

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Philip Windsor

Cloonascragh

lavally

Tuam

Galway

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin 1

D01 V902

Date: 09 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'm a fifth generation farmer living and working in the area. My home is 792 metres from T9 and my farm abounds the area marked out by the windfarm development at cooloo. I've managed and maintained 20 acres of peatland for nature and biodiversity as have my ancestors. This is directly on the boundary of the windfarm and I'm concerned that my stewardship of this habitat will be undone by this development. Additionally, I have some lying peatland which was reclaimed by my predecessor and I'm worried my farm viability will be affected by the disturbance of the water table by the massive foundation of concrete and steel at T9. I'm also concerned that the floating road proposed will lead to water table disruption, peat movement and wetting of farmland I rely on for my livelihood. The floating road is only 200m from the habitat I've maintained as have generations before me. I also care fulltime for my 85 year old Uncle who lives 735m from T9 and as a result it impacts my place of work here as well as my ability to enjoy my workplace (Farm). I'm concerned that this development will cause undue stress on my uncle who has lived here his entire life. I'm worried the animals on my farm will be stressed and could cause financial loss as well as impeding the development of my farm business. My eldest son hopes to return from Australia in the near future to carry on the family farm. I'm concerned it may impede on his decision to take over as he doesn't want to live in an area where turbines dominate him. I'm fearful that as all my property is within 792m that he will be unable to obtain planning permission to build and live here which is a necessity in order to care for the livestock.

## **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 Killarney Community Council and Killarney 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 application depends upon the 2006 Wind Energy Development Guidelines (WEDG), which are nearly twenty years old. These guidelines were written when onshore turbines rarely exceeded 100 metres in height. The proposed turbines, however, are approximately 180 metres tall, almost double that scale, yet the same 500-metre setback is applied. This outdated standard fails to reflect advances in turbine design, the increased magnitude of visual, noise and shadow impacts, or current scientific understanding of low-frequency sound and health. Comparable European jurisdictions apply height-based setbacks (for example, 10 times turbine height or a minimum of 1–2 km). Proceeding under static 2006 standards is inconsistent with international best practice and contrary to the precautionary principle enshrined in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). By relying on obsolete national guidance, the proposal fails to satisfy the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028 (GCDP) objectives to preserve landscape character and protect residential amenity (Policies LCM 1 and LCM 2).

## **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.

### **Right to Peaceful Enjoyment of Property**

Article 1, Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) protects 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."

Granting permission for this wind farm development would seriously interfere with my right to the peaceful enjoyment of my property as a landowner and farmer. My land is not only my livelihood but also my home and heritage, and its value lies in its usability, productivity, and tranquillity. The construction and operation of large-scale wind turbines would bring constant noise, vibration, and shadow flicker, making it extremely difficult to work or live on the land without disruption.

During the lengthy construction period, the constant movement of heavy machinery, road congestion, and elevated noise levels would disturb livestock, damage rural roads, and make normal farm operations significantly harder to carry out. Once operational, the turbines would permanently alter the landscape, impacting both animal welfare and the environment in which I work daily. The cumulative effects of noise, flicker, and visual dominance would deprive me of the peaceful enjoyment and practical use of my land.

Such disruption cannot reasonably be regarded as proportionate or justified in the public interest, and therefore would constitute a breach of the protections guaranteed 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**

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**

The EIAR's treatment of shadow flicker fails to meet statutory and international standards for the assessment and mitigation of human health and residential amenity impacts. It relies on outdated guidelines, applies over-simplified modelling assumptions, and does not provide adequate protection to the large number of dwellings and receptors affected.

The EIAR confirms that:

- 218 residential receptors are located within 1.62 km of proposed turbines,
- 171 of these are predicted to experience shadow flicker, and
- 43 receptors are within 1 km of a turbine.

These figures demonstrate that the project is situated in a densely inhabited rural area, yet the assessment dismisses the significance of impact based solely on a theoretical model rather than verified site conditions.

By any reasonable measure, 171 dwellings affected by a rotating shadow intrusion constitutes a major residential amenity and public health concern, not a negligible effect.

The EIAR applies the 2006 DoEHLG Wind Energy Development Guidelines, which allow up to 30 minutes per day or 30 hours per year of shadow flicker at any dwelling.

However:

- The 2019 Draft Wind Energy Development Guidelines (and reiterated in the 2025 Climate Action Plan Annex) require that no occupied dwelling or sensitive receptor experiences any shadow flicker through the use of automatic turbine control systems.
- The EIAR itself acknowledges that turbine software could achieve this standard but chooses to assess impacts under the obsolete 2006 thresholds.

This approach is contrary to current best practice and fails to future-proof the development in line with national policy on renewable energy development and community protection. Although the EIAR cites various international studies (some over a decade old) claiming no proven medical link between shadow flicker and disease, it fails to address contemporary health guidance:

- The World Health Organisation (2018) recognises annoyance and sleep disturbance as legitimate health effects of environmental light and noise intrusions.
- The HSE's own scoping response (2023) requested an assessment of all likely significant impacts on sensitive receptors, including shadow flicker, along with proposed mitigation.
- The EIAR's discussion focuses on whether shadow flicker can cause seizures (which is rare), but ignores chronic stress, fatigue, and loss of amenity due to regular flicker events within residential interiors.

The result is a narrow and outdated view of human health inconsistent with EPA (2022) guidance, which defines health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being."

The shadow flicker assessment in the Cooloo Wind Farm EIAR is deficient, outdated, and incomplete. It underestimates the true scale of residential intrusion and fails to apply the precautionary principle required under both EU and Irish environmental law.

Given:

- 171 dwellings predicted to experience flicker
- Outdated 2006 guideline thresholds
- Absence of enforceable mitigation and cumulative analysis

this development cannot be deemed to have no likely significant effect on human health or amenity.

## **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.

### **Cooloo National School**

Cooloo National School is 1.59km away from Turbine No 8.

The turbines being this close to the school will no doubt have an impact on the education of the children in Cooloo NS. The school will suffer from noise pollution, infrasound and shadow flicker. 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 catchment area of Cooloo NS. 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**

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

### **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  $23 \pm 7$  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>

### **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**

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 EIAR 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 EIAR'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 EIAR 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 (EIAR)
- European Commission (2024) Environmental Impact Assessment: Overview of EU Rules

### **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.

### **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,

Philip Windsor

Name: Philip Windsor  
Date: 09 November 2025