

Gerard Healy
Lissadrone,
Ballycastle,
Co. Mayo,
F26 RX92
healygerard2@gmail.com

14th June 2026

The Secretary
An Coimisiún Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Case reference: PAX16.324258

Re: Planning permission for the construction of Tirawley Windfarm consisting of 16 no. wind turbines, a permanent 110kV substation, 110kV underground cable and grid connection, and ancillary development in the townlands of Ballymurphy, Ballynaleck, Barnhill Lower & Upper, Barroe, Billoos, Carn, Carrickanass, Carrowmore, Castlelacken Demesne, and other townlands in County Mayo.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm Strategic Infrastructure Development application submitted by Constant Energy Limited.

As a resident of Lissadrone, Ballycastle, and one of the closest residents to the proposed development, I have serious concerns regarding the significant and irreversible impacts this project would have on the local environment, biodiversity, landscape, residential amenity, and the wellbeing of those living in close proximity to the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure.

The proposed development, comprising 16 wind turbines, a permanent 110kV substation, underground cabling, grid connection infrastructure and ancillary works, would introduce substantial industrial-scale development into a sensitive rural area of north Mayo. I believe the application fails to adequately address a number of significant planning, environmental and community concerns and is therefore contrary to the principles of proper planning and sustainable development.

1. Introduction

My name is Gerard Healy and I reside at Lissadrone, Ballycastle, County Mayo. My home is identified within the Applicant's Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) as receptor **H3**, and is acknowledged as the closest occupied dwelling not associated with the proposed development. The EIAR identifies my home as approximately 555 metres from Turbine AT08, 601 metres from Turbine AT09 and 676 metres from Turbine AT10. These distances place my family among those who will experience the greatest direct effects from the proposed development.

My family has lived in this home since 2009. I built our home in 2009 on land that has been in our family for generations. We chose this location because of its rural character, tranquillity, scenic quality and strong connection to the local community. We are raising our young son in this environment and have a long-term commitment to the area and its future.

I recognise the importance and the need to address climate change. However, renewable energy developments must be appropriately located and designed so that they do not impose unacceptable impacts on existing communities, residential amenity, environmental quality and landscapes of recognised value.

The proposed Tirawley Wind Farm, consisting of 16 large-scale turbines, a permanent 110kV substation, underground cabling, grid infrastructure and associated works, would introduce an industrial-scale development into a highly sensitive rural and coastal landscape in North Mayo. In my view, the application has not demonstrated that the significant impacts on nearby residents, particularly those living closest to the development, can be adequately avoided or mitigated.

This observation focuses on the principal reasons why I believe the proposed development does not represent proper planning and sustainable development. The key concerns are:

- Failure to carry out meaningful and transparent community consultation with the affected community, including the nearest residents.
- Unacceptable impacts on residential amenity at H3 arising from turbine proximity, visual dominance, noise and shadow flicker, together with wider impacts on the North Mayo landscape.
- Significant concerns regarding the reliability and representativeness of the baseline noise assessment.
- Impacts on the wider North Mayo landscape, heritage assets, tourism resources and community identity.
- Failure to adequately consider cumulative impacts over the lifetime of the development.
- Potential impacts on biodiversity, including the hen harrier, an Annex I protected species under the EU Birds Directive.

For the reasons outlined throughout this observation, I respectfully submit that the proposed development would place a disproportionate burden on those living closest to the

turbines and would result in significant and irreversible changes to the character of the receiving environment.

2. Failure of Community Consultation and Engagement

A fundamental concern with this application is the adequacy of the pre-application consultation process. Meaningful consultation is not simply a procedural exercise; it is essential to ensuring that local knowledge, community concerns and potential impacts are identified at an early stage and considered during the evolution of a project.

Despite the Applicant stating that direct consultation was undertaken with local residents and that door-to-door engagement occurred in the vicinity of the development, my own experience as the nearest occupied non-participating resident does not support those claims. My home is identified throughout the EIAR as a sensitive receptor that would experience significant visual, noise and shadow flicker effects, yet I received no direct engagement of any kind from the Applicant or its representatives.

There was no:

- Door-to-door visit;
- Letter or leaflet delivered to my home;
- Telephone contact;
- Community meeting involving those most directly affected;
- Meaningful opportunity to understand the likely effects of the development before the final application was prepared.

This absence of engagement is particularly concerning given that the Applicant's own assessments acknowledge my home (H3) as one of the most affected residential receptors.

The public information process appears to have relied primarily on a single Public Information Day held in June 2023. That event related to an earlier version of the proposal and was advertised principally through a newspaper notice. The final 16-turbine layout now before the Board was never the subject of meaningful public consultation, and affected residents were not given an opportunity to comment on how the project had evolved.

The consultation process also failed to properly recognise **Lacken as the host community**. Public-facing documentation repeatedly described the development as being located between Ballycastle and Killala, despite the fact that the proposed turbines are situated within the Lacken Parish area and that the residents of Lacken will experience many of the primary visual, environmental and social impacts of the development.

A further issue arises regarding the Public Information Day advertisement. A discrepancy appears to exist between the advertisement reproduced in Appendix 1.6 of the Community Engagement Report and the advertisement that was published in the *Western People*. The level of geographic detail included in the Appendix version gives the impression of a more targeted local notification exercise than appears to have been undertaken. This matter requires clarification, as it goes to the transparency and adequacy of public notification.

Overall, the consultation process appears to have been limited in scope, related largely to an earlier design, and did not provide meaningful engagement with those residents identified by the Applicant as the most sensitive receptors.

3. Residential Amenity and Visual Impact on H3

The impact of the proposed development on my home, identified as **H3**, represents one of the most significant issues in the assessment of this application. The Applicant's own EIAR acknowledges that H3 is the closest occupied non-participating dwelling to the proposed wind farm and identifies it as a highly sensitive visual receptor. However, I respectfully submit that the conclusions reached within the assessment significantly underestimate the real and lasting effect that this development would have on my family's home and quality of life.

Our home occupies an elevated position within the North Mayo coastal landscape and currently benefits from extensive open views across the surrounding countryside, coastline and Atlantic seascape. The scenic quality, openness and tranquillity of this environment form an essential part of the character of our home and the wider landscape. The proposed turbines would introduce large-scale industrial structures into this setting and would fundamentally alter the existing sense of place.

The Applicant's photomontages, particularly Viewpoint 16, demonstrate that multiple turbines would be visible from and around our property. The images show turbines occupying a wide horizontal field of view, with turbines located to the north, south and west of the dwelling. This would create an enclosing effect whereby the development would not be experienced as a distant feature within the landscape, but as a constant and unavoidable presence surrounding the home.

The proposed turbines would be visible from several parts of our daily living environment, including:

- The entrance and driveway to the property;
- The sitting room;
- The kitchen and main living area;
- Bedrooms; and
- External garden and amenity areas.

As a result, the development would not affect a single outward view but would influence the experience of living within the property itself. The presence of multiple turbines, their substantial height, movement of rotating blades, and their visibility from multiple aspects of the house would create a dominant and intrusive industrial character within what is currently a quiet rural residential setting.

The Applicant's assessment concludes that the dispersed arrangement of turbines means residents would not experience a sense of being contained within a wind farm. However, the visual evidence presented in the Applicant's own photomontages suggests otherwise. Multiple turbines would be visible across a broad visual envelope around H3, meaning the

practical experience for residents would be one of enclosure and visual dominance rather than a distant landscape change.

Particular concern arises from the proximity and scale of the turbines in relation to our dwelling. The photomontages show turbines appearing prominently within immediate residential views, including views where turbine structures rise significantly above the roofline of the home. Such imagery demonstrates that the effects are not simply general landscape impacts but direct impacts on the daily living conditions and enjoyment of a family home.

Residential properties are recognised as highly sensitive visual receptors because people experience these views continuously and over long periods of time. Unlike a visitor passing through the area, my family would be exposed to the visual presence, movement and scale of these structures every day for the entire operational lifetime of the development.

