

Mary O'Keeffe
Ismael Alves
Ballygrennan,
Bruff
Limerick

The Secretary,
An Bord Pleanála,
54 Marlborough Street,
Dublin 1

Case Reference: 323780; Installation of 17 160m wind turbines

18th November 2025

We object to the location of this development for the reasons outlined below.

Our main concern with this proposed project is the impact on our quality of life and health. We both work from home and will be at constant exposure to the effects of the turbines, with the closest one being 1 kilometre from us. Constant infrasound is a serious concern as this can cause anxiety, tinnitus, dizziness, breaks in concentration, etc. Long-term exposure is said to have adverse effects on multiple bodily systems and causes cell damage. In addition, consistent and fluctuating audible turbine sounds as well as the strobe effect of shadow flicker are likely to cause disruption and distress at the distance we are at from the wind farm (especially one of this scale) and the closest turbine. We are sensitive sleepers and, though we did not live in an overly noise-polluted part of the city previously, there were some nights when we could not sleep due to environmental noise. This is why we moved to the countryside, and it has since improved our health and wellbeing. This windfarm will take this away from us. Lack of sleep and sleep disturbance is a side-effect of living in proximity to wind turbines that is not in dispute, and it is named as a serious cause of ill health by the WHO. The Geneva Convention also lists it as a form of torture. Sleep disturbance plays a well-known significant role in causing accidents of all kinds.

We would like to note, in addition to the above, that there have been high court decisions recently taken where turbines have been decommissioned due to adverse impacts on quality of life for nearby residents, as well as loss of property value. Some individuals received compensation in damages from the wind energy companies in question, as ordered by the court. It took over a decade for these cases to come through the legal system, resulting in additional strife for the residents. How many years will it take for others affected to move through the courts? Here, we are speaking of those who have the resources and the means to take on major energy companies. It is likely that there are many others who cannot afford to have a voice in these matters, regardless of how their lives are affected. I do not think the government will be able to claim ignorance for not knowing the ill effects of living close to industrial turbines, since they refuse to implement regulations in the first place.

There have also been recent examples of damaged turbines causing issues to local populations and the environment. One such example is a turbine catching fire in Fermanagh and spouting toxic fumes into the district. A similar incident took place in Antrim in 2016. In Plymouth, Massachusetts last week (November 10th), a 22-30m long blade fell into a cranberry bog, with the local fire chief stating that “We were fortunate that this turbine is located out in the middle of the cranberry bogs and not in a residential area.” In May of this year, a turbine caught fire and a blade dislodged and fell off in Victoria, Australia. Also in May, a wind turbine in Lower Saxony in Germany caught fire, completely burning down the nacelle, while parts of the rotor blades and other components fell into the surrounding countryside, which was contaminated as a result of the incident. One hundred firefighters tackled this fire, which came from a turbine with a hub height of 65m. The entire windfarm had to be disconnected from the grid for safety reasons. In January of this year, a turbine in Meurthe-et-Moselle in France ignited, causing burning debris to fall from it, and where the fire brigade required reinforcements from another district to tackle the flames. In December of 2024, two Brazilian workers in the state of Rio Grande do Norte had to be rescued by helicopter when a wind turbine caught fire while they were servicing it. In August 2023 on the Norfolk coast, a wind turbine caught fire, destroying the turbine blades, generator, and gearbox, and leading to the decommissioning of 6 other nearby turbines until the cables could be isolated. A similar incident occurred in Hull in 2022, with people being advised not to use pleasure craft on the close-by river as a precaution after the incident. These are just some examples, and I’m sure many of them do not reach the news. The point is not that the turbines constantly catch fire, but that the fire risk is well high enough for turbines to not be placed in the midst of communities. This is especially pertinent when considering that there are many rural spaces for the project to proceed in a way that would be far safer for citizens. Due to toxic fumes, the height of the proposed turbines, falling debris, the dangers unique to this kind of fire, and the risk of fire spreading through the cables if not contained in time, it must also be asked whether the local emergency services will be equipped to deal with this kind of emergency and the risks associated with it, especially in time to prevent destruction and harm to human life? Was this something that was considered and accounted for when the developers chose this area? It is doubtful. In addition to this, on particularly dry and hot days, an increasing phenomenon in Ireland due to climate change, there is an even higher likelihood of fires spreading in the district that may not be controllable. The human cost associated with these risks is simply too high for such a project to proceed in such a well-populated location.

