



Outlook

Fw: ACP-324165-26 — Response to Section 4.3.2 - Keira O'Sullivan

From SIDS <sids@pleanala.ie>

Date Mon 9/14/2026 9:02 AM

To Honor Caird Marren <honor.cairdmarren@pleanala.ie>

 1 attachment (11 KB)

Keira_OSullivan_Section_4.3.2_Response.pdf;

From: Keira Osullivan <keiralouiseosullivan@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2026 6:36 PM

To: SIDS <sids@pleanala.ie>

Subject: ACP-324165-26 — Response to Section 4.3.2 - Keira O'Sullivan

You don't often get email from keiralouiseosullivan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an **External Email** and may have malicious content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the ICT Helpdesk.

Dear members of An Coimisin Pleanála,

Following your letter of 14 August 2026, my response to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations in case ACP-324165-26 is attached.

Could you please confirm that this has been received.

Yours sincerely,

Keira O'Sullivan

Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork

Keira O'Sullivan
Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork

Dear members of An Coimisiún Pleanála,

Re: Maughanaclea Renewable Energy Development, ACP-324165-26 — response to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations

Thank you for your letter of 14 August 2026. I am responding only to Section 4.3.2 of the applicant's Response to Observations, received by the Commission on 14 July 2026, as your letter asks. Nothing in this response takes back anything in my original letter of May 2026 — my objections on noise, on the walks, on all of it, still stand.

i. What my camera saw.

In May I sent the Commission four photographs from a trail camera placed in upland heath within walking distance of the proposed turbines: a pine marten on the morning of 8 August 2025, a red squirrel on 20 August, a jay in flight over flowering heather on 23 August — and an Irish hare, photographed in infrared at 23:25 that same night. I sent them because the developer's ecology chapter called the residual effects on these species "imperceptible," and the photographs say otherwise.

I want to draw the Commission's attention to the last one especially. The hare was photographed at half past eleven at night. That single frame proves something Section 4.3.2 never once considers: this habitat is alive after dark. Every bird survey behind the applicant's Nature Conservation response was carried out in daylight. There is no nocturnal data in this application at all — not one hour of it.

ii. What is planned for the dark.

That gap matters because of what the same document agrees to elsewhere. At page 34, the applicant confirms it is agreeable to the Department of Defence condition requiring fixed red obstacle lighting of at least 2,000 candela on all fourteen turbines, operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week — permanently. The consented Dreenacreenig West scheme on the ridge across the valley carries the same lighting on its three turbines. So the two skylines that hold our valley between them will both burn red all night, over habitat that my camera shows is in use at night, and nobody has assessed what that does to the creatures using it. NatureScot's information note on aviation obstruction lighting and birds identifies attraction to light — phototaxis — as the principal concern with this kind of lighting. The applicant never mentions it.

iii. Being pushed out, not just struck.

Section 4.3.2 talks about collisions. But the strongest Irish evidence is about something quieter: displacement. Fernández-Bellon, Wilson, Irwin and O'Halloran (2019, Conservation Biology 33(2), 413–422, doi: 10.1111/cobi.13239) surveyed twelve wind farms and twelve control sites in Irish uplands — ground like ours — and found lower bird densities at wind farms, with effects on open-habitat species tied to wind-farm size rather than distance, operating at a landscape scale. That study is not referenced anywhere in the applicant's Section 4.3.2. The Development Applications Unit's submission on this case (SID-CK-2026-011, 25 May 2026) gives the figures for the species of our own bog: a predicted 53% reduction in hen harrier flight activity within 500 metres of turbines, and a 50% reduction in snipe breeding density within 500 metres. With turbines on Maughanaclea

to the north and Dreenacreenig West to the south, the wildlife of this valley would be squeezed from both ridgelines at once — and that combined effect has never been assessed in any chapter of this application.

iv. What I am asking for.

I am twenty. The animals in my photographs cannot read the applicant's tables, and they will not be saved by a conclusion of "imperceptible" that was written without anyone watching the site at night. But I do not want the Commission to think that what I am looking for is a better survey. No survey, however careful, turns this into the right place for fourteen turbines and a lifetime of red light over living ground — and I would be writing to you in the same terms if every study I have mentioned had been done perfectly. What the gaps in Section 4.3.2 prove is that the applicant's reassurances are worth nothing; what my photographs prove is what stands to be lost. I am asking you, plainly and finally, to refuse permission for this development.

Could you please acknowledge receipt of this response.

Yours sincerely,

Keira O'Sullivan
Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork