

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Kevin Healy

Dangan

Barnaderg

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 17 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,

My name is Kevin Healy and I am 21 years old, I was born and raised in the townland of Dangan, I am the 4th generation of my family to live and work the farmlands in Dangan and I currently live here with my ageing parents and 3 siblings, My dream from a young age has been to live in Dangan, build a house and take over our 4th Generation family farm. The plans of the proposed Cooloo wind farm distress and worry me for my future in this tightly knitted rural parish of Killererin.

We have farmland located only 530 m from proposed Turbine T1 and near the proposed substation and BESS in Dangan Eighter. This is my place of work along with my father, brother and uncle. I am concerned as my only brother, who is 14, has a neurological condition and he does be with me, my father and uncle some days when we are tending to the livestock and working on our lands at Dangan Eighter and noise does affect him.

I am extremely concerned and worried about any implications if I want to build a house in the field adjacent to T1 in the future, which is our own field for generations and is only 530 meters from T1, like noise or visual impacts, I have always talked about wanting to build a house in this field when I got older, it has a fabulous view looking onto the hill at Knock, Barnaderg. I also walk on the roads surrounding the planned windfarm for exercise and to take in the beauty of our quiet, peaceful and unspoiled location where biodiversity is truly alive, if this development goes ahead it will pose limitations on my wellbeing and my daily routes. I myself

need to breathe in fresh air regularly as I have Asthma and it can get very bad when I'm in an area of poor air quality or a dusty environment, this development also concerns me for my own health.

My Brother with the Neurological condition goes to St. Cuans College in Castleblakeney by a special need's bus and the road closures for the Construction works and cabling will affect his route to school, along with affecting us farming, accessing our lands in Dangan Eighter and moving and tending to our livestock. Me and my family are using the Barnaderg / Gortbeg group water scheme for our house, farm and farmlands and are extremely fearful for our water quality as that turbines are proposed to be built within the source of protection area of our local water source, this is a vital water source for many homes, farms and businesses and any development of this scale within a protected zone poses risks to our water quality, this does concern me a lot as our Group water scheme Barnaderg/ Gortbeg have worked tirelessly to provide good clean and safe water to our households and farms, and fear pollution from the initial construction could destroy it.

We as a family personally are not against renewable energy, we are planning on installing solar panels on our house and farm to help with climate change, but we feel this windfarm is not suitable in this location due to the many reasons I am outlining in this submission.

Currently, most of the farms in our area are part of environmental programs like ACRES (Agri-Climate Rural Environment Scheme). In our community, these programs have experienced a high level of engagement and have been extremely effective in mitigating the loss of biodiversity and enhancing the water, climate and air quality. These programs have proven very effective in halting the loss of biodiversity and promoting measures to build and improve ecosystems. The developer's commissioned reports highlighted our area's great biodiversity, which is mainly due to these government and EU-funded initiatives. Therefore, I think it would be damaging and undo all the wonderful work that was paid for by consumers if such a significant development in this area is to happen. Significant habitat destruction, displacement, and damage would happen regardless of the mitigation strategies the developer suggests.

According to the developer's application, a portion of the site and some of the turbines are situated in an area that the current Galway development plan has identified as generally unsuitable. During preplanning meetings and discussions, the council brought up this issue. But the developer hasn't provided an adequate response in any of the methods used thus far to explain why this is the case. I don't think they've done anything to deal with this.

I wish to object to this development because of these reasons outlined and the reasons and points I outline below

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 Killinerin Community Council and Killinerin 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 karstified 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.

Right to Peaceful Enjoyment of Property

Article 1, Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) protects 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."

Granting permission for this wind farm development would seriously interfere with my right to the peaceful enjoyment of my property as a landowner and farmer. My land is not only my livelihood but also my home and heritage, and its value lies in its usability, productivity, and tranquillity. The construction and operation of large-scale wind turbines would bring constant noise, vibration, and shadow flicker, making it extremely difficult to work or live on the land without disruption.

During the lengthy construction period, the constant movement of heavy machinery, road congestion, and elevated noise levels would disturb livestock, damage rural roads, and make normal farm operations significantly harder to carry out. Once operational, the turbines would permanently alter the landscape, impacting both animal welfare and the environment in which I work daily. The cumulative effects of noise, flicker, and visual dominance would deprive me of the peaceful enjoyment and practical use of my land.

Such disruption cannot reasonably be regarded as proportionate or justified in the public interest, and therefore would constitute a breach of the protections guaranteed 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.

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.

Impact of Wind Turbines on the Neurodiverse within the Community

Numerous studies and planning inspectors with An Coimisiún Pleanála have acknowledged that wind turbines can have negative effects on neurodiverse individuals. Research by Howell (2015) found that people with autism are more sensitive to environmental noise, experiencing higher rates of sleep disturbance, cognitive difficulties, and stress due to low-frequency noise (LFN). The neurodiverse community often struggles to filter background sounds, and constant turbine noise and vibration could cause pain, anxiety, and loss of concentration, reducing quality of life.