The impact cannot be adequately mitigated through landscaping or screening. Due to the height of the turbines, the elevated nature of the site and the openness of the surrounding landscape, any planting would be incapable of screening structures of this scale. The effect would therefore remain for the full duration of the development, which is proposed to operate for approximately 35 years.

It is difficult to reconcile the Applicant's acknowledgement that H3 is one of the most sensitive and affected receptors with the conclusion that the resulting effects on residential amenity are acceptable. If the closest occupied dwelling can only be accommodated by accepting substantial visual dominance, multiple turbine views and a fundamental alteration of its residential environment, serious questions arise as to whether the development represents proper planning and sustainable development at this location.

For these reasons, I respectfully submit that the proposed development would result in a significant and unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenity of H3. The scale, proximity and cumulative visual presence of the turbines would transform a peaceful rural family home into an environment dominated by industrial infrastructure for the lifetime of the project.

4. Landscape, Heritage and Tourism Impacts

The assessment of landscape and visual effects is a central consideration in determining whether the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm can be accommodated within the sensitive North Mayo coastal landscape. The proposed development would introduce large-scale industrial structures into a highly sensitive North Mayo coastal landscape. The assessment of these effects must have regard not only to individual viewpoints but to the wider character of the receiving environment, including its scenic, cultural, heritage and tourism value.

4.1 Impact on North Mayo Landscape Character

The receiving environment is not an ordinary rural landscape. It is a landscape of recognised scenic, heritage and recreational value, characterised by open coastal views, a strong sense of remoteness, and a distinctive relationship between land and sea.

The proposed development would introduce turbines of substantial height and industrial character into this setting. Due to the open nature of the landscape and the prominence of the surrounding ridgelines, these structures would be visible over a wide geographical area and would permanently alter the existing landscape character for the duration of the project.

The visual impact would not be limited to individual viewpoints but would affect the wider appreciation of North Mayo as a natural coastal landscape. The cumulative presence of multiple large structures across the skyline would diminish the sense of openness and tranquillity that currently defines the area.

The proposed development should not be viewed solely as the introduction of individual turbines, but as the establishment of a large-scale industrial energy complex within the North Mayo landscape. The combined presence of sixteen 135-metre turbines, extensive access roads, turbine hardstands, spoil deposition areas, a 110 kV substation, Battery Energy Storage System and associated infrastructure would represent a fundamental and long-term transformation of the receiving environment for approximately 35 years. The question for the Board is not simply whether these structures can be seen, but whether the landscape has the capacity to absorb a development of this scale without unacceptable damage to its character, tranquillity and sense of place.

4.2 Impact on Heritage, Recreation and Tourism Assets

Particular concern arises regarding the impact on internationally and nationally recognised tourism and heritage assets, including:

- The Céide Fields;
- Downpatrick Head;
- The Wild Atlantic Way;
- Kilcummin Loop Walk;
- Kilcummin Back Strand;
- Rathlacken Court Tomb Trail;
- The Western Way and other outdoor recreation routes.

These locations are valued not only for their individual heritage importance but also for their outstanding landscape setting, extensive views and sense of connection with the natural environment. The introduction of prominent wind turbines into these views has the potential to undermine the visitor experience and the scenic qualities upon which these destinations depend.

The concerns regarding the adequacy of the visual assessment have also been reflected by Mayo County Council. During a Council meeting on 25 March 2024, members expressed

concern regarding the visibility of turbines from Downpatrick Head and the need to carefully assess the submitted photomontages in order to protect important views associated with the Wild Atlantic Way.

It is also important to recognise that visitors experience the North Mayo landscape as a journey rather than through a series of isolated viewpoints. The experience of travelling along the Wild Atlantic Way, walking the Kilcummin Loop Walk, visiting the Céide Fields or enjoying the wider coastal landscape is based on a continuous experience of openness, wildness, tranquillity and connection with the natural environment. The cumulative visibility of large-scale turbines throughout this experience has the potential to fundamentally alter the perception and identity of the landscape.

4.3 Conclusion on Landscape and Visual Assessment

The visual evidence submitted with the application does not, in my view, provide a complete or realistic representation of the likely effects of the proposed development. The reliance on static viewpoints fails to communicate the true scale, movement, cumulative presence and long-term influence of the turbines within the landscape.

Given the sensitivity of the North Mayo coastal environment and the importance of its scenic, cultural and tourism assets, any assessment that underestimates these effects risks failing to provide a reliable basis for informed decision-making.

For these reasons, I submit that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and accompanying photomontages do not adequately demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated without causing unacceptable harm to the character of the North Mayo landscape, its heritage setting, and its tourism value.

5. Hen Harrier & Biodiversity Impacts

I am particularly concerned about the potential impact of the proposed development on hen harrier, an Annex I species under the EU Birds Directive and a species of conservation concern in Ireland.

The EIAR identifies hen harrier as a target species for the site and records 14 observations during flight activity surveys, mostly in the northern sector of the study area. It also confirms that a winter hen harrier roost was recorded at inner Lacken Bay, with evidence of continued use in subsequent winters, including 3–4 birds in winter 2025/26.

The EIAR further acknowledges that the wind farm site contains habitats such as blanket bog, wet grassland, semi-improved grassland, scrub, hedgerows and forestry edge, all of which may provide foraging habitat for hen harrier. Given this habitat context, it is a serious concern that winter roost survey effort appears to have focused on the Lacken Bay reedbed roost rather than comprehensively surveying suitable roosting habitat within the proposed development footprint itself.

In the absence of robust winter roost survey coverage across the areas most likely to be directly affected by turbine bases, roads, forestry felling, habitat removal and associated infrastructure, there remains uncertainty as to whether the full extent of potential impacts on hen harrier has been adequately assessed.

The proposed development would result in permanent habitat alteration and fragmentation. While mitigation and habitat restoration measures are proposed, uncertainty remains as to whether replacement habitats can replicate the ecological function of established foraging and roosting habitats within the timescales required by the species.

There is also concern regarding cumulative effects arising from habitat loss, construction disturbance and potential operational displacement. Scientific evidence indicates that hen harriers may avoid otherwise suitable habitat close to operational turbines, thereby reducing the effective availability of foraging habitat.

Given the conservation status of hen harrier, the confirmed presence of suitable habitat, repeated winter records, and the recorded winter roost within the study area, I do not consider that sufficient scientific certainty has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will avoid significant effects on this protected species. In circumstances where uncertainty remains, the precautionary principle should apply.

6. Noise Assessment Deficiencies and Protection of Residential Amenity

The assessment of operational noise is one of the most important aspects of this application, particularly given the close proximity of my home, H3, to multiple proposed turbines. The Applicant has repeatedly identified H3 as the closest occupied non-participating dwelling to the development. However, despite this acknowledgement, no baseline noise monitoring was undertaken at, or in the vicinity of, H3. This raises a fundamental question as to whether the existing acoustic environment at one of the most affected residential receptors has been properly understood.

6.1 Reliability of the Baseline Noise Survey

The EIAR states that noise monitoring locations were selected based on the identification of the nearest receptors surrounding the proposed turbines. However, the evidence presented raises significant concerns regarding whether the selected monitoring locations accurately represent the quiet rural environment experienced by the nearest non-participating residents.

A significant number of monitoring locations appear to have characteristics that may limit their suitability as representative locations. These include:

- Monitoring points located close to the R314, where existing road traffic may influence background noise levels;

- Monitoring undertaken at unoccupied properties;
- Monitoring at properties associated with landowners or parties financially connected to the development;
- Limited monitoring in the quieter northern section of the site, where many of the nearest turbines and affected residential receptors are located.

These factors raise concerns that the baseline dataset may not accurately reflect the existing noise environment experienced by residents who are not associated with the development and who may be most affected by operational turbine noise.

6.2 Absence of Monitoring at H3

My home is located approximately 555 metres from Turbine AT08, 601 metres from AT09 and 676 metres from AT10, placing it among the closest occupied dwellings to the proposed turbines. Despite this, H3 was not selected as a baseline monitoring location.

Given the proximity of H3 to multiple turbines and its location within a quieter rural environment away from the main road corridor, it is difficult to understand why this receptor was not considered a priority location for establishing baseline noise conditions.

The absence of monitoring at the nearest occupied dwelling creates uncertainty as to whether the existing environmental conditions against which operational turbine noise has been assessed are truly representative of those who will experience the greatest effects.

6.3 Predicted Operational Noise at H3 and Reliance on Mitigation

Beyond concerns regarding the adequacy of the baseline noise survey, there are also serious concerns regarding the predicted operational noise levels at H3, the closest occupied non-participating dwelling.

The Applicant's own assessment indicates that compliance with the applicable night-time noise limit of **43 dB(A)** at H3 is only achieved following the application of both **directivity corrections and operational curtailment of the turbines**.

This demonstrates that the proposed development has no meaningful acoustic headroom at the nearest occupied dwelling and can only achieve compliance through the application of both directivity corrections and turbine curtailment.

It is notable that the development requires operational restrictions from the outset in order to achieve compliance at the nearest dwelling, rather than providing a design with sufficient separation distance and acoustic margin.

The absence of acoustic headroom is particularly significant given the inherent uncertainties associated with predictive noise modelling, including assumptions relating to turbine operation, wind conditions, atmospheric effects and the accuracy of correction factors. Where compliance is only achieved after the application of multiple adjustments and operational restrictions, there is limited confidence that the required noise limits can be consistently maintained under all operating conditions over the lifetime of the development.

This is particularly concerning given that H3 is not a marginal receptor but is the closest occupied non-participating dwelling to multiple turbines. A development of this scale and duration should demonstrate a robust level of compliance at the most affected properties without relying on a combination of corrections and operational restrictions to achieve the applicable noise limits.

The dependence on curtailment also raises practical concerns regarding the long-term effectiveness, monitoring, and enforcement of mitigation measures. Operational conditions may vary over time, and there is limited confidence that the predicted noise environment can be consistently maintained throughout the approximately 35-year operational life of the project.

When this reliance on mitigation is considered alongside the shortcomings of the baseline noise survey — including the absence of monitoring at H3 and questions regarding the representativeness of selected monitoring locations — the level of uncertainty surrounding the actual noise impact on the nearest residents becomes significant.

In accordance with the precautionary approach that should apply to developments with potential long-term effects on residential amenity, this uncertainty should weigh significantly in the planning balance.

6.4 Conclusion on Noise Assessment

The noise assessment contains a number of significant shortcomings that create uncertainty regarding the reliability of the predicted operational impacts.

In particular:

- The closest occupied non-participating dwelling, H3, was not included within the baseline noise survey;
- Several monitoring locations may not represent the quieter northern rural environment where the nearest turbines are located;
- A number of monitoring locations were associated with road traffic, unoccupied properties, or financially involved parties;
- There are inconsistencies regarding the use of H2 as a baseline monitoring location while excluding it from operational assessment.

Given that noise is a key factor affecting health, sleep, wellbeing and residential amenity, these uncertainties should be given significant weight. In the absence of a robust and representative baseline assessment, it cannot be confidently concluded that the proposed development will not result in unacceptable impacts on the nearest residents.

7. Shadow Flicker, Human Health and Quality of Life

The assessment of shadow flicker and its potential effects on nearby residents is of particular importance in this case due to the proximity of my home, H3, to several proposed turbines. The Applicant's own assessment identifies H3 as one of the closest occupied non-participating dwellings to the proposed development, and therefore one of the receptors most likely to experience the effects associated with turbine operation, including shadow flicker, noise, visual dominance and the cumulative impact of continuous exposure to wind turbine infrastructure.

7.1 Impact of Shadow Flicker on H3

Shadow flicker occurs when rotating turbine blades cast moving shadows through windows or across external living areas. While the Applicant has undertaken a shadow flicker assessment, I am concerned that the approach relies heavily on future operational mitigation rather than demonstrating from the outset that unacceptable impacts will not occur.

The assessment predicts that H3 may be affected by shadow flicker; however, the proposed mitigation measures do not provide sufficient certainty that the residential amenity of my home will be protected throughout the lifetime of the development. The reliance on operational controls after the turbines are constructed places the burden on residents to experience, identify and report problems before corrective action is taken.

7.2 Lack of Receptor-Specific and Enforceable Mitigation

A significant concern is the absence of clear, receptor-specific mitigation measures that guarantee protection for affected homes. A general commitment to manage shadow flicker after the turbines become operational does not provide the same level of certainty as a design that avoids significant impacts from the beginning.

The effectiveness of operational mitigation depends on ongoing monitoring, accurate reporting systems and the willingness and ability of the operator to respond promptly to complaints. It also requires residents to continually engage with the operator over a prolonged period, potentially for the entire operational lifespan of the development.

For a development expected to remain in place for approximately 35 years, it is essential that the Board is satisfied in advance that nearby residents will be adequately protected and that mitigation measures are clear, effective and enforceable.

7.3 Human Health, Sleep and Quality of Life

The potential impacts of this development must also be considered cumulatively. The issue is not simply whether individual impacts such as noise, shadow flicker or visual change can each be assessed in isolation. The lived experience of residents is the combined effect of all these factors occurring together over a prolonged period.

For my family, the proposed development would result in:

- Continuous visibility of multiple large turbines from our home and garden;

- The movement of turbine blades across multiple views;
- Potential shadow flicker impacts;
- Predicted operational noise in close proximity to our home;
- The loss of the existing sense of tranquillity and rural character of the area.

The cumulative effect of these impacts has the potential to materially affect our enjoyment of our home, our wellbeing and our overall quality of life. This is particularly significant given that our home is not a location that we visit occasionally but a permanent family residence where we spend substantial periods of our daily lives.

7.4 Need for a Precautionary Approach

The proposed development would operate for several decades. Once constructed, the effects on nearby residents would be difficult, if not impossible, to reverse. Therefore, where uncertainty exists regarding the adequacy of assessments or the effectiveness of proposed mitigation, a precautionary approach should be applied.

In this case, the combination of turbine proximity, unresolved concerns regarding noise assessment, potential shadow flicker, and the overwhelming visual presence of turbines around H3 creates a level of uncertainty that should weigh significantly in the planning balance.

7.5 Conclusion on Shadow Flicker, Health and Residential Wellbeing

While the Applicant has proposed mitigation measures, these measures do not provide sufficient certainty that the residential amenity of nearby homes, particularly H3, will be protected over the lifetime of the development.

The effects of shadow flicker must be considered alongside the wider impacts of noise, visual dominance and landscape change. When these factors are considered together, the proposal would result in a substantial and enduring alteration of the living environment of the nearest residents.

I therefore submit that the Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development can operate without causing unacceptable impacts on the health, wellbeing and quality of life of those living closest to the turbines.

8. Cumulative Impacts, Planning Policy and Overall Planning Balance

The assessment of this application should not consider individual impacts in isolation. The true effect of the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm must be assessed by considering the **combined and cumulative impacts** of visual change, noise, shadow flicker, landscape transformation, effects on tourism and heritage assets, and the long-term impact on the communities living closest to the development.

8.1 Cumulative Impact on Residential Amenity and Community Character

For residents such as my family, who live in close proximity to the proposed turbines, the impact will not be experienced as a series of separate environmental effects. The daily reality will be the combined experience of:

- Large-scale turbines visible from multiple aspects of the home;
- The continuous movement of turbine blades;
- Potential noise impacts over the operational life of the development;
- Potential shadow flicker effects;
- The introduction of industrial-scale infrastructure into a previously quiet rural environment.

Taken together, these impacts would fundamentally alter the character of our home and surrounding landscape. The cumulative effect would result in a substantial loss of the peace, tranquillity and rural character that currently defines this part of the Lacken area.

This concern is particularly significant given that H3 has been identified by the Applicant as the closest occupied non-participating dwelling and one of the receptors expected to experience the greatest effects from the development. The fact that the most affected dwelling would experience such substantial impacts raises a fundamental question as to whether this location is suitable for a development of this scale.

8.2 Cumulative Landscape, Tourism and Environmental Effects

The proposed development must also be considered in the context of existing, permitted and proposed energy developments within the wider North Mayo landscape.

North Mayo is valued for its open coastal scenery, archaeological heritage, tourism destinations and recreational amenities. The cumulative presence of large-scale energy infrastructure has the potential to gradually transform the character of the area from a predominantly natural and rural landscape into one increasingly influenced by industrial development.

This is particularly relevant in relation to the wider setting of important tourism and heritage assets including the Céide Fields, Downpatrick Head, the Wild Atlantic Way, local walking routes and other recreational areas. The cumulative effect of multiple developments has the potential to diminish the scenic quality and visitor experience that contribute significantly to the local economy and identity of the region.

The key planning question is not simply whether individual environmental effects can be reduced through mitigation, but whether the receiving landscape has the capacity to accommodate a development of this scale without suffering a fundamental loss of character, visual quality, tranquillity and environmental value.

8.3 Conflict with Planning Policy

I acknowledge that national policy strongly supports the transition to renewable energy and the development of renewable electricity infrastructure as part of Ireland's response to climate change. However, such development must be carefully planned and balanced against the obligation to protect residential amenity, landscape quality, environmental heritage and the rights of existing communities.

The Mayo County Development Plan and relevant planning guidance recognise that renewable energy development should be undertaken in a manner that avoids unacceptable impacts on people and the environment. The fact that a development contributes to renewable energy targets does not remove the requirement to demonstrate that the chosen location is suitable and that significant adverse effects can be adequately avoided or mitigated.

In this case, I respectfully submit that the application has not demonstrated that an appropriate balance has been achieved. The proximity of the turbines to H3, the unresolved concerns regarding consultation, the inadequacy of the visual assessment, uncertainty regarding the noise assessment, and the potential impacts on the wider landscape and community all weigh significantly against the granting of permission.

9. Overall Conclusion and Request to Refuse Permission

I support the transition to renewable energy and recognise the importance of developing sustainable sources of electricity. However, renewable energy developments must be located and designed in a way that respects existing communities and protects the qualities that make rural areas suitable places in which to live, work and visit.

The proposed Tirawley Wind Farm would impose a disproportionate burden on those living closest to the development, particularly my family as the occupants of H3, the nearest occupied non-participating dwelling. The evidence presented throughout this observation demonstrates serious concerns regarding:

- The failure to undertake meaningful consultation with the affected community;
- The unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of H3;
- The scale and dominance of the turbines within a sensitive coastal landscape;
- The inadequacies and limitations of the visual and noise assessments;
- The uncertainty surrounding shadow flicker and long-term effects on wellbeing;
- The cumulative impact on the landscape, tourism assets and the identity of the Lacken community.

The applicant's own assessments identify H3 as one of the most sensitive receptors, yet the conclusions reached fail, in my view, to adequately reflect the reality of living in such close proximity to multiple turbines over a period of approximately 35 years.

The fact that the closest occupied non-participating dwelling can only achieve compliance with the night-time noise limit through the combined application of directivity corrections

and operational curtailment demonstrates the sensitivity of this receptor and raises serious concerns as to whether the proposed turbines are appropriately located in relation to existing residential amenity.

When all impacts are considered together, the proposed development would result in a significant and irreversible change to the character of my home, the surrounding landscape and the wider North Mayo environment.

The proposed development has not demonstrated that the significant impacts identified can be avoided, adequately mitigated or reduced to an acceptable level, particularly in relation to the nearest occupied dwelling and the sensitive environmental characteristics of the receiving area.

For these reasons, I respectfully submit that the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm has not demonstrated that it represents proper planning and sustainable development. I therefore respectfully request that **An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the proposed development.**

Thank you for taking the time to consider these observations

Yours faithfully,

Gerard Healy