

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Niamh Donohue
Cloondahamper
Lavally
Tuam
Galway

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

Date: 15 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 in the townland of Cloondahamper. My home is just 1km from turbine No7. I was born and reared here and went to the local national school in Barnadeg. I used to play football for the local club St Mary's. The parish of Killenerin is home to me and where from a young age I always wanted to live and build a home.

I am very concerned if this proposed Wind Farm was to get planning that my dream of building a house on family land would be in jeopardy. I would prefer to build a home close to my ageing parents rather than been forced to move away and build/purchase a house away from Wind Farms and at an increased cost.

I enjoy leisurely walks in the local rural roads and in Cloondahamper Bog. This is a nice get away from the hustle and bustle of a 9 to 5 job in a busy office. We have wonderful habitats and wildlife in our bogs and it would be ashamed for them to be destroyed.

I am also concerned about the potential of a bog slide similar to what happened in Derrybrien years ago. This would be devastating for the area.

I plead with An Coimisiún Pleanála to consider my submission and refuse planning permission for this

development.

As well as the above I wish to object on the following grounds.

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 Killereerin Community Council and Killereerin 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.

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.

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 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. The presence of shadow flicker, excessive noise, and visual intrusion from turbines would seriously disrupt this, affecting both our work and our well-being.

Scientific research underscores this concern. The study - 'Importance of Noise Hygiene in Dairy Cattle Farming – A Review (Dimov, Penev & Marinov, 2023)' highlights that exposure to noise and vibration—even from sources like a milking parlour—can reduce milk yield, lower milk quality, and stress the animals. Turbine noise represents a new, unfamiliar source that could have similar or worse effects on livestock.

Additionally, the developer has not addressed the practical realities of farming life. 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. For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed windfarm.

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 - 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>

Climate impact

From a scientific standpoint, developing the Cooloo Wind Farm on peat and forested land will create significant carbon losses from disturbed soils and vegetation. The Environmental Protection Agency already reports over 7 Mt CO₂e annually from the LULUCF sector. Any further increase breaches the intent of Ireland's carbon budgets and the EU LULUCF Regulation, which requires no net debit from land use. The Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2021 obliges decision-makers to act consistently with these limits. Replacing intact carbon sinks with infrastructure and limited native replanting does not align with the national climate objective of net zero by 2050. This project should be refused unless it fully restores and rewets the affected peatlands to avoid additional emissions.

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.

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,

Niamh Donohue

Name: Niamh Donohue

Date: 15 November 2025