

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Martin Greaney

Lissavalley,

Barnaderg

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 21 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 was born and reared in the townland Lissavalley. I am married to Marie and we have 2 adult children. We built our family home about 30 years ago. Our house is approximately 500 metres from the proposed entrance to the Cooloo Wind Farm.

I went to school in the local national school in Barnaderg and played sports with Killererin in my youth. I farm the family farm full time with my son at the moment. Both of our children intend to build a house on family lands in the near future all of which is within 1 Km of the site entrance. If this Wind Farm gets planning permission, they could struggle to get planning permission.

Lissavalley and the parish of Killererin is a wonderful community to live in with wonderful family and very helpful neighbours living close by.

As a family we object to the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm as it will be visually imposing on our landscape. A rural area is no place for an Industrial Wind Farm with Turbines towering 180 metres in the sky.

The increased traffic on the R332 during construction will also cause massive inconvenience as we go about

our day to day jobs.

I request An Coimisiún Pleanála to consider my submission and I also strongly request that they refuse planning permission for this development.

I also like to object on the following grounds

Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme

I use the water from Barnaderg Gortbeg Group Water Scheme as my main source of drinking water for my household. The water is of excellent quality and I am very concerned that pollution of various types such as silt, sediment and other contaminants will enter the water source, causing me and my family harm. With the location of two Turbines within the Source Protection Area (SPA) I believe the Cooloo Windfarm should not be granted permission whatsoever, especially in such a highly karsified and hydrologically sensitive area.

Right to Own/Transfer Property

Article 43.1.2 of Bunreacht na hÉireann provides that “the State accordingly guarantees to pass no law attempting to abolish the right of private ownership or the general right to transfer, bequeath, and inherit property.” Granting permission for this wind farm development would effectively undermine this constitutional protection. Landowners and farmers within the affected area would face significant restrictions, as land situated near turbines would become unsuitable for residential development. This would prevent families from transferring land for the purpose of building homes for future generations, thereby eroding their practical rights of ownership and inheritance.

Furthermore, Article 43.2.1 acknowledges that the exercise of property rights must be regulated by the principles of social justice. However, this proposed development cannot be regarded as socially just. It disproportionately burdens local residents while providing little to no direct benefit to the community. Those of us living in the area would experience substantial and lasting impacts — including increased traffic and road closures during construction, ongoing noise pollution, shadow flicker, and significant visual intrusion on our landscape. In addition, there remains insufficient scientific evidence to conclusively demonstrate that large-scale wind farms pose no long-term health risks to nearby residents. In these circumstances, permitting this development would be neither fair nor consistent with the principles of social justice recognised under Article 43.

Property Devaluation

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

Noise

Planning permission for the proposed Cooloo Wind Farm should be refused on the basis that it poses a clear and foreseeable risk of substantial interference with the normal use and enjoyment of nearby homes. In *Byrne & Moorhead v ABO Energy* [2025] IEHC 330, the Irish High Court found that wind turbine noise—specifically low-frequency and amplitude-modulated sound—constituted a private nuisance under common law, as it significantly disrupted residents’ ordinary domestic life. The Court held that such noise

amounted to an unreasonable and continuous intrusion, preventing the quiet occupation of the home and resulting in the permanent shutdown of three turbines in County Wexford.

The Cooloo proposal relies on outdated ETSU-based noise criteria that fail to account for the same low-frequency and modulated noise effects found to cause substantial nuisance in the Wexford case. Given the proposed turbines' greater height and rotor size, the likelihood of these harmful acoustic effects occurring at Cooloo is even higher. Approving this development under obsolete standards would disregard the High Court's findings and expose local residents to predictable and legally recognized interference with their right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes. Planning permission should therefore be refused in full on these grounds.

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
- EIA Chapter 6 (Biodiversity)
- An Coimisiún Pleanála Case 323761

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.

Major accidents and natural disasters

I object on the grounds that Chapter 16 of the Cooloo Wind Farm EIA 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 EIA'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 EIA 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 (EIA)
- European Commission (2024) Environmental Impact Assessment: Overview of EU Rules

Visual Impact

The proposed turbines would be highly intrusive and visually dominant, overwhelming the existing rural character of the local landscape. Their visibility from multiple vantage points would transform a natural and agricultural setting into an industrial-scale development.

The proposal is out of scale with the surrounding environment. The turbines' extreme height and size would cause visual clutter and a loss of scenic amenity, remaining visible even at long distances and creating continuous visual intrusion.

When combined with existing or approved wind farms in the region, this development would lead to visual saturation and skyline dominance, further eroding the landscape's character and reducing its recreational value.

The developer's visual impact assessment understates the visibility and significance of the turbines. Photomontages appear selective and fail to represent the true extent of visual intrusion likely to be experienced by residents and visitors.

The proposal would diminish the rural amenity, tranquillity, and identity of the local region. It threatens the area's sense of place and the quality of life for residents who value the natural and agricultural landscape.

The local wind farm's size and visual impact are excessive and inconsistent with the character of the area. While supporting renewable energy, developments must respect the local landscape — this project does not. The proposal should therefore be refused on the grounds of unacceptable visual and landscape impacts.

Conclusion

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,

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

Name: Martin Greaney

Date: 21 November 2025