

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Declan McWalter

Hillsbrook

Barnaderg

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 09 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 live in Hillsbrook with my wife Sinead and our 3 young children. Killererin is where I was born and reared and Sinead is from the neighbouring parish. I went to the local national school and played sports with Killererin GAA club in my youth.

Killererin is a wonderful community and a nice peaceful place to raise a family. We hope that our children will be able build on the family land in the future and raise families of their own.

I strongly request An Coimisiún Pleanála to reject planning for the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm and we are objecting on the following issues.

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 Killarinerin Community Council and Killarinerin 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 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.

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.

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/ceis/files/WP-2023-01.pdf>

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.

Barnaderg National School

Barnaderg National School is located approximately 2.49 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 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.

Farming

I am deeply concerned about the impact this proposed windfarm will have on the farmers in Barnaderg, Cooloo, and the surrounding areas. Many of these are full-time and part-time dairy and dry-stock farmers,

with holdings of varying sizes, and their livelihoods depend directly on the health and productivity of their animals. Farming in this area is not just a way to make a living—it is a way of life, a source of pride and satisfaction. Farmers rely heavily on the local roads for moving cattle and accessing their land every day. These essential activities could be disrupted by construction traffic, turbine maintenance, or other project-related impacts, further jeopardizing livelihoods. Also the presence of shadow flicker, excessive noise, and visual intrusion from turbines would seriously disrupt this, affecting both our work and our well-being.

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

As a local farmer, I am deeply concerned that the Cooloo Wind Farm will lead to further peat drainage and the felling of productive forest land. This will increase national land-use emissions and make it harder for Ireland's agriculture and forestry sectors to stay within their climate ceilings. Under the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2021, every sector must remain within its own emission limits. Projects that raise LULUCF emissions add to future pressure on rural landowners, who may face restrictions such as mandatory rewetting or livestock reductions to make up the shortfall. This proposal benefits energy targets but harms the land sector and undermines fair burden-sharing under national climate law.

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

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.

Conclusion

In light of the serious concerns outlined above I respectfully urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse permission for this development. The proposal is not compatible with the principles of proper planning or sustainable 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.

If permission is not refused outright, I request that an oral hearing be held so that the community can have our say on the impacts of this development.

Yours Sincerely,

Declan
McWalter

Name: Declan McWalter
Date: 09 November 2025