-route corridor — a serious omission when tall turbines and infrastructure could present hazard in extreme events.

The assessment is incomplete and fails to satisfy the legislative requirements of an EIAR insofar as it must identify, describe and assess direct and indirect effects of the development on the environment and human

beings.

I call on An Coimisiún Pleanála to require an independent supplementary risk assessment, specific to peat-hazard, flood-modelling and major-accident scenarios, before any decision is made on this application.

References:

- Galway County Council (2024) Local Authority Climate Action Plan 2024-2029
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2022) Guidelines on the Information to be Contained in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports (EIAR)
- European Commission (2024) Environmental Impact Assessment: Overview of EU Rules

Bird collision risk

I object to the proposed development on the grounds that the Collision Risk Assessment (Appendix 7-6, MKO 2025) is methodologically and scientifically inadequate to protect legally protected bird species.

The assessment relies on the theoretical Band Model, which assumes fixed avoidance rates and static behaviour, without validation using telemetry or local field data. Survey coverage is temporally and spatially limited, missing key migration and nocturnal flight periods. This approach fails to capture the real-world behaviour of birds in the area.

The use of a 99.5% avoidance rate for Whooper Swans, without local validation, significantly underestimates the risk of collision. Evidence from Irish Wetlands Bird Survey (I-WeBS) and BirdWatch Ireland indicates that Whooper Swans routinely commute between Horseleap Lough and surrounding feeding areas at low altitudes that overlap turbine rotor heights. The conclusion of 'negligible risk' is therefore unsupported and unreliable.

The report fails to consider cumulative impacts with other regional wind farms or infrastructure, contrary to EU Directive 2009/147/EC (Birds Directive) and Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive. This is a serious omission given the presence of multiple wind energy developments in the region.

Mitigation measures are undefined and untested. Key figures such as flightline maps (e.g., Figure 7-6-1) are omitted, hindering independent review and transparency. Without clear, evidence-based mitigation strategies, there is no guarantee that collision risks can be managed effectively.

Under the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and the Habitats Directive, Ireland has a legal obligation to protect migratory and resident bird populations. The assessment as presented does not provide sufficient evidence that these obligations can be met.

I respectfully request that the planning authority reject or defer this application pending an independent, peer-reviewed reassessment. This should include:

- Full telemetry and radar data for local bird populations
- Expanded seasonal coverage including migration and nocturnal periods
- Transparent disclosure of all field survey data and model assumptions
- Cumulative impact assessment with regional wind farms
- Defined, evidence-based mitigation strategies

References:

- MKO (2025). Appendix 7-6 Collision Risk Assessment, Cooloo Wind Farm EIA
- Band, W., Madders, M. & Whitfield, D. (2007). Developing field and analytical methods to assess avian collision risk at wind farms
- Scottish Natural Heritage (2018). Avoidance Rates for the Onshore Wind Farm Collision Risk Model
- NatureScot (2021). Research Report 909: Using a collision risk model to assess bird collision risks onshore wind farms
- Rees, E. (2006). Whooper Swans: Biology and Conservation. T & AD Poyser
- Crowe, O. et al. (2019). Migration and Roosting of Whooper Swans. Irish Birds 43

- BirdWatch Ireland (2024). Whooper Swan Species Profile & Irish Wetlands Bird Survey (I-WeBS)
- European Commission (2021). Wind Energy and Natura 2000

Visual Impact

The proposed turbines would be highly intrusive and visually dominant, overwhelming the existing rural character of the local landscape. Their visibility from multiple vantage points would transform a natural and agricultural setting into an industrial-scale development.

The proposal is out of scale with the surrounding environment. The turbines' extreme height and size would cause visual clutter and a loss of scenic amenity, remaining visible even at long distances and creating continuous visual intrusion.

When combined with existing or approved wind farms in the region, this development would lead to visual saturation and skyline dominance, further eroding the landscape's character and reducing its recreational value.

The developer's visual impact assessment understates the visibility and significance of the turbines. Photomontages appear selective and fail to represent the true extent of visual intrusion likely to be experienced by residents and visitors.

The proposal would diminish the rural amenity, tranquillity, and identity of the local region. It threatens the area's sense of place and the quality of life for residents who value the natural and agricultural landscape.

The local wind farm's size and visual impact are excessive and inconsistent with the character of the area. While supporting renewable energy, developments must respect the local landscape — this project does not. The proposal should therefore be refused on the grounds of unacceptable visual and landscape impacts.

Broadband Impact

Given the number currently working from home now, strong broadband is a necessity. There are concerns that the signal, and therefore working from home capabilities will be negatively affected by this proposed windfarm. This is due to the fact that the windfarm is situated exactly within line of sight to the mast. It is unacceptable that broadband signal and mobile phone services utilizing this mast will be degraded, and potentially to such a degree that it will be unusable. This may be worsened by the width of the wind turbine needed to support the weight, and the blades which can create periodic drops in signal level and variable amounts of reflection.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out in this submission, it is clear that this windfarm would cause more harm than benefit to our area. This community values its peace, safety, and way of life. The proposed windfarm threatens all of these. I ask An Coimisiún Pleanála to listen to the genuine concerns of local people and to reject this development in the interest of protecting our environment, our homes, and our future.

If permission is not refused outright, I request that an oral hearing be held so that I as a local can have my concerns about this development heard.

Yours Sincerely,

A. Cunningham

Name: Anne Cunningham
Date: 14 November 2025