OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Karen Carrick

Dangan

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 20 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 have lived in this area all my life. I am raising my four children here, and our closest distance to one of the proposed turbines is approximately 1.2 km. The rural landscape and natural environment are central to our daily lives, and I am deeply concerned about the potential impacts this development may have on our family and the wider community.

We live beside Horseleap Lake, an important local amenity and a habitat for a wide range of birds and wildlife. I am particularly worried about how the construction and operation of the turbines could affect these sensitive species. Increased noise, disturbance, and changes to the natural environment may have long-term consequences for local bird populations and other wildlife that depend on this area.

In addition, Horseleap Lake and the surrounding water sources are vital to the local ecosystem. I am concerned about potential risks of pollution or disruption to water quality during construction, as well as any long-term hydrological impacts the development could cause. Protecting our water sources is essential for both environmental and public health.

With my family living so close to the proposed site, and with the strong connection we have to this landscape, I believe the potential environmental risks, combined with the disturbance to the tranquillity of the area, pose

too great a cost to our community.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed development.

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 Killererin Community Council and Killererin 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

Relying on the Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 is no longer appropriate. Since their publication, wind energy technology has advanced significantly, and scientific understanding has deepened. The 2006 Guidelines were based on turbines under 100 metres and 1–2MW in capacity, whereas the proposed turbines will be 180 metres tall and produce around 6MW, causing greater impacts.

The outdated nature of these guidelines has been acknowledged in the Dáil multiple times. In 2013, Deputy Micheál Martin noted that the guidelines did not reflect modern technology, and in 2025, Tánaiste Simon Harris confirmed that the Government prioritizes the creation of new guidelines.

Therefore, it is inappropriate for An Coimisiún Pleanála to base decisions solely on the 2006 Guidelines. Decisions must reflect current technology and environmental standards. All new Wind Farm developments should be paused until updated guidelines are established so that affected communities are not unfairly treated by these outdated guidelines

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

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

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

Chapter 5 of the EIAR ('Population and Human Health') states that the nearest residential property is 720 metres away from the closest wind turbine (T8) However there is no mention of a house (Eircode H53 FF64) that is 530 metres away from Turbines 4 and 5 and 600 metres away from Turbine 8. This property is not accounted for at all in the EIAR.

The Wind Energy Guidelines of 2006 advise a setback distance between a wind turbine and a house of 500 metres. These guidelines are almost 20 years old and outdated.

The 2019 Draft Wind Energy Development Guidelines suggest a mandatory minimum setback distance of 500 metres between a wind turbine and the nearest residential property, and 4 times the tip height, whichever is greater.

Shadow flicker, caused by the rotating blades of wind turbines casting intermittent shadows, can have a significant impact on nearby residents. Prolonged exposure to these flickering shadows can cause visual discomfort, headaches, and even trigger migraines in susceptible individuals. Adequate setback distances and screening measures should be implemented to minimize the potential health effects associated with shadow flicker.

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 3.5 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.

Farming

There are dairy and dry-stock farmers in Barnaderg, Cooloo and the surrounding areas, both full-time and part-time. Holdings vary in size. Many of these farmers depend on their livestock performing well in order to pay their bills. Also, those who are farming in the area enjoy the work they do, in the absence of shadow flicker, noise or visual pollution. If this development is granted their livelihoods will be impacted.

The 'Importance of Noise Hygiene in Dairy Cattle Farming – A Review' (Published November 1st of 2023 by Dimo Dimov, Toncho Penev and Ivaylo Marinov) details how vibration and noise from a milking parlour can negatively impact the milk yield and milk quality of a dairy cow. The paper also discusses how exposing animals to noise from an unfamiliar source can cause them stress.

It is also important to note that the developer has not taken into account the ways in which farmers depend on the local roads for moving cattle and for access to their land when going about their daily tasks within their farms.

Reference:

Dimov, D., Penev, T., and Marinov, I. (2023) 'Importance of Noise Hygiene in Dairy Cattle Farming – A Review'. Featured Position and Review Papers in Acoustics Science.

Available at: https://www.mdpi.com/2624-599X/5/4/59.

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

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

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.

Project Splitting

The applicant proposes to seek planning consent for the nine turbines at this stage, while deferring a separate application for the substation, BESS, and grid connection. This approach amounts to project splitting, which is contrary to proper planning practice and should not be permitted.

These elements are integral and interdependent components of a single development. They cannot function in isolation, nor can the community have their say on the development unless it is seen as one complete project. The entire scheme must therefore be evaluated as one complete project under a single planning process.

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,



Name: Karen Carrick
Date: 20 November 2025