This project, with wind turbines so close to communities of this size, especially with turbines of these proportions as well as a windfarm of this magnitude, carries a high risk of leading to community decay at a time when a protracted housing crisis is projected to last another 15 years at least. Communities must be protected and be allowed to develop further and to grow and flourish. This also provides opportunities in terms of a place to settle down for aspiring home-owners. If this project goes ahead, not only will future potential home-buyers and home-builders be far more likely deterred from the area due to proximity to this substantial wind farm, but the windfarm company themselves will likely object to any housing planning applications within 3 kilometres (often for the very same reasons that

residents object to windfarms in proximity to their homes). One recent example of this reached the news when a windfarm objected to a Tipperary woman's plans to build a home, although we can be certain that most incidents do not reach the media. This will mean the slow death of the community and the decay and waste of existing amenities and resources as well as the denial of future resources for the district. This will not only badly affect the community, but will feed back into and worsen the housing crisis in Limerick, giving home-buyers and home-builders fewer options of where to make their home. Of all times, existing communities that are already built up should be strengthened and supported and encouraged to grow instead of nudged into decline by misplaced industrial projects.

Our home is a part of The Golden Vale which is famous for being the best pastureland in the country. Digging it up for cables and pouring concrete over it will cause irreparable damage at a time when the climate crisis is rapidly worsening and when food scarcity is a very real concern for a future which is unfortunately fast approaching. Putting a windfarm in the Golden Vale area is the same kind of short-sightedness and prioritisation of short-term convenience that has led to the climate crisis in the first place. The destruction of prime farmland will also have economic repercussions for the district too. There must be more consideration and care employed here, for the good of the whole country as well as ourselves our community.

Since The Golden Vale consists of critical quality soil, the area is home to flourishing biodiversity. This biodiversity will be put at risk by industrial wind farm development on this land. Balancing wind energy needs for a cleaner environment should be measured against detrimental environmental impacts that wind energy initiatives could cause in an unsuitable area or the 'green' result will be offset and nullified by the resulting environmental damage. Native vegetation and wildlife must be protected at this time when all species, though some more than others, are vulnerable. This is, of course, even more so the case in relation to endangered bird and bat species, which this area is home to, when it comes to wind farms. The turbines proposed in this case, have blades substantial enough to have catastrophic effect on these local populations, some of which are red-listed. Other local animals, insects, and pollinators will also be adversely impacted, with trees felled, hedgerows destroyed and habitats uprooted for cables or paved over for roads and facilities. Again, the knock-on effects of this also have implications for land productivity in all of the surrounding area as well as future food security.

This is a historic area, containing, amongst other invaluable sites, the Grange Stone Circle (the largest surviving stone circle in Ireland), Lough Gur (a place of great cultural and spiritual significance in ancient Ireland, and an area which includes various ancient tombs, remains of dwellings, and areas of importance), the historic town of Bruff which forms part of the Ballyhoura Way, Ballygrennan castle, and many other sites of historical significance. This location is home to ancient tombs, dwellings, and significant sites from the stone age until the present day. Digging up roads and fields and implanting the turbines and their associated infrastructure will have a detrimental effect on these important heritage sites that are integrated with surrounding nature. Installing windfarms and the accompanying requisite infrastructure in these areas would diminish our heritage which is closely tied to the land

itself, and it would also hinder tourism. This project will diminish our enjoyment of and connection to our home and community, of which we are proud.

This project could also have a detrimental impact on some of our natural floodplains, exposing the locality to additional dangers and risks as a result. Trees will also be felled as part of this project, which can further exacerbate flooding. Just last week, our own land as well as the surrounding countryside was left waterlogged after persistent rains. There is a significant chance these kinds of scenarios will be exacerbated, causing safety issues and damage to our property, should this project proceed.

It is worth mentioning that property values decline within the shadow of windfarms, as highlighted in the results of recent court cases in relation to the matter in Ireland. While we personally have no current intention of selling our house as we are very happy here, having chose this location carefully when buying, we are left uncertain with what the future will hold if this windfarm is allowed to proceed. If living in proximity to these turbines becomes unbearable, leaving will not likely be an option for us since there is an ever-intensifying housing crisis and, since the value of properties in proximity to turbines will diminish, it will make it almost impossible to sell in order to escape them.

the company's claims that they engaged earnestly with the community must also be disputed. We take exception, as outlined below, to the company's quote: "Our community clinics replace traditional 'town hall' or open exhibition forum. The community team feels this forum presents an opportunity for all voices to be heard and avoids situations where a small cohort of anti-wind voices dominate."

First of all, this company, whose project will have a major impact on the homes of hundreds of people in the area, not to talk of the environmental effects, somehow feels it has the right to decide how the entire community should engage with the proposed changes and has made an executive decision to this effect. We have made appeals to the company to speak to us and the community openly in a "town hall" format, which is 'traditional' because it is effective. It should not need to be said that a "town hall" lends itself to transparency and openness which the individual meetings the company held do not. A "town hall" also allows the community as well as the company to discuss all aspects of the project to make decisions and share opinions together. We have shared these concerns with the company via email and they were not receptive to our feedback, instead deflecting the concerns and questions. That the company did not proceed with such a meeting leads us to believe that they do not wish to discuss this and make decisions about suitability and community safety and health together. Who knows what they have told various individuals who visited the clinics that may not have been in alignment with what they told other community members who attended? We cannot know, as this is not a transparent method. This is not good enough. The company refusing to meet the community on terms which the community is comfortable with, to us, is an indicator of bad faith on behalf of the company. There is a sense in this approach that the decision will be made regardless of the community and so public engagement, despite the calls from the community to speak with the company on more transparent and fair terms, was not something that they needed to consider. It is all but certain that the company were not flexible on their plans and made no changes to their initial proposal based on any of the concerns of the

residents. If this project is approved with the 'community engagement' aspect taking place on these terms, then it will confirm that community voices do not, in fact, matter.

As stated in their own documentation, the claim that the 'forum' they proceeded with would allow "an opportunity for all voices to be heard and avoids situations where a small cohort of anti-wind voices dominate" is deeply contradictory. To explore the many problems with this statement, I will use bullet points for clarity:

- To claim that individual meetings constitute a 'forum' is misleading at best. It comes across as disingenuous at the very least for the company to use this word when they refuse at all turns to have a forum, instead leaving community members only with the option of individual clinics.
- The company claims that the 'forum' allows for all voices to be heard and yet in the same sentence anticipates an "anti-wind cohort" from whom they admit they do not want to hear. If "all opinions" are truly important, this should include an "anti-wind cohort." The decision to not go ahead with a public meeting for this reason suggests that they do not want a truly open and transparent conversation with the community and that there are questions that they are not comfortable answering. Accountability has to be part of a project such as this. This company has blatantly refused it.
- "anti-wind cohort" also implicitly suggests that those who oppose the project are against clean energy, in an apparent attempt to dismiss those who disagree. Speaking for ourselves, and, honestly, anyone else in the community that we have spoken to about this, we are in no way against wind energy and are in support of clean energy initiatives. To lump any opposition to this specific project into an "anti-wind cohort" is frankly insulting and minimises the many real concerns I and other community members have about the specifications of this particular project, and the responsible application of any industrial developments, may they be for wind farms or coalmines.
- Again, the reluctance to have a group meeting with the community in conjunction with the anticipation of a dissenting "cohort" indicates that the company is aware that this project is not beneficial for the area and community and would rather bypass the entire community to implement the project regardless of the community and minimise any potential for accountable conversation.
- The company is not consistent when they say that a "small cohort" will "dominate." If the cohort is so small, why do they expect them to dominate the discussion? This makes no logical sense and again suggests that the company is operating in bad faith when it comes to these clinics. This may be another indicator that the company do not anticipate community support from the outset, due to the nature of the project and the negative impact it will have on this area.

