

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Joe Hennelly

Dangan

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 Dangan, my house is approximately 1.2 km from proposed Turbine 1. My family have been living in the same area for generations. Currently in the house are my parents and myself.

I am greatly concerned about the impact this development will have on my family. Our house is on the R332 road and we will be greatly impacted by the proposed road closures for this project. We need to travel regularly to Tuam and Mountbellew and during the construction period of this project the road will be restricted for long periods of time.

I am also concerned about the noise impact these turbines will have once operational. I don't believe enough consideration has been given to the impact of infrasound on local houses. Infrasound will affect our wellbeing and ability to have a peaceful life in our home.

I don't believe there was enough community consultation about this project and no one called to our door to tell us about the project and what was proposed.

I strongly urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to reject this windfarm development for the reasons outlined below.

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 Killarinerin Community Council nor Killarinerin 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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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

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,

Joe H

Name: Joe Hennelly
Date: 08 November 2025