

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

David Sheehan

Cooloo

Moylough

Ballinasloe

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 07 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 recently purchased a new house which will be 1.5 km from the nearest proposed turbine - turbine 4. I am concerned about my quality of life if this development goes ahead especially health concerns due to shadow flicker, noise pollution and visual disturbance.

We have a 4 month old baby and this development has unknown health risks for children. I would like her to be able to grow up and go to school in the area (Brierfield NS). I am concerned about her social development will be adversely affect by the wind turbines next to my house.

I urge the board to reject this development for these reasons and the reason listed below

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These guidelines have repeatedly been acknowledged in the Dáil as outdated.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 In 2025, Tánaiste Simon Harris reiterated in the Dáil that the guidelines remain outdated.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

The 2023 CERIS (Centre for Economic Research on Inclusivity and Sustainability) paper — 'Wind Turbines and House Prices Along the West of Ireland: A Hedonic Pricing Approach' — surveyed the prices of houses located near windfarms in seven counties.

The paper states that: 'The analysis finds a robust and significant reduction in property value of -14.7% within 1km of a turbine' and that 'Back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that the total loss in value for houses within 1km of a turbine in the case counties is approximately €6.8 million.'

Galway County Council is an agent for the state of the Republic of Ireland and as such is responsible to uphold Article 40 of the Irish Constitution which states — 'the state shall in particular by its laws protect as best it may from unjust attack and in the case of injustice done vindicate the life, person, good name, and property rights of every citizen.'

I am aware that the Barnaderg Cooloo Wind Farm Action Collective have spoken to a local auctioneer, who said that he had trouble selling a house in County Mayo because it was close to several wind turbines. The auctioneer was able to site a specific instance whereby a married couple looked at the house and decided not to buy it. The auctioneer said that the presence of the wind turbines was a crucial factor in the couple's decision not to buy the house. The owners of this house ended up selling for less money than the couple had been initially willing to pay for the house.

Noise

The proposed Cooloo Wind Farm should be refused planning permission, citing the Irish High Court case *Byrne & Moorhead v ABO Energy* [2025] IEHC 330, in which wind turbine noise was legally recognized as a private nuisance, leading to the permanent shutdown of turbines in County Wexford. The objection highlights that the Cooloo proposal fails to address proven low-frequency and amplitude-modulated noise impacts similar to those measured in the Wexford case, where sound levels far exceeded safe limits and caused serious disturbance to residents living over a kilometre away. The Cooloo project's reliance on outdated ETSU-style noise standards, which disregard low-frequency and tonal effects, is therefore deemed inadequate to protect public health and residential amenity.

The proposed turbines at Cooloo—significantly larger than those involved in the Wexford case—are likely to generate even stronger low-frequency noise that travels farther and fluctuates more intensely under local atmospheric conditions. This increases the risk of nuisance and potential legal liability for both developers and planning authorities. Ireland's 2006 wind energy guidelines are outdated and fail to reflect modern scientific understanding of turbine acoustics. Until revised national standards are adopted, approving large-scale wind farms under obsolete criteria would be unsafe and contrary to the public interest. Planning permission should therefore be refused due to the clear and foreseeable risk of harm to residential amenities, the inadequacy of current noise controls, and the legal precedent confirming wind turbine noise as a substantial nuisance.

Shadow Flicker

The EIAR's treatment of shadow flicker fails to meet statutory and international standards for the assessment and mitigation of human health and residential amenity impacts. It relies on outdated guidelines, applies over-simplified modelling assumptions, and does not provide adequate protection to the large number of dwellings and receptors affected.

The EIAR confirms that:

- 218 residential receptors are located within 1.62 km of proposed turbines,
- 171 of these are predicted to experience shadow flicker, and
- 43 receptors are within 1 km of a turbine.

These figures demonstrate that the project is situated in a densely inhabited rural area, yet the assessment dismisses the significance of impact based solely on a theoretical model rather than verified site conditions.

By any reasonable measure, 171 dwellings affected by a rotating shadow intrusion constitutes a major residential amenity and public health concern, not a negligible effect.

The EIAR applies the 2006 DoEHLG Wind Energy Development Guidelines, which allow up to 30 minutes per day or 30 hours per year of shadow flicker at any dwelling.

However:

- The 2019 Draft Wind Energy Development Guidelines (and reiterated in the 2025 Climate Action Plan Annex) require that no occupied dwelling or sensitive receptor experiences any shadow flicker through the use of automatic turbine control systems.
- The EIAR itself acknowledges that turbine software could achieve this standard but chooses to assess impacts under the obsolete 2006 thresholds.

This approach is contrary to current best practice and fails to future-proof the development in line with national policy on renewable energy development and community protection. Although the EIAR cites various international studies (some over a decade old) claiming no proven medical link between shadow flicker and disease, it fails to address contemporary health guidance:

- The World Health Organisation (2018) recognises annoyance and sleep disturbance as legitimate health

effects of environmental light and noise intrusions.

- The HSE's own scoping response (2023) requested an assessment of all likely significant impacts on sensitive receptors, including shadow flicker, along with proposed mitigation.
- The EIAR's discussion focuses on whether shadow flicker can cause seizures (which is rare), but ignores chronic stress, fatigue, and loss of amenity due to regular flicker events within residential interiors.

The result is a narrow and outdated view of human health inconsistent with EPA (2022) guidance, which defines health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being."

The shadow flicker assessment in the Cooloo Wind Farm EIAR is deficient, outdated, and incomplete. It underestimates the true scale of residential intrusion and fails to apply the precautionary principle required under both EU and Irish environmental law.

Given:

- 171 dwellings predicted to experience flicker
- Outdated 2006 guideline thresholds
- Absence of enforceable mitigation and cumulative analysis

this development cannot be deemed to have no likely significant effect on human health or amenity.

National Schools

I am concerned that the presence of the wind turbines so close to the three local schools will have an impact on students, staff and the overall school community. All of the schools are less than 2.5 km away from a turbine. Turbines are known to create noise, low frequency infrasound and shadow flicker. These issues will no doubt impact on the students in the local schools.

Also 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. I am also concerned that if Cooloo Wind Farm is granted planning permission less people will be moving to or building in the area. This will lead to fewer children in the community and may lead to schools losing teachers, and ultimately school closures.

Brierfield National School

Brierfield National School is 1.35 km away 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 Brierfield NS. The school will suffer from noise pollution, infrasound and shadow flicker. 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.

Brierfield NS also has a special class for children with Autism. These children process noise and light differently to other children. The noise, infrasound and shadow flicker will no doubt impact on their daily lives in school.

I am also concerned that if planning permission is granted less people will be moving to or building in the catchment area of Brierfield NS. 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

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.

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

Conclusion

In light of the serious concerns outlined above I urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse permission for this development. This proposal has also divided our community and in time, if this development is allowed to go ahead, it will destroy relationships within the community and no doubt have an impact on the population of the community. In addition it will no doubt result in further action to legally stop the windfarm from operating as a result of its impact on the community. An Coimisiún Pleanála must listen to the concerns of our community and act accordingly.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized initial 'D' followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Name: David Sheehan

Date: 07 November 2025