

# OBSERVATION/SUBMISSION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Case Reference: 323761

Rachael Hanly  
Curryoughter  
Cummer  
Tuam  
Galway

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

Date: 08 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 was raised in Lissavalley in my home house with my parents and siblings. My home house is 1.7km from turbine 1. But it will be around 90m to the construction entrance and will be greatly impacted by additional traffic, noise, dust and general disturbances of the construction route.

My children need to visit their grandparents every week. When we visit we will be impacted by noise pollution, LFN and shadow flicker. This will really impact us as one of my children is autistic. My child is greatly impacted by change and this development will without a doubt impact her weekly visits. The additional traffic and noise may even make it impossible for us to visit at all. When the road is closed for the laying of the cable it will be impossible to get into the family home.

I am also concerned about my parents, my brothers, niece and nephew living in the area. This development will impact of their daily life and their health.

I grew up in the area and do not want the visual amenity and peace of the area to be destroyed by this development.

My father and my brother both farm the land around this area. No doubt the development will impact on our family farm. It will also have an impact on the birds and animals in the area.

The following are the reasons I object to this proposed development:

## **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**

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.

### **Impact of Wind Turbines on the Neurodiverse within the Community**

Numerous studies and planning inspectors with An Coimisiún Pleanála have acknowledged that wind turbines can have negative effects on neurodiverse individuals. Research by Howell (2015) found that people with autism are more sensitive to environmental noise, experiencing higher rates of sleep disturbance,

cognitive difficulties, and stress due to low-frequency noise (LFN). The neurodiverse community often struggles to filter background sounds, and constant turbine noise and vibration could cause pain, anxiety, and loss of concentration, reducing quality of life.

These impacts extend to education. Local schools and preschools, including Brierfield National School which has a special class for children with autism, would be particularly affected. Senior planning inspectors have previously noted that facilities for children with additional educational needs may become unviable near large-scale wind farms due to such disturbances.

Shadow flicker poses further risks, as studies (Becchio et al., 2010) show that individuals on the autistic spectrum may fixate on spinning movements, heightening distress. Those with epilepsy or neurological conditions may also be affected.

Ireland's obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities require protection from harm and equal enjoyment of rights. Allowing this development would contradict those principles.

While more research is needed, there is no definitive evidence proving that wind farms are safe for, and do not significantly impact, the neurodiverse community—and the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

#### References:

- An Bord Pleanála. (2016). PA0041 – Assisting report to Senior Inspector [PDF]. <https://www.pleanala.ie/anbordpleanala/media/abp/cases/reports/pa0/rpa0041a.pdf>
- An Bord Pleanála. (2015). Inspector's report: ABP-PA0038 [PDF]. <https://www.pleanala.ie/anbordpleanala/media/abp/cases/reports/pa0/rpa0038.pdf>
- Howell, G. (2015). Autism and the effect of introducing a new noise source into quiet rural communities: risk factor from industrial wind power generation
- Becchio C, Mari M, Castiello U (2010) Perception of Shadows in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. PLoS ONE 5(5): e10582. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010582>

## Farming

There are dairy and dry-stock farmers in Barnaderry, Cooloo and the surrounding areas, both full-time and part-time. Holdings vary in size. Many of these farmers depend on their livestock performing well in order to pay their bills. Also, those who are farming in the area enjoy the work they do, in the absence of shadow flicker, noise or visual pollution. If this development is granted their livelihoods will be impacted.

The 'Importance of Noise Hygiene in Dairy Cattle Farming – A Review' (Published November 1st of 2023 by Dimo Dimov, Toncho Penev and Ivaylo Marinov) details how vibration and noise from a milking parlour can negatively impact the milk yield and milk quality of a dairy cow. The paper also discusses how exposing animals to noise from an unfamiliar source can cause them stress.

It is also important to note that the developer has not taken into account the ways in which farmers depend on the local roads for moving cattle and for access to their land when going about their daily tasks within their farms.

#### 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

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

#### **Road disruption during construction**

I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds of significant traffic and road safety impacts during construction, particularly in relation to abnormal load deliveries. The Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 15-2) lacks essential detail, including the number, timing and routing of heavy goods and turbine loads, and commitments to off-peak scheduling. Without clear and enforceable mitigation, there is a risk of damage to narrow rural roads, verges and drainage, along with conflicts between construction vehicles, farm traffic and school transport. No robust plan has been presented for road strengthening, maintenance or reinstatement. The absence of detailed community-specific measures leaves local access, amenity and safety inadequately protected. Until comprehensive information and binding commitments are provided, the proposal represents an unacceptable risk to road infrastructure and rural community wellbeing. Having roads closed for a combined 210 days (at a minimum) is unacceptable. It is also unacceptable for locals to have diversions of up to 13.7km per journey for the duration of this project.

#### **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**

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 and would have lasting negative effects on local residents, farmers, and the wider community. I therefore strongly object to this proposal and ask that it be refused in full.

If permission is not refused outright, I request that an oral hearing be held so that local residents, farmers, and the wider community can have our say on the impacts of this development.

Yours Sincerely,

Rachael Hanly

Name: Rachael Hanly

Date: 08 November 2025