

Tushaline Sahseetharan

From: Music Magic Video Classes <musicmagicfun@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2026 9:54 AM
To: SIDS
Subject: Subject: ACP-324165-26 — Response to Section 4.3.2 — Timothy O'Sullivan (Laharanshermeen)
Attachments: response.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Honor

You don't often get email from musicmagicfun@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.

To whom it may concern,

Attached is my response to Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations, case ACP-324165-26, per the Commission's letter of 14 August 2026. Please note there are two observers named Timothy O'Sullivan on this file; I am the observer at Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, P75 P599.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Regards,
Timothy O'Sullivan
Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 P599

RESPONSE TO SECTION 4.3.2 OF THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS
Maughanaclea Renewable Energy Development — ACP-324165-26

From: Timothy O'Sullivan, Moonlands, Laharanshermeen, Bantry, Co. Cork, P75 P599

To Whom It May Concern,

I refer to the Commission's letter of 14 August 2026. This response addresses Section 4.3.2 (Nature Conservation) of the applicant's Response to Observations, received by the Commission on 14 July 2026, and nothing else. My original submission of May 2026 — including its noise grounds — stands in full. I have set out my points in numbered form, as before. I am a mechanical engineer; my concern here is with whether the document is internally consistent and whether its conclusions rest on data. It is not, and they do not.

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY

1. In Section 4.3.2 the applicant includes the consented Dreenacreenig West wind farm in its cumulative bird assessments. It is named individually in the kestrel assessment and upland-habitats list (p. 40), appears in the upland habitats list for red grouse (p. 41) and snipe (p. 42), and is named individually for buzzard (p. 42) and sparrowhawk (p. 43).
2. The same development is excluded from the cumulative assessments in the EIAR's landscape chapter, noise chapter and project description. A development is either within the cumulative study envelope or it is not. It cannot be within the envelope for six bird species and outside it for every other environmental topic. In my May submission I identified two internal contradictions in this application (climate accounting; Annex I habitat). This is a third, and it goes to the reliability of the entire cumulative methodology.
3. Quality control within Section 4.3.2 itself is poor. At page 43, the section headed "Sparrowhawk" opens with the sentence: "Snipe is a habitat generalist that may use commercial forestry, agricultural and upland environments." That is a copy-paste error in the assessment of a protected species, in a document produced to answer the concerns of statutory consultees and the public. If the species assessments are assembled by duplication, the Commission is entitled to ask what else has been duplicated rather than assessed.

DATA COMPLETENESS

4. Section 4.2 of the same Response (p. 34) confirms the applicant is agreeable to the Department of Defence condition that all turbines carry "Type C, Medium intensity, Fixed Red obstacle lighting with a minimum output of 2,000 candela, to be visible in all directions of azimuth and to be operational H24/7 days a week" (EIAR Ch. 15, S.15.2.4.3). That is a permanent nocturnal emission source on all 14 structures, and the consented Dreenacreenig West carries the same specification on its 3 turbines (its EIAR, S.13.8.5).
5. Every bird survey underpinning Section 4.3.2 was conducted in daylight. The application therefore commits to a 24/7 lighting regime while holding zero hours of nocturnal flight data for the airspace it will illuminate. NatureScot's information note on aviation obstruction lighting and birds identifies phototaxis — attraction to light — as the principal concern with precisely this lighting class. The applicant does not cite it and does not address the issue. An assessment cannot conclude "no significant effect" on a receptor group it never measured.
6. The Development Applications Unit (submission SID-CK-2026-011, 25 May 2026) makes the same structural criticism of the applicant's cumulative logic: a conclusion of no individual significance rolled forward into a conclusion of no cumulative significance "misses the point of cumulative impact and in combination effects," and displacement effects are "often not calculated for or mitigated for." The DAU also notes the applicable legal standard: an assessment must contain "complete, precise and definitive

findings and conclusions capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt." Section 4.3.2, with an unassessed nocturnal dimension and an inconsistent cumulative envelope, does not meet that standard.

CONCLUSION

7. In engineering, when a safety case is found to contain an inconsistent boundary condition, an unmeasured operating regime and copy-paste errors in its component analyses, the finding is not "resubmit" — the finding is that the case has failed, because the process that produced it cannot be trusted. Section 4.3.2 fails on exactly those grounds: it does not and cannot meet the standard the DAU identifies of findings "capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt." For the avoidance of doubt, my objection is not conditional on the quality of the paperwork. My May submission set out why this development is wrong for this valley on its merits, and no corrected assessment alters that. The failed assessment simply removes any lawful basis on which permission could be granted. I ask the Commission to refuse the application.

8. Please acknowledge receipt of this response.

Yours sincerely,

Timothy O'Sullivan

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