As an additional point, I (Mary) would like to add that when I personally reached out to the company to appeal to them to hold an actual open forum for this project, I was advised that the company had experience already with 'aggressive' community members when trying to discuss the project and so did not wish to proceed in this manner. I find this very difficult to believe because we have a very respectful and peaceful community, but it had also been so recent since the project was made known to the community and the community was still

coming to terms with it that it was hard to believe that such an interaction truly could have taken place already at that point. This was well before the clinics and before project specifics were released. I asked why their expectation was that the community would be aggressive if spoken to as a whole, when they had not even tried this approach yet. They failed to answer my question.

All of the above is to say that no real effort was made to speak with the community, and so the company's claims of engagement are false. The first we heard of it was from a knock on the door. By the time we answered, the man and woman from the company were already making their way back to their car and a leaflet was on the floor of the porch. They seemed reluctant to speak to us and told us that there was information on the leaflet and more on the website and seemed to want to get away. Mary had some questions for them about where it would be and they said it would be behind our house but when asked for more details, the woman said that the company doesn't know where exactly yet (this seemed disingenuous, since she was initially confident that it would be behind our house). We also asked would we benefit from this energy and she said that we would not, that it would go back to the grid. Asked if the energy would be exported, as some other windfarms in Ireland have been, she said that it would not. The man, seemingly irritated by the questions, made a sarcastic comment about an aspect of our house which required work. Being sneered at for asking questions left a bad taste in our mouths which future interactions with the company only added to. It also led us to wonder why they were making house calls if they were unwilling to discuss the project or answer questions about it. It seemed more like they wanted to tick the box of saying that they engaged the community. They were eager to get away and told us again that all information needed was on the leaflet and more on the website. The leaflet had very sparse information, and the website little, if any, more. Any further interactions with the company took place because we reached out to them and, each time, they were committed to not answering any questions, and instead deflecting or repeating what seemed to be stock text that was not relevant to the question asked.

As a final note, with no regulations for building and locating industrial wind farms, only outdated guidelines from 2006, a time when wind turbines were almost 4 times smaller than those being proposed in our area and much less data available as to their impact at this time. The rules cannot be that there are no rules. In this particular case, if the project proceeds, a quite large and well-populated community will be forced to live with one of the biggest on-shore wind projects in the country, despite the fact that the area is not suitable due to population size in proximity, the best pastureland in the country being here, at-risk bats, birds and biodiversity being put at further risk, sub-optimal wind levels, etc. We are aware that it is easier and more cost-effective for wind energy companies to install developments on-shore and in areas with existing infrastructure than it is to build projects offshore or in more rural places. This should never take precedence over the safety of citizens and the responsible protection of the environment. If the green light is given for this project, it appears that the main considerations taken before allowing it to proceed were that someone was willing to sell the land to the company, and that the company merely had to proceed with the formality of asking in order to be allowed to move forward. Wind energy targets or no, a

more rural, more wind-optimised area should be found, and there are plenty of these in Ireland.

Wind energy should certainly be harnessed in order to reduce harmful emissions, but this can only truly lead to 'greener' outcomes if allowed to proceed responsibly. There is no need to put communities at risk. There are far more rural, not to speak of more wind-efficient, spaces in Ireland that can be used. The reason for proceeding and putting communities, biodiversity, and the environment at risk cannot be only that it is convenient for the developers; that they have been sold the land and that the climate goals are looming.