

An Coimisiun Pleanala,  
64, Marlborough St.,  
Dublin 1.

Dated: 03.02.2026

**Name: John Fitzgerald**

**Address: Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find enclosed my Observation on the proposed **Ballyfasy Wind Farm/Case Reference number – PAX10.323957.**

Also included are the observations of the following people listed below:

1. Killian Fitzgerald, Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.
2. Lisa Fitzgerald, Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.
3. Jamie Fitzgerald, Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny
4. Seamus Fitzgerald, Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny
5. Bridget Fitzgerald, Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.
6. James Fitzgerald, Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.
7. Mary Fitzgerald, Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny.
8. Michael Kent, Redgates, Smithstown, Tullogher, Co. Kilkenny.
9. Rachel Kent, Redgates, Smithstown, Tullogher, Co. Kilkenny

AN COIMISIUN PLEANALA			
LDG- 086484-26			
ACP-			
Fee: € 50	Type: Cash		
Time: 10:15	By: HAND		
	05 FEB 2026		

We would appreciate your consideration on this matter which will hugely impact the lives and health of the community within this area.

Yours Sincerely,  
John Fitzgerald

---

Name: John Fitzgerald

Address: Flemingsstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Flemingsstown  
Glenmore to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms(both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards

Sam Fitzgerald

Name: Killian Fitzgerald  
Address: Flemington, Glenmore  
Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm  
Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Flemington, Glenmore to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms(both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**


The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards



Name: Lisa Fitzgerald

Address: Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co Kilkenny

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Flemingstown  
Glenmore to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### 4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms (both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### 5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### 6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### 7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind regards  
Lisa Fitzgerald

Name: JAMIE Fitzgerald

Address: Flemingstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Flemingstown  
Glenmore to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms (both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind regards  
Jamie Fitzgerald

Name:

*Seamus Fitzgall*

Address:

*weathertown*

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of *weathertown* to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

1

1900-1901  
1902-1903

1904-1905  
1906-1907

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms(both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards

---

Name: Bridget Fitzgerald

Address: Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co Kilkenny

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Weatherstown to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms (both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards

Bridget Fitzgerald

Name: JAMES FITZGERALD

Address: WATHERSTOWN GLENMORE CO KILKENNY

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of WATHERSTOWN to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms(both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards

James Fitzgerald

Name: Mary Fitzgerald  
Address: Weatherstown, Glenmore, Co. Kilkenny

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of Weatherstown to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms(both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**


The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter Fitzgerald', is written over a horizontal line.

Name: MICHAEL KENT

Address: REDGATES, SMITHSTOWN, TULLOGHER, KILKENNY, X91 CZY4.

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of [Insert Townland] to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms (both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**

The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications after permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards



2

Name: RACHEL KENT

Address: RED GATES, SMITHSTOWN, TULLOCHER, KILKENNY, X91C2Y4.

Application Name: Ballyfasy Wind Farm

Case Reference: PAX10.323957

## FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED BALLYFASY WINDFARM

Dear Secretary,

I am writing as a resident of [Insert Townland] to formally object to the proposed Ballyfasy Wind Farm. Our home is located less than 2km from the nearest turbine and is the centre of our family life and our children's upbringing. The scale of this industrial project, featuring 10 turbines up to 180m in height, is entirely incompatible with our settled rural environment.

My objection is based on the following fundamental grounds:

### 1. Dismissive Approach to Noise and Health (AM and LF Noise)

In their submission, the developers significantly downplay the impacts of Low-Frequency Noise (LFN) and Amplitude Modulation (AM), treating these rhythmic "thumping" or "beating" sounds as imperceptible. This dismissive stance is deeply concerning to our household. Planning permission is not a defence against private nuisance, as established in the landmark High Court decision *Webster v Meenacloghspar*.

Recent rulings like *Byrne & Moorhead v. ABO Energy* have acknowledged that wind turbine noise can cause profound sleep disturbance, anxiety, and heart palpitations and this is a genuine concern for our household.

### 2. Failure of Meaningful Community Engagement

There are 168 identified as being within 2km of the proposed windfarm, of which our house is one. The developer's engagement strategy has been "structurally and operationally resistant to inclusive practices". Rather than fostering a "social licence to operate" through genuine dialogue, the developer has treated engagement as a superficial, "box-ticking" exercise.

By replacing traditional "town hall" meetings with one-on-one "clinics," the developer prevented our community from collectively hearing the same message and prevented us from harnessing our local expertise to challenge the proposal. The clinic was held 13km from the proposed site leaving many people unable to attend. A fundamental principle of the Aarhus Convention is the right to public participation at an early stage, yet critical information—such as specific site entrances and turbine specifications—was withheld until after the planning application was submitted, making it too late for us to "shape and refine" the project.

### 3. Road Safety and School Traffic Hazards

The construction period (18–24 months) will introduce intense HGV traffic to narrow "L" roads used daily by school buses (servicing St Beacons NS and Ballyfasy NS) and families. The developer estimates 200,000 additional trips, not including the foundation pours and delivery of the turbines, which we feel poses an unacceptable safety hazard for our children and community. Our local roads lack the foundations for these industrial loads, and the developer's traffic plan fails to account for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on these narrow routes.

#### **4. Unacceptable Proximity to the Local National School**

The concentration of industrial turbines around our local school is a direct threat to the welfare of our children. Four industrial-scale turbines are proposed within 2km of the school, and all ten turbines are within a 3km radius. This creates an intensive industrial environment for our children's primary place of education.

We are gravely concerned about the shadow flicker and distracting noise that will enter classrooms (both during construction and operational phases), potentially disrupting concentration and the daily learning environment, especially for kids that have additional learning needs. The developer has failed to provide a specific assessment of how this concentration of large-scale machinery will impact the long-term well-being and safety of the youngest members of our community.

#### **5. Visual Domination and Inadequate Setbacks**

At a tip height of 180m, these turbines will exert a total spatial dominance over our landscape. Even following the 2019 Draft Guideline of four times the tip height, these turbines will be as close as 720m to many homes. Turbines placed this close represent an overbearing intrusion into our private living space. Furthermore, we demand "zero shadow flicker" at our home and school, as recommended in the 2019 Draft Guidelines. Relying on unverified automated software to stop a massive blade is not a sufficient guarantee for our family's health.

#### **6. Abuse of "Design Flexibility" (Section 37CC)**


The developer is seeking "Design Flexibility" under Section 37CC to decide on the final turbine specifications *after* permission is granted. This means we are being asked to accept a development where the exact rotor diameter, tip height, and sound power levels remain unconfirmed. We contend that it is impossible for the Commission to carry out a robust Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) when the "worst-case scenario" remains a moving target, leaving residents in the dark about the true impact on their properties.

#### **7. Devaluation and Community Sustainability**

This development puts our family's single largest asset—our home—at financial risk. Local evidence suggests such developments can lead to property devaluations of 15% to 40%. This project effectively "sterilises" the land for future generations, making it nearly impossible for our children to build homes here. We fear this will lead to a decline in school enrolments, local GAA clubs and the eventual "slow death" of our local community life.

**Conclusion** While we recognise national climate goals under Section 15(1) of the Climate Action Act, we implore that the potential for permanent injury to our residential amenity and child welfare is not outweighed by this project's contribution to energy targets. I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the Ballyfasy Wind Farm.

Kind Regards



David Key