

**OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION**  
**Case Reference: 323761**

Gerard Silke  
Cloondahamper  
Lavally  
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 Cloondahamper all my life and am married to Marita. We have 6 children. We live next door to the old Cloondahamper National School, just marginally outside the 1km zone. Just a small number of fields and bog separate us from Turbine no 7.

I enjoy leisurely walks with other family members in Cloondahamper bogs and our dogs love these walks. There is wonderful Flora and Fauna of the boglands.

Our children go to the local Barnaderg National School and we have been involved as a family in many community groups over the years such as the Board of management of Barnaderg National School, member of the Pastoral council and I am a life long member of Killarerin GAA Club. Three of my children currently play with the club. Community means a lot to me and my family.

Having children in Holy Rosary College in Mountbellew is a big concern for us as the construction of this Wind Farm will disrupt the Bus route to this school.

I vehemently oppose the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm and request An Coimisiún Pleanála to reject planning

permission.

I am objecting on the following issues.

### **Community Consultation and Engagement**

The basis that the consultation was undertaken by Neoen and MKO for the Cooloo Wind Farm has failed to meet the basic expectations of transparent and inclusive community engagement. It falls short of national guidelines and the intent of An Bord Pleanála's Strategic Infrastructure Development process.

Statutory notices were published in the Irish Examiner instead of the Tuam Herald, which most local households rely on for news.

Despite claims of consultation with local groups, key organisations such as Killrerin Community Council and Killrerin GAA, were not engaged in any meaningful way.

No public event was held in Moylough, even though seven of nine turbines are proposed there, excluding many directly affected residents.

The developer's report cites "door-to-door engagement" with only 55 homes and ten written responses is evidence of a process that reached few and failed to inform many.

The developer's continued reliance on online materials to provide information disadvantaged rural residents with poor internet access and a large number of older residents without a technical knowledge.

These shortcomings show that the consultation was administrative rather than genuine, and did not provide the community with a fair chance to participate. An Bord Pleanála should recognise these significant deficiencies when assessing the project's compliance with public engagement standards.

### **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.

### **Property Devaluation**

It is fair to surmise that people will not want to live near an industrial wind farm. There is growing evidence of loss of value and depreciation in the marketability of houses which are located near wind farms. The knock-on effect is that people will not move to the area or the local schools, and the community will wither. Rural Ireland still has a strong thriving support network of neighbours and community which will fundamentally be put at risk by imposing an industrial wind farm in the midst of 400 homes.

### **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**

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 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 - 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>

### **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.

### **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

### **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 and would have lasting negative effects on local residents, farmers, and the wider community. I therefore strongly object to this proposal and ask that it be refused in full.

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

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gerard Silke', written in a cursive style.

Name: Gerard Silke

Date: 09 November 2025