

---

**Fw: ACP-324265-26-Response to Section 4.3.2-Melanie 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 (12 KB)

Melanie\_OSullivan\_Section\_4.3.2\_Response.pdf;

---

**From:** Melanie O'Sullivan <meltimsullivan@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, September 13, 2026 6:09 PM

**To:** SIDS <sids@pleanala.ie>

**Subject:** ACP-324265-26-Response to Section 4.3.2-Melanie O Sullivan

You don't often get email from meltimsullivan@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/Madam

Thank you for your letter of 14 August 2026 regarding case ACP-324165-26. I attach my observations on Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations. I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Melanie O'Sullivan

Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 XN61

Melanie O'Sullivan  
Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 XN61

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,

Thank you for your letter of 14 August 2026. I understand that observations at this stage are to be confined to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations, received by the Commission on 14 July 2026, and I have kept to that. I would ask only that it be noted that my original objection of May 2026 — including everything I said there about noise, shadow flicker and our school — remains before the Commission in full.

I am a school principal and a mother of four, and I hope the Commission will forgive me for coming at Nature Conservation the way a teacher does. Part of my work, and part of my life in this valley, is teaching children what lives here — the harriers over the bog, the frogs in the wet ground, the stars they can still name because our nights are actually dark. When I read Section 4.3.2, the question I kept asking was the one a child would ask: how do you know? And on the most basic points, the applicant does not know, because it has not looked.

The clearest example concerns the night. The applicant confirms, at Section 4.2 (page 34) of its Response, that it accepts the Department of Defence requirement for medium-intensity fixed red lighting of at least 2,000 candela on every one of the fourteen turbines, operating twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, permanently. The consented Dreenacreenig West scheme on the opposite ridge of our valley carries the same lighting on its three turbines. So both skylines of a dark rural valley are to be lit red, all night, every night, for decades — and yet every bird survey on which Section 4.3.2 rests was carried out in daylight. There is not one hour of nocturnal flight data in the application. NatureScot's information note on aviation obstruction lighting and birds identifies attraction to artificial light — phototaxis — as the principal concern with lighting of exactly this type; the applicant does not reference the guidance or the phenomenon at all. If one of my pupils presented a project declaring there was no effect on something they had never once observed, I would send it back. I do not think the Commission should apply a lower standard to a document of this consequence.

The second point is consistency, because children notice that too. In its bird assessments in Section 4.3.2, the applicant counts the Dreenacreenig West development as part of the cumulative picture — it is named at pages 40 to 43 in the assessments for kestrel, red grouse, snipe, buzzard and sparrowhawk. Yet the same development is left out of the cumulative assessments for landscape, noise and the project description in the EIAR. The

same wind farm cannot be real for the snipe and imaginary for everything else. The Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage warned in its submission on this case (SID-CK-2026-011, 25 May 2026) that concluding "no individual significance, therefore no cumulative significance" misses the point of cumulative assessment entirely, and that displacement effects are often never calculated at all. Our valley will experience these developments together, from both ridges at once. So will its wildlife.

I want to finish carefully, because I do not want my meaning mistaken. I am not asking the Commission to set this applicant extra homework, and I would not be reassured by a further report, however thick. What Section 4.3.2 shows is an applicant that concluded "no effect" on a night it never watched and a valley it counts differently from one chapter to the next — and a project assessed that way, in a place like this, should not be permitted at all. The families of this valley, mine among them, do not want this wind farm on any terms. I respectfully ask An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse permission.

I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Melanie O'Sullivan

Goulanes, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 XN61