

OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Phelim Conacur

Dangan

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 with my wife Emir and our daughter Megan. We purchased an old house 5 years ago and renovated it. Where we now reside is a peaceful and tranquill place to live. It is our forever home. Emir is a avid gardener and we have spent a substantial amount on our beautiful garden. This is where we go to relax and be at peace with nature.

A major concern for us is the disruption to our local roads during construction. This will have a serious impact on us for going to work etc and for our daughter who gets a bus from head of the road for college. Our roads are not made for this increased traffic and large abnormal loads.

I strongly request An Coimisiún Pleanála to consider my submission and to refuse planning for this development. I am objecting on the following issues.

Community Consultation and Engagement

The consultation led by Neoen and MKO for the Cooloo Wind Farm was deeply flawed and misleading. It does not meet the standards of genuine public engagement expected by An Bord Pleanála.

Notices appeared in the Irish Examiner while the Tuam Herald, the community's main news source, was ignored.

There was only a single public consultation meeting which was held outside Moylough, even though seven of nine turbines are proposed there. The plans have also changed significantly since this original meeting.

Despite claims of outreach to community groups, neither Killereen Community Council nor Killereen GAA were consulted. Only 55 homes were visited during 'door-to-door' engagement and ten written responses were received which is evidence of a process that failed to inform or involve the community. With poor broadband limiting access to online materials, and many residents not having the skills or technical knowledge to access online content, many locals were effectively excluded.

This was not meaningful consultation but a box-ticking exercise which did not provide the community with a fair chance to participate. These failures must carry serious weight in An Bord Pleanála's consideration of the application.

Planning Framework and Guidelines

Relying on the Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 is no longer appropriate. Since their publication, wind energy technology has advanced significantly, and scientific understanding has deepened. The 2006 Guidelines were based on turbines under 100 metres and 1–2MW in capacity, whereas the proposed turbines will be 180 metres tall and produce around 6MW, causing greater impacts.

The outdated nature of these guidelines has been acknowledged in the Dáil multiple times. In 2013, Deputy Micheál Martin noted that the guidelines did not reflect modern technology, and in 2025, Tánaiste Simon Harris confirmed that the Government prioritizes the creation of new guidelines.

Therefore, it is inappropriate for An Coimisiún Pleanála to base decisions solely on the 2006 Guidelines. Decisions must reflect current technology and environmental standards. All new Wind Farm developments should be paused until updated guidelines are established so that affected communities are not unfairly treated by these outdated guidelines

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.

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.

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

Lack of detailed traffic management plan

This submission objects to the proposed development due to insufficient traffic management and risk assessment in Appendix 15-2 (Traffic Management Plan). The plan omits essential quantitative data—such as expected abnormal load numbers, peak-phase traffic volumes, and route-specific scheduling—required to evaluate construction impacts. Narrow rural roads near Barnaderg and Cooloo lack the capacity for large turbine transport without pre-works strengthening or verge reinforcement. No detailed programme for road condition monitoring or reinstatement is provided. The TMP also fails to model cumulative or worst-case haulage scenarios, nor does it include enforceable mitigation measures for school transport, farm access or local business continuity. In the absence of these specifics, the project's potential impacts on road safety, infrastructure integrity and rural amenity remain unacceptably high. The application states that locals will be kept informed about traffic construction. Judging by how poorly locals were informed about the windfarm initially, I would be very sceptical as to whether we would be kept informed once construction was to commence. The Board should refuse permission or impose strict, verifiable traffic and haulage conditions.

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.

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.

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

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,



Name: Phelim Conacur

Date: 15 November 2025