



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ACP-323955-25

|                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| <b>Case Reference / Description</b>                                              | Proposed development of Kilmichael Wind Farm, associated 110kV off-site Substation, and associated works within the townlands of Mountebo, Kilmichael Hill, Lyrane, Craanhill, Craan Lower, Ballygullen, Ballyowen, Ballinacoola, and Glandoran Lower, Co. Wexford |                   |        |
| <b>Case Type</b>                                                                 | Pre-application consultation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                   |        |
| <b>1<sup>st</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> / 3<sup>rd</sup> / 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting</b> | 1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                   |        |
| <b>Date</b>                                                                      | 12 March 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>Start Time</b> | 2:30pm |
| <b>Location</b>                                                                  | MS Teams                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>End Time</b>   | 3:55pm |

|                                                |
|------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Representing An Coimisiún Pleanála</b>      |
| Una Crosse (Assistant Planning Director) Chair |
| Adrian Ormsby (Senior Planning Inspector)      |
| Emmet Smyth (Senior Scientist)                 |
| Paula Kearney (Senior Ecologist)               |
| Ellen Moss (Executive Officer)                 |

|                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| <b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b> |
| Jenny Howard, Regnum Renewables               |
| Daragh Browne, Regnum Renewables              |
| Karen McDermott, Regnum Renewables            |
| Jim Hughes, Fehily Timoney                    |
| Robyn Nicholl, Fehily Timoney                 |
| Trevor Byrne, Fehily Timoney                  |

|                                 |
|---------------------------------|
| Aoife Hurd, Fehily Timoney      |
| Jason Guile, APEM               |
| Maeve Maher-McWilliams, Woodrow |
| John Ball, Woodrow              |
| Richard Barker, MacroWorks      |
| Alistair Clarke, TLI Group      |

## Introduction

The Commission referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant on the 4<sup>th</sup> December 2025, requesting pre-application consultations under section 37B of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and advised the prospective applicant that the instant meeting essentially constituted an information-gathering exercise for the Commission; it also invited the prospective applicant to outline the nature of the proposed development and to highlight any matters that it wished to receive advice on from the Commission. The Commission's representatives mentioned the following general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process:

- The Commission will keep a record of this meeting and any other meetings, if held. Such records will form part of the file which will be made available publicly at the conclusion of the process. The record of the meeting will not be amended by the Commission once finalised, but the prospective applicant may submit comments on the record which will form part of the case file.
- The Commission will serve notice at the conclusion of the process as to the strategic infrastructure status of the proposed development. It may form a preliminary view at an early stage in the process on the matter.
- A further meeting or meetings may be held in respect of the proposed development.
- Further information may be requested by the Commission and public consultations may also be directed by the Commission.

- The Commission may hold consultations in respect of the proposed development with other bodies.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Commission in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in any legal proceedings.

**Presentation made by the prospective applicant:**

The prospective applicant set out their presentation, which is on the file.

**Discussion:**

- ACP representative's sought clarity on the strategic infrastructure status of the proposed development with the prospective applicant stating that the proposal would exceed the 50MW threshold.
- ACP representatives advised that the proposal should consider all relevant policies in the current CDP and not solely those related to renewable energy with the consideration of material contravention advised.
- The prospective applicant clarified that BESS is not proposed in this application.
- The ACP representatives advised that decommissioning should be considered as part of the EIAR.
- Noted that NatureScot guidelines are being followed.
- Requirement to obtain letters of consent for works on third party lands outlined.
- Public consultation strategy proposed to be outlined.
- ACP representatives recommended that EIA and AA reporting should employ the most up-to-date guidance for survey and assessment, with clear and concise reporting. Survey methodology guidelines followed to be outlined, including assumptions, limitations, timing, duration, and any deviations from guidance.
- Consultation with statutory bodies is advised early in the process to discuss survey and assessment methodologies and biodiversity enhancement proposals within the site.

- ACP representatives highlighted recent revisions to NatureScot guidelines with respect to Collision Risk Modelling (CRM), Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore windfarms (NatureScot, 2025). Please provide the rationale for determining which species are included and excluded from CRM analyses.
- ACP representatives advised that a robust methodological approach is required to assess impacts on birds within the proposed wind farm site, including cumulative and in combination effects from all relevant developments for the appropriate area, using best practice techniques and scientific knowledge, to include population-level references for assessment and context of magnitude of impact.
- ACP representatives stated that a detailed rationale is required for the selection of key ecological receptors brought forward to the assessment.
- ACP representatives advised that baseline aquatic ecology surveys should be completed upstream and downstream of the proposed river crossings. The results should be used to characterise existing conditions and to inform the scope and design of ecological monitoring during the construction phase.
- ACP representatives advised that otter, bat and breeding bird surveys should be conducted in accordance with best practice guidelines, at water crossings within the wind farm site, and on the turbine delivery and grid connection routes.
- ACP representatives advised that detailed proposals should be provided with respect to the borrow pits and spoil storage areas with respect to dewatering, water management and pollution control. Detailed hydrological assessments are required to assess potential alterations on flow regimes to receiving waterbodies.
- ACP representatives advised that, if required, Regulation 54 derogation licences for Annex IV species to be obtained in advance of submitting the application.
- ACP representatives advised that, where possible, the removal of linear vegetation is minimised on the turbine delivery route and grid connection route.

- ACP representatives advised that an invasive species survey and management plan should include the wind farm site, turbine delivery route and grid connection route.
- ACP representatives advised that a detailed and scientifically robust evidence-based approach is required to validate the effectiveness of the site-specific mitigation measures proposed, noting the proximity of high-status water bodies and protected aquatic species. Source control and pathway interception measures appropriate to local environmental conditions should be prioritised.
- ACP representatives stated that the impact assessment should address how habitats are altered by the wind farm construction and how biodiversity enhancement measures may affect future wildlife use of the site under post-construction conditions.
- ACP representatives stated that a robust Water Framework Directive (WFD) report should form part of the application.
- ACP representatives requested that a robust justification be provided for the noise limits as part of the noise assessment.
- ACP representatives stated that landslide susceptibility should form part of the stability assessment.
- ACP representatives stated that consistency should be maintained between the and the archaeological assessment.
- Justification for the viewpoint locations for landscape and visual assessment should be provided.
- ACP representatives advised that notwithstanding consideration of landscape impacts relevant to Cultural Heritage may also be required within the EIAR e.g. visual impacts towards and from archaeological monuments etc.
- The Commission's representatives requested that a robust chapter on human health and well-being be submitted with any future application.
- ACP representatives advised that the distance to nearest dwellings should be clearly identified on a map. This should also include location and distances to possible non habitable dwellings/structures etc.

- ACP representatives noted that communication masts would be relocated. The prospective applicant stated that consultations are ongoing with the telecom provider, and a robust strategy would be in place.
- ACP representatives requested that wind wake considerations be addressed and mapped -both within and external to the site.
- ACP representatives advised that the Commission has very limited opportunity to request further information under the provisions of the REDIII.
- ACP representatives advised that a pre-application consultation under section 182E would be required if design flexibility was required for the electricity elements. The prospective applicant advised that it is intended to apply for one option.
- A discussion was held in respect of new EIA scoping provisions.
- ACP representatives ended the meeting by advising that an agenda would be issued in advance of the next meeting to inform the relevant experts required to attend.

### **Conclusion:**

The Commission's representatives advised that the onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Commission's representatives advised that the record of the instant meeting will be issued in the meantime and that the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting.

The Meeting concluded at 15:55.



**Una Crosse**

**Assistant Director of Planning**