

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Darragh Whyte

Trasternagh

Moylough

Ballinasloe

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 08 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 was born and raised in the townland of Trasternagh. Its a very peaceful quite rural area, which is the main appeal of it. I went to the local national school in Cooloo and also took part in local sports clubs including Mountbellew Moylough GAA and the community games.

I work from home and I enjoy leisurely walks on the local rural roads, taking in the wildlife and habitats.

I intend to build a house in the near future on the family farm. Trasternagh is home to me and where I intend to live the rest of my days.

I firmly request An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse planning permission for the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm. This development is totally out of character with the landscape of the area and I wish to object on the following grounds.

Community Consultation and Engagement

The consultation led by Neoen and MKO for the Cooloo Wind Farm was deeply flawed and misleading. It does not meet the standards of genuine public engagement expected by An Bord Pleanála.

Notices appeared in the Irish Examiner while the Tuam Herald, the community's main news source, was ignored.

There was only a single public consultation meeting which was held outside Moylough, even though seven of nine turbines are proposed there. The plans have also changed significantly since this original meeting.

Despite claims of outreach to community groups, neither Killereen Community Council nor Killereen GAA were consulted. Only 55 homes were visited during 'door-to-door' engagement and ten written responses were received which is evidence of a process that failed to inform or involve the community. With poor broadband limiting access to online materials, and many residents not having the skills or technical knowledge to access online content, many locals were effectively excluded.

This was not meaningful consultation but a box-ticking exercise which did not provide the community with a fair chance to participate. These failures must carry serious weight in An Bord Pleanála's consideration of the application.

Planning Framework and Guidelines

The ongoing reliance on the Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 is increasingly inappropriate given the advancements in wind energy technology almost twenty years ago. At the time, turbines rarely exceeded 100 metres in height and produced 1–2 MW of power. In contrast, the turbines proposed in this development will reach 180 metres and generate approximately 6 MW, resulting in significantly greater impacts than those envisaged by the 2006 Guidelines.

These guidelines have repeatedly been acknowledged in the Dáil as outdated. In 2013, Deputy Micheál Martin informed then-Taoiseach Enda Kenny that the guidelines did not account for contemporary technology. In 2025, Tánaiste Simon Harris reiterated in the Dáil that the guidelines remain outdated.

Accordingly, it is unreasonable and inconsistent with principles of proper planning and sustainable development for An Coimisiún Pleanála to rely solely on the 2006 Guidelines. Any decision must be informed by current standards and technological realities.

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

Given this proximity and the extraordinary scale of the proposed turbines, I believe the shadow flicker standards outlined in the Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006) issued by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage are no longer adequate to protect residential amenity or public health.

The proposed turbines represent a dramatic escalation in size compared to those contemplated in 2006:

- Tip Height: 180 meters
- Rotor Diameter: 162 meters
- Hub Height: 105 meters
- Swept Area: Over 20,000 m² per turbine

These dimensions significantly increase the area affected by moving shadows, extending the reach and intensity of shadow flicker events. The 2006 Guidelines do not account for turbines of this magnitude, nor the cumulative impact of multiple units in close proximity to residential receptors.

The Guidelines permit up to 30 hours of shadow flicker per year at any dwelling. This threshold is:

- Arbitrary and unsupported by contemporary health research
- Uniformly applied without regard to turbine scale or proximity
- Silent on cumulative exposure from multiple turbines

No scientific basis is provided for the 30-hour limit, and no differentiation is made between single-turbine exposure and multi-directional flicker from clustered arrays.

Shadow flicker is often dismissed as a minor nuisance, yet growing evidence suggests more serious

implications:

- Annoyance and Stress: The U.S. Department of Energy's WINDEXchange notes that even limited flicker can create persistent discomfort, especially during sensitive times of day.
- Sleep Disruption: A 2013 report commissioned by the Scottish Government (University of Salford) found that shadow flicker may contribute to sleep disturbance and reduced sleep quality.
- Photosensitive Epilepsy: Although rare, flicker frequencies between 3–30 Hz can pose risks. Complex interactions between blade movement, sun angle, and window geometry may approach sensitive thresholds.
- Motion Sickness-like Symptoms: The ClimateXChange report noted symptoms such as dizziness and nausea linked to visual stimuli like flicker.
- Mental Health and Quality of Life: A 2023 article by Fritz Energy documented community complaints about anxiety, reduced concentration, and general decline in wellbeing.
- The Guidelines make no distinction between general receptors and vulnerable groups (children, elderly, or those with neurological conditions).
- In ABP Case 318943, shadow flicker was cited as a material concern, particularly where receptors were located within 500m of turbines. The Environmental Impact Assessment recommended turbine-specific control measures.

The 2006 Wind Energy Development Guidelines offer minimal direction on how shadow flicker should be assessed, modelled, or mitigated. This omission is particularly problematic in the context of modern turbine arrays, where cumulative impacts and technological scale far exceed what the original standards contemplated.

The Guidelines do not specify:

- Which modelling tools should be used (e.g. WindPRO, WAsP, or bespoke GIS-based systems)
- What input parameters are required (e.g. rotor dimensions, sun path algorithms, terrain shading)
- Whether modelling should account for worst-case scenarios or realistic exposure windows

This opens the door to inconsistent and potentially misleading assessments. Developers may use optimistic assumptions (e.g. average sunshine hours, limited exposure angles) that understate the true impact on nearby dwellings.

There is no requirement to assess:

- Overlapping flicker events from multiple turbines
- Multi-directional exposure due to turbine layout
- Seasonal variation in sun angle and flicker duration

The Guidelines do not require developers to implement or even consider:

- Automated curtailment systems that shut down turbines during predicted flicker windows
- Physical shielding (e.g. planting, screens) to block flicker paths
- Real-time monitoring or complaint-based response protocols

This leaves residents like us with no enforceable protection. Even if flicker exceeds tolerable levels, there is no mechanism to compel mitigation unless it's voluntarily offered by the developer or imposed by planning conditions.

Other jurisdictions have moved beyond static thresholds:

- Germany requires modelling based on actual sunshine hours and mandates curtailment if flicker exceeds 30 minutes per day.
- Scotland recommends site-specific modelling and mitigation, especially near sensitive receptors.
- The Netherlands uses dynamic modelling and requires flicker-free zones around homes.

Ireland's 2006 Guidelines fail to reflect these advances, leaving communities exposed to outdated standards that do not match the realities of modern turbine design.

The shadow flicker provisions in the 2006 Wind Energy Development Guidelines are outdated and insufficient for assessing the impacts of modern wind farms, particularly in residential settings like mine. The scale and proximity of the turbines proposed near my home significantly increase the risk of adverse effects, yet the current standards offer no meaningful protection.

I respectfully urge the planning authority to:

- Apply a precautionary approach
- Require robust modelling and mitigation
- Consider the lived experience of residents
- Reject applications that fail to demonstrate compliance with updated standards

References

- Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006) – Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
- ABP Case 318943 – Chapter 11: Shadow Flicker
- WINDEXchange – U.S. Department of Energy
- ClimateXChange – Report on Health Impacts of Wind Turbines (2013)
- Fritz Energy – Wind Turbines and Shadow Flicker (2023)
- Clean Power – Wind Turbines and Public Health

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)

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.

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,



Name: Darragh Whyte
Date: 08 November 2025