

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Freda Potter  
Cloondahamper  
Lavally  
Tuam  
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 live in Cloondahamper and my house is 1 km from proposed turbine 7. I am greatly concerned about the scale of this development and the impact the construction will have on our local environment. I believe the health impacts of this development on local people has not been given enough consideration for example low frequency noise ( infrasound ) will greatly disrupt our wellbeing and ability to live a peaceful life. Another aspect of this development is the impact of shadow flicker on our home which is north west of the proposed site. When the sun is in the south and shining through the turbines it will cause shadow flicker in our home, I don't believe enough consideration has been given to the cumulative impact of having 9 turbines close together and the cumulative effect they will have on local houses.

I am also greatly concerned the damage the construction work will do to the special habitat in our local bog of Cloonahamper. I enjoy going for walks around this area and enjoy the wildlife that is supported by this habitat and would fear that the construction will cause irreversible damage to this beautiful landscape and our eco system.

Also I depend on the Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water scheme for the water in my home and there is a strong risk our water supply will become polluted because of the construction work which will take place in the

source area for this water supply.

I would strongly urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to reject this windfarm development for the following reasons.

### **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 Killererin Community Council and Killererin 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 application depends upon the 2006 Wind Energy Development Guidelines (WEDG), which are nearly twenty years old. These guidelines were written when onshore turbines rarely exceeded 100 metres in height. The proposed turbines, however, are approximately 180 metres tall, almost double that scale, yet the same 500-metre setback is applied. This outdated standard fails to reflect advances in turbine design, the increased magnitude of visual, noise and shadow impacts, or current scientific understanding of low-frequency sound and health. Comparable European jurisdictions apply height-based setbacks (for example, 10 times turbine height or a minimum of 1–2 km). Proceeding under static 2006 standards is inconsistent with international best practice and contrary to the precautionary principle enshrined in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). By relying on obsolete national guidance, the proposal fails to satisfy the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028 (GCDP) objectives to preserve landscape character and protect residential amenity (Policies LCM 1 and LCM 2).

### **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**

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 m<sup>2</sup> 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

### **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.

### **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

### **Extra construction traffic**

I strongly object to this proposal due to the major disruption and safety risks it poses to our local community during the construction phase. The Traffic Management Plan fails to provide clear information on delivery schedules, routes or mitigation for abnormal turbine loads. Our rural roads are narrow, shared by farm machinery, school buses and local traffic, and cannot safely accommodate such heavy haulage without damage or obstruction. The application states that there will be approximately 14 extra return trips made by trucks carrying materials. This is vastly underestimated for a project of this size. There are no binding guarantees on road repairs, traffic management or timing of deliveries to avoid peak community use. Residents, farms and schools in Barnaderg, Cooloo and surrounding areas will face delays, dust, noise and restricted access. This plan does not adequately safeguard community safety, local livelihoods or the integrity of rural infrastructure. Permission should not proceed without full, enforceable traffic controls and local protection measures.

### **Climate impact**

I support renewable energy but object to the Cooloo Wind Farm because it will worsen Ireland's land-use emissions. Clearing mature forest and disturbing peat for turbine bases and access roads will release long-stored carbon into the atmosphere. Ireland's Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2021 and the European Climate Law both require that each sector reduce its emissions without offsetting increases elsewhere. This means energy targets cannot legally override land-use targets. If projects like this go ahead without full rewetting and carbon recovery, Ireland risks breaching its climate budgets and facing EU fines. We need clean energy that complements, not competes with, our land-based climate commitments.

### **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 (LiFePO<sub>4</sub>) 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.

### 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,

Freda Potter

Name: Freda Potter  
Date: 08 November 2025