

Formal Objection to Proposed Lemanaghan Wind Farm Development

To: An Coimisiún Pleanála

Re: Formal Objection / Observation on Proposed Lemanaghan Wind Farm Development

Case Reference: PAX19.324161

Development: Proposed - Proposed development of 15 no. wind turbines, a permanent 220kV on-site substation, and associated infrastructure at Lemanaghan, Co. Offaly.

Submitted by: Glenn Halligan, Niamh Halligan, Tom Halligan, Ben Halligan and Dan Halligan

Address: Lemanaghan, Ballycumber, Co. Offaly, R35 WK16

Nearest Turbine: T05, approximately 1,328 metres from our home - – Identified by applicant as House ID: 112

Date: 24th May 2026

Dear Inspector,

We wish to formally object to the proposed Lemanaghan Wind Farm development.

This objection is made by our family: Glenn Halligan, Niamh Halligan and our three sons, Tom, Ben and Dan. Our family home at House ID 112 is located approximately 1,328 metres from the nearest proposed turbine, T05.

We are not opposed to renewable energy in principle. However, we strongly object to this proposed development because of its scale, location and proximity to our family home. We are seriously concerned that the proposal would have unacceptable impacts on our sleep, health, residential amenity, road safety, local environment, wildlife and the rural character of Lemanaghan.

Having reviewed the applicant's documentation, we do not believe the full real-world impact on nearby family homes has been adequately assessed. We respectfully ask An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse permission.

1. Sleep, Health and Residential Amenity

Our primary concern is the impact this development would have on our home, our sleep and our family life.

Lemanaghan is a quiet rural area. At night, background noise levels are very low. This matters greatly to families living here, particularly where children and medically vulnerable people are involved.

I Glenn live with a chronic autoimmune condition. Chronic sleep disruption is not a minor inconvenience for someone managing these conditions; it is a serious health and wellbeing concern.

The applicant's noise assessment predicts that guideline limits will be met at our property. However, **predicted compliance on paper does not guarantee that our family will be protected in practice.**

Noise modelling cannot fully account for every wind direction, night-time condition, temperature inversion, atmospheric effect or real-life experience over the lifetime of the development. Once turbines of approximately 220 metres blade-tip height are built and operating through the night, 1,328 metres from our home, there is no simple way to undo the impact if the reality is worse than predicted.

We ask the Commission to treat our home as a genuinely sensitive receptor: a family home with three children and a medically vulnerable adult, located close to very large turbines in a quiet rural landscape.

2. Shadow Flicker

The applicant's own documentation confirms predicted shadow flicker at House ID 112:

Maximum daily shadow flicker: 29 minutes

Maximum annual shadow flicker: 24 hours and 1 minute

Adjusted annual shadow flicker: 7 hours and 4 minutes

The applicant states that mitigation is not required. We do not accept that this is reasonable.

Shadow flicker is not an abstract technical issue. It is a physical intrusion into a family home. We have children who do homework, read, rest and sleep at home. We should not be expected to accept recurring shadow flicker simply because it falls slightly below a guideline threshold.

The applicant's own figures confirm that our home will be affected. The issue for the Commission is whether it is acceptable to impose this recurring impact on a family home for the lifetime of the development.

We submit that it is not.

3. Paper Compliance Versus Real-World Impact

We are concerned that the application relies too heavily on predicted compliance and not enough on real-world living conditions.

We understand that the High Court decisions in **Webster and Anor v Meenacloghspar (Wind) Limited** and **Shorten and Anor v Meenacloghspar**

(Wind) Limited, including [2024] IEHC 136 and [2026] IEHC 154, considered complaints from families living near operational wind turbines.

We refer to these cases because they appear directly relevant to our concern. They show that compliance with planning noise conditions does not necessarily answer the practical question of whether turbine noise may interfere with the ordinary enjoyment of a home.

That is exactly our concern here. We are not saying that the applicant's model is dishonest. We are saying that **a model cannot fully predict what it will actually be like to live in our home with these turbines operating nearby.**

The Commission has the opportunity to consider that risk now, before permission is granted. We respectfully ask that it does so.

4. Scale and Setback

The proposed turbines would reach approximately 220 metres to blade tip. That is an enormous industrial scale for this rural landscape.

Our home is approximately 1,328 metres from T05. We do not believe this is an adequate setback, having regard to the height of the turbines, the quiet nature of the receiving environment and the direct impacts predicted at our home.

There is no statutory minimum setback distance for wind turbines in Ireland. However, the absence of a fixed rule does not mean this proposal is acceptable.

