

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Liam Donohue

Hillsbrook

Barnaderg

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 live just within 1.5 kilometers of turbine six. I rent land for agriculture right next to the proposed construction compound, and am deeply concerned for the impact the construction phase of this development may have on my livelihood. I have two sons who hope to build in the area in the future, and I know that in other parts of the country - in Tipperary - wind turbine companies have been known to object to housing planning applications for people who want to build on their own land in their own local areas (reference; Irish Independent 11th November 2025 "Wind Farm Company Challenges Planning Permission for Tipperary Woman's Home"). I am the caretaker to the local Barnaderg Gortbeg group water scheme, and am concerned for the potential contamination of the water supply if ever there was a fire associated with this development.

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 In 2013 Deputy Michéal Martin told, the then Taoiseach, Enda Kenny that the guidelines were outdated and were never framed in the context of the new technology. Yet in 2025 Tánaiste Simon Harris is still saying in the Dáil that he acknowledges that the guidelines are outdated and that there is a specific commitment from the Government to prioritise the publication of new guidelines.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 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

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.

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.

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.

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

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,

Liam Donohue

Name: Liam Donohue
Date: 20 November 2025