

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Padhraic Stone  
Barnaderg South  
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 grew up in the area and have a close affiliation and love for the landscape and area. My relatives are still living in the area and continue to farm the land as they have done for generations. My wife and I have recently refurbished a derelict home to live in the community. I have made several observations and comments regarding the ineffective nature of the proposed location:

1.) The spinning turbines of a wind farm take energy from the wind, they create a wake that slows the wind beyond the wind farm. This wake can stretch more than 100km (62 miles) and can reduce the energy output of wind farms down wind by as much as 10% or more. The proposed wind farm in Cooloo is within the 100km wake of the West Galway windfarms of Leitir Guingaid Wind Farm, Ugool, Seecon and Knock South Wind Farm. The wind farm in Cooloo is proposed to only operate 35% of the time and it is immediately 10% less effective as it lies in the wake of West Galway wind farms.

2.) The proposal does not logically make sense and is in contradiction with Ireland's increasing societal, legal and financial pressures from the EU and international commitments to conserve and restore peatlands (EU Habitats Directive & upcoming Nature Restoration Law). To maintain and improve water quality (EU Water Framework Directive), and to estimate and report reliable national greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from peatlands (UN Paris Agreement). This proposal intends to remove virgin bog(carbon store) that would help

Ireland meet these commitments and fill it with literal tons of concrete (carbon producing) to harness wind energy to combat climate change. This is an exercise in futility. It will compromise biodiversity, hamper water quality, and have a negative visual impact on green tourism.

3.) Water - The UN recognises access to clean, safe water as a fundamental human right, yet the proposed wind farm risks undermining this principle. If construction or operation leads to water contamination, local residents could be forced to buy clean water, placing an unfair financial and health burden on the community. No development should compromise such a basic right.

I wish to make observations and comments on the proposed Cooloo Windfarm:

### **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.

### **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**

Similar to noise, shadow flicker caused by turbines would be similar to living with a faulty light bulb during the day, and at night, with flashing red lights. Residents have a right to live in their homes without unreasonable interference. The UN Convention on Human Rights guarantees that people will not be subjected to arbitrary interference to their homes or family.

### **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.

### **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

### **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 CO<sub>2</sub>e 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.

### **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**

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,

AS+ONE

Name: Padhraic Stone  
Date: 20 November 2025