The Commission must assess whether this specific development, at this specific scale, in this specific location, and at this distance from our family home, is acceptable in planning terms.

We submit that it is not.

5. Inadequate Cumulative Assessment

We are concerned that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report does not adequately assess the combined impact of the development on nearby homes.

The effects should not be considered in isolation. For our family, the impact would be cumulative and long-term, including:

Operational turbine noise

Low-frequency noise and amplitude modulation concerns

Shadow flicker confirmed at our home

Visual dominance from very large turbines

Aviation lighting

Construction traffic, dust and disruption

Long-term change to the surrounding bogland landscape
Impacts on wildlife and local biodiversity

The EIAR separates these issues into different chapters. However, our family would experience them together, at one home, over many years.

The real planning question is not whether each individual chapter can be defended in isolation. The question is whether the overall impact on nearby family homes is acceptable.

We submit that it is not.

6. Construction Traffic and Road Safety

The roads around Lemanaghan are narrow rural roads used every day by families, children, farmers, pedestrians, cyclists and local traffic.

The construction of 15 turbines, with turbine foundations, access tracks, hardstands, cabling, cranes and abnormal loads, would generate significant heavy construction traffic.

We are concerned about:

Increased danger to children and local road users
HGV traffic on unsuitable rural roads
Dust, noise and disruption
Damage to local roads
Risks at junctions and narrow stretches
The impact on normal family and community life

A traffic management plan is not enough if the underlying road network is unsuitable for the scale of construction proposed.

We submit that construction traffic and road safety have not been adequately assessed from the perspective of families who live here and use these roads daily.

7. Peatland, Wildlife and Environmental Concerns

Lemanaghan Bog is not a blank site. It is a sensitive rural bogland landscape with wildlife, water systems, peat, habitat value and local ecological importance.

We are concerned about the impact of turbine foundations, access roads, drainage works, cabling and construction compounds on peatland and wildlife.

In particular, we are concerned about:

Disturbance of peat and stored carbon
Changes to drainage and water movement
Habitat loss and fragmentation

Impacts on birds, bats and protected species
Construction pollution and sediment risk
Long-term ecological damage

Where protected species, peatland hydrology and sensitive habitats are involved, assurances are not enough. The Commission must be satisfied on evidence that significant adverse effects will not occur.

Where uncertainty remains, **the precautionary principle should apply.**

8. Visual Impact and Rural Character

The proposed turbines would permanently alter the character of Lemanaghan.

These are not modest structures. They are industrial-scale turbines of approximately 220 metres blade-tip height, with moving blades and associated aviation lighting.

At this scale, and in this landscape, they would become visually dominant from homes, roads and community areas.

Lemanaghan is a quiet rural area with a distinct landscape, community and heritage character. The proposed development would fundamentally change that character for future generations.

We submit that this level of industrialisation is inappropriate for this location.

9. Community Concern

Many local families have serious concerns about this proposal. These concerns are not abstract. They come from the people who will live with the consequences of the decision every day.

We are not objecting because we oppose renewable energy. We are objecting because this particular proposal is too large, too close to homes, and too damaging to the receiving environment.

The people living nearest to this development are the ones who will carry the burden. Our homes, sleep, health, roads, landscape and children's quality of life are directly at stake.

We ask the Commission to give real weight to that concern.

10. Request to Refuse Permission

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse planning permission for the proposed Lemanaghan Wind Farm.

If the Commission is not minded to refuse outright, we submit that permission should not be granted without, at minimum:

Independent review of noise impacts, including night-time noise, low-frequency noise and amplitude modulation

Reassessment of shadow flicker at affected homes, including House ID 112

Binding mitigation for any dwelling where shadow flicker is predicted

A substantially greater setback from family homes

A proper cumulative assessment of all impacts over the operational lifetime

Independent ecological assessment of impacts on peatland, birds, bats and protected species

A robust and enforceable construction traffic plan developed with affected residents

However, our position is clear.

This development is the wrong scale, in the wrong location, and too close to family homes.

It would place an unfair and unacceptable burden on our family and on the wider Lemanaghan community.

We respectfully ask the Commission to find that the proposal is contrary to proper planning and sustainable development and to refuse permission.

Yours faithfully,

Glenn Halligan

Niamh Halligan

Tom Halligan

Ben Halligan

Dan Halligan

Lemanaghan

Ballycumber

Co. Offaly

R35 WK16

Email: glen.halligan@gmail.com