These impacts extend to education. Local schools and preschools, including Brierfield National School which has a special class for children with autism, would be particularly affected. Senior planning inspectors have previously noted that facilities for children with additional educational needs may become unviable near large-scale wind farms due to such disturbances.

Shadow flicker poses further risks, as studies (Becchio et al., 2010) show that individuals on the autistic spectrum may fixate on spinning movements, heightening distress. Those with epilepsy or neurological conditions may also be affected.

Ireland's obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities require protection from harm and equal enjoyment of rights. Allowing this development would contradict those principles.

While more research is needed, there is no definitive evidence proving that wind farms are safe for, and do not significantly impact, the neurodiverse community—and the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

References:

- An Bord Pleanála. (2016). PA0041 – Assisting report to Senior Inspector [PDF].
<https://www.pleanala.ie/anbordpleanala/media/abp/cases/reports/pa0/rpa0041a.pdf>
- An Bord Pleanála. (2015). Inspector's report: ABP-PA0038 [PDF].
<https://www.pleanala.ie/anbordpleanala/media/abp/cases/reports/pa0/rpa0038.pdf>
- Howell, G. (2015). Autism and the effect of introducing a new noise source into quiet rural communities: risk factor from industrial wind power generation
- Becchio C, Mari M, Castiello U (2010) Perception of Shadows in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. PLoS ONE 5(5): e10582.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010582>

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.

Barnaderg National School

Barnaderg National School is located approximately 3.49 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.

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

Biodiversity Impact - Earthworms

I object on the grounds that the Environmental Impact Assessment fails to address the impacts of wind turbine-induced vibrational noise on soil biodiversity and ecosystem function, particularly earthworm populations.

Recent peer-reviewed research by Velilla et al. (2021, *Oikos*, 130(7), 1033–1047) demonstrates that wind turbines generate continuous low-frequency vibrations (< 500 Hz) that travel considerable distances through soil. Key findings include:

- Vibrational noise decreased by only 23 ± 7 dB over 200 metres, meaning measurable vibration extends well beyond turbine bases
- Earthworm abundance declined by approximately 40% near turbines compared to sampling points further away
- Soil compaction and crop type were ruled out, confirming vibrational noise was the primary cause
- The impact is body-size-dependent, especially harmful to earthworms and other large soil invertebrates

Earthworms are critical "ecosystem engineers" essential to soil health and agricultural productivity. A 40% decline in their populations can lead to:

- Reduced soil aeration and water infiltration, increasing flooding and erosion risks
- Disruption of nutrient cycling and carbon sequestration, undermining soil fertility and climate regulation
- Deterioration of soil structure and microbial balance, impacting crop performance and long-term land viability

These impacts are especially concerning in productive agricultural soils. The Cooloo site shares characteristics with the farmland studied by Velilla et al. (2021) — organically managed, rural, and composed of active agricultural soils.

The Environmental Impact Assessment submitted for Cooloo does not address subsurface vibrational noise or its potential to degrade soil ecosystems. This represents a significant omission in the assessment of environmental and agricultural impacts.

I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála require:

- Comprehensive assessment of soil-borne vibrational noise impacts
- Evaluation of effects on soil macrofauna, especially earthworms
- Protective buffer zones of at least 200–250 metres from turbine bases to high-value agricultural soils
- Vibration-dampening measures in turbine design and foundations
- Soil biodiversity indicators in post-construction monitoring

Reference:

- Velilla, E., Collinson, E., Bellato, L., Berg, M.P., & Halfwerk, W. (2021). Vibrational noise from wind energy turbines negatively impacts earthworm abundance. *Oikos*, 130(7), 1033–1047.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08166>

Biodiversity Impact - Bats

I object to the Cooloo Wind Farm because the proposal fails to adequately protect bats, which are strictly protected under EU law. The developer's surveys show that several bat species, including the Lesser Horseshoe Bat, use the area leaving a real risk of collision, disturbance, and loss of important foraging habitat. As these impacts cannot be confidently ruled out, the project should be refused on the grounds of

non-compliance with the EU Habitats Directive and insufficient protection of bats and their habitats.

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.

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.

Broadband Impact

Given the number currently working from home now, strong broadband is a necessity. There are concerns that the signal, and therefore working from home capabilities will be negatively affected by this proposed windfarm. This is due to the fact that the windfarm is situated exactly within line of sight to the mast. It is unacceptable that broadband signal and mobile phone services utilizing this mast will be degraded, and potentially to such a degree that it will be unusable. This may be worsened by the width of the wind turbine needed to support the weight, and the blades which can create periodic drops in signal level and variable amounts of reflection.

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

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,

Kevin Healy

Name: Kevin Healy

Date: 17 November 2025