

Nonie and Gerry McGee
Killogeary
Carrowmore Lacken
Ballina
Co. Mayo
F26HF97

nonie.mcgee@gmail.com

21/06/2026

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

**Re: Objection to the Proposed Tirawley Wind Farm Strategic Infrastructure
Development Objection Submission to An Coimisiún Pleanála**

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, Castlелacken Demesne, and other townlands in County Mayo.

Case Number: PAX16.324258

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a resident of the area within proximity to the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm project, submitted by Constant Energy Limited, to formally lodge my objection to this Strategic Infrastructure Development application. This development poses significant and irreversible risks to the local environment, biodiversity and local residents. In particular the proposal threatens critical habitats for protected species such as the Hen Harrier, involves substantial habitat removal including over 4 km of hedgerow, and raises serious concerns regarding visual impact, traffic disruption, and inadequate community consultation. These issues, coupled with shortcomