

Name: Carmel Coughlan
Address: Leitrim, Cree, Co. Clare
Date: 10/05/26

AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA	
LDG-	<u>087884-26</u>
ACP-	
15 MAY 2026	
Fee: €	<u>50</u> Type: <u>Chg</u>
Time:	<u>9:15</u> By: <u>Post</u>

Planning Reference Number: APC 324155-26

Re: Objection to Planning Application APC 324155-26 - Proposed Cahermurphy West Wind Farm

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I wish to lodge my objection to the above application for eight industrial wind turbines at the Cahermurphy West Wind Farm site.

Find enclosed the prescribed fee of €50 for this objection.

Grounds for Objection

1. Excessive Cumulative Impact and Landscape Overdevelopment

The West Clare area is already subject to an excessive concentration of industrial wind energy development, with 119 turbines operational and a further 42 awaiting determination. This level of proliferation has resulted in significant cumulative visual and landscape impacts, contrary to the principles of proper planning and sustainable development as set out in the *Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)* and the *Clare County Development Plan*.

The proposed development would further erode rural landscape character and scenic amenity, contrary to the *Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2006)* (and subsequent updates), which require careful consideration of cumulative impacts and landscape capacity.

2. Established Planning Precedent of Unsuitability

This proposal, previously submitted as *Cahermurphy II*, has been refused permission by Clare County Council and by An Coimisiún Pleanála (formerly An Bord Pleanála). These decisions establish a clear planning precedent that the site is unsuitable for this scale and type of development.

No material change in planning policy, environmental constraints, or site conditions has been demonstrated that would justify a different outcome, contrary to principles of consistency and proper planning.

3. Inappropriate Scale, Height, and Visual Dominance

The proposed turbines, at approximately 600 feet in height and located on land elevated approximately 200 feet above sea level, represent an excessive scale of development.

This conflicts with the *Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006)*, which emphasise the protection of residential amenity and landscape sensitivity. The development would result in significant visual intrusion, dominance, and adverse effects on the character of the receiving landscape and nearby dwellings.

4. Adverse Residential Amenity – Shadow Flicker

The proposal gives rise to a high likelihood of shadow flicker impacts on nearby residences. This is contrary to the *Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006)*, which require that shadow flicker be avoided or strictly controlled to protect residential amenity.

5. **Adverse Residential Amenity – Noise Impacts**

The likely noise emissions from turbines of this scale raise serious concerns regarding compliance with accepted noise thresholds set out in the *Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006)*.

The potential for adverse health and wellbeing impacts, particularly for vulnerable individuals (including those who are neurodivergent or have sensory sensitivities), has not been adequately addressed and is contrary to the requirement to safeguard residential amenity.

6. **Impacts on Protected Species and Biodiversity**

The area provides habitat for the hen harrier, a species protected under the EU Birds Directive and associated national legislation.

The proposed development gives rise to significant risks of disturbance, displacement, and collision mortality. As such, it is contrary to the requirements of the *Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC)* and the obligation to undertake Appropriate Assessment under Article 6, where significant effects on protected species cannot be ruled out.

7. **Inadequate and Unsuitable Road Infrastructure**

The local road network is rural in nature, with limited width, poor alignment, and restricted capacity. The scale of construction traffic associated with the development would be inconsistent with the capacity of this infrastructure.

This is contrary to the *Clare County Development Plan* policies on road safety and infrastructure provision, and raises significant concerns regarding traffic safety, road degradation, and disruption to local residents.

8. **Inadequate Public Consultation and Community Engagement**

The application is deficient in terms of meaningful public consultation and community engagement. This is contrary to the principles of public participation embedded in the *Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)* and the Aarhus Convention, which emphasises the right of communities to be properly informed and consulted in environmental decision-making processes.


9. **Negative Impact on Property Values and Residential Stability**

The proximity of large-scale industrial turbines has the potential to adversely affect property values in the surrounding area due to visual intrusion, noise, and perceived environmental impacts.

This may undermine the economic stability of local households and is contrary to the principle of protecting residential amenity as embedded in the *Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)*.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse Planning Application APC 324155-26 in the interests of habitat and environmental protection, public health and community wellbeing.

Yours Sincerely,


Carmel Coughla