

Tushaline Sahseetharan

From: Lauren Osullivan <laurenosullivan01@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2026 7:08 PM
To: SIDS
Subject: ACP-324165-26 — Response to Section 4.3.2 — Lauren Carter-O'Sullivan
Attachments: Section4.3.2Response.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Honor

You don't often get email from laurenosullivan01@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 Sir or Madam,

Please find attached my response to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations in case ACP-324165-26, submitted in reply to the Commission's letter of 14 August 2026. None of the grounds of my May 2026 objection is withdrawn.
I would appreciate acknowledgement of receipt.

Yours sincerely,
Lauren Carter-O'Sullivan
Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 P599

Lauren Carter-O'Sullivan

Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 P599

The Secretary

An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street, Dublin 1, D01 V902

Re: Maughanaclea Renewable Energy Development, ACP-324165-26

Response to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write in response to the Commission's letter of 14 August 2026. As invited, this submission addresses only Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations, received by the Commission on 14 July 2026. My objection of May 2026 stands in full; none of its grounds — noise among them — is withdrawn or diluted by anything below.

In May I put two nature conservation arguments to the Commission, with sources. The first was that the peer-reviewed Irish evidence — Fernández-Bellon, Wilson, Irwin and O'Halloran (2019), *Conservation Biology* 33(2), 413–422, doi: 10.1111/cobi.13239 — shows that wind farms on Irish uplands reduce bird densities in the surrounding country, with effects on open-habitat species scaling with the size of the development and operating at a landscape scale. The second was that the night-time dimension of this development had not been assessed at all. Section 4.3.2 was the applicant's opportunity to answer both. It answers neither.

On the first: the Fernández-Bellon study is not referenced anywhere in Section 4.3.2. This is a study conducted at twelve Irish upland wind farm sites — the closest available scientific analogue to the development now proposed — published in a leading international conservation journal, cited to the applicant in multiple observations, and cited again by implication in the submission of the Development Applications Unit (SID-CK-2026-011, 25 May 2026), which warned that displacement effects "are often not calculated for or mitigated for" and that the applicant's chain of reasoning — no individual significance, therefore no cumulative significance — "misses the point of cumulative impact and in combination effects." A Response to Observations that declines to engage with the central piece of Irish evidence put against it has not responded to the observations. It has filed past them.

On the second: the applicant confirms at Section 4.2 (page 34) that it is agreeable to the Department of Defence condition requiring every one of the fourteen turbines to carry Type C, medium-intensity, fixed red obstacle lighting with a minimum output of 2,000 candela, visible in all directions of azimuth and operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The consented Dreenacreenig West scheme confirms the same 2,000-candela fixed red lighting on all three of its

turbines (its EIAR, Section 13.8.5). Taken together, that is a permanent, all-night red lighting installation on both ridgelines of one of the darkest valleys in the country — and it has been consented into an evidence vacuum, because every bird survey underpinning Section 4.3.2 was conducted in daylight. There is no nocturnal flight data for this site. None. NatureScot's information note, "The Effect of Aviation Obstruction Lighting on Birds at Wind Turbines, Communication Towers and Other Structures," identifies phototaxis — the attraction of birds to artificial light — as the principal ecological concern with obstruction lighting. The applicant does not cite the guidance, does not use the word, and does not assess the issue. I would put it to the Commission as plainly as I can: the applicant has agreed to light the night sky of this valley permanently, without once surveying what moves through that sky at night.

I am twenty-five, and I expect to live with the consequences of this determination for longer than most of the people who will make it. So let me be precise about what I am not asking for. I am not asking the Commission to commission the missing science, because the missing science is not my grievance — it is my evidence. An applicant that ignores the central Irish displacement study put against it, and agrees to light both ridgelines of a dark valley permanently without one hour of nocturnal data, has demonstrated the character of its entire assessment, and demonstrated it in its own documents. Were every survey done again and done properly, my answer — and my generation's answer in this valley — would be the same: this is the wrong development in the wrong place, and no finding softens that. An assessment with the night missing from it is not a complete assessment, and a permission built on it would not be a sound one. I ask the Commission to refuse this application in its entirety.

I would appreciate acknowledgement of receipt of this response.

Yours sincerely,

Lauren Carter-O'Sullivan

Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 P599