

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

## Case Reference: 323761

Michael and Pauline Hughes  
Dangan Oughter  
Tuam  
Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála  
64 Marlborough Street  
Dublin 1  
D01 V902

Date: 07 November 2025

**Re: Observation/Submission to proposed wind energy development at Cooloo Wind Farm**

Location: Cloondahamper, Cloonascragh, Elmhill, Cooloo, Lecarrow, Dangan Eigher, Lissavally, Slievegorm  
- Co. Galway

Applicant: Neoen Renewables Ireland Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the above proposed development. My family have lived and farmed in this area for generations.

My two sons and my two grandchildren ( two & five ) all also live in this area. My grandson attends one of the three national schools in the area and my granddaughter will be starting preschool next September. My wife and myself believe in protecting the environment for the future of our children and grandchildren. We are not against renewable energy and to the contrary we have carried out significant energy upgrades to our house up to and including PV panels which have significantly reduced our energy bills.

However in addition to the issues listed below I am deeply concerned about the impact this development including its construction will have on our lovely landscape, safety of our grandchildren travelling to & from school, security of our water source, visual & noise impact from the turbines, etc.

I urge the board to reject this development for these reasons and reason below.

### **Community Consultation and Engagement**

The basis that the community consultation process was carried out by Neoen and MKO for the proposed

Cooloo Wind Farm has been fundamentally inadequate and does not meet the standards of meaningful public engagement required under the Draft Revised Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2019) or An Bord Pleanála's Strategic Infrastructure Development protocols.

The consultation was poorly publicised, using the Irish Examiner, a Cork-based paper with minimal reach in north-east Galway, for statutory notices instead of the Tuam Herald, the area's primary local newspaper. This choice deprived many residents of awareness and opportunity to participate.

Claims of engagement with "local groups, clubs and schools" are inaccurate. Key organisations such as Killenerin Community Council and Killenerin GAA received no correspondence or invitations to contribute. Furthermore, no public consultation meeting was held in Moylough, where seven of the nine turbines are proposed, further excluding the most affected residents.

Reported "door-to-door engagement" reached just 55 homes within 1 km of the turbines, yielding only ten written responses which is an unacceptably low level of participation for a project of this scale. Reliance on online materials was ineffective given poor broadband in the area.

Overall, the process was selective, poorly targeted, and misleading in its presentation of local engagement. These failings undermine the project's compliance with public participation standards and should be given significant weight in An Bord Pleanála's assessment.

### **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**

A study from the University of Galway and international research indicates that homes within 1 km of wind turbines experience adverse effects on property value, with reductions of up to 14.7%. My home falls within this range, and I am deeply concerned about the financial and emotional impact this will have on my family and our future prospects. The planning application does not appear to address or mitigate this issue.

<https://www.universityofgalway.ie/media/researchsites/ceris/files/WP-2023-01.pdf>

### **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.

### **National Schools**

The presence of wind turbines near schools can have a range of impacts on students, staff, and the overall learning environment. Wind turbines produce both audible noise and low-frequency infrasound, which can be noticeable inside buildings, which can cause a distraction. This constant distraction will interfere with children's attention and overall cognitive performance, making it more difficult for students to focus on learning.

- Cooloo NS is 1.59km away from the nearest wind turbine.
- Brierfield NS is 1.35 km away from the nearest wind turbine.
- Barnaderg NS is located approximately 2.49 km from the nearest wind turbine.

Shadow flicker caused by rotating turbine blades can create intermittent light in classrooms, which can be distracting and, in some cases, uncomfortable or stressful for children. The noise and shadow flicker will also greatly impact on the children in the school who have an additional need. There is a lack of research to state the impact on these children.

In addition to the above, 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. While the severity of these impacts depends on distance from the turbines, it is clear that wind turbines in close proximity to schools have the potential to disrupt learning, reduce student wellbeing, and interfere with the overall educational experience.

### **Barnaderg National School**

Barnaderg National School is located approximately 2.49 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 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 - 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.

### **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**

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.

### **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 (LiFePO<sub>4</sub>) 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

### 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 windfarm would not bring progress, it would bring lasting damage. This community values its peace, safety, and way of life. The proposed development threatens the peace, safety, and character of the place we call home. I urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to stand with the local people and reject this development to protect our landscape, our homes, and the generations to come.

Yours Sincerely,

*Michael Hughes*  
*Pauline Hughes:*

Name: Michael and Pauline Hughes

Date: 07 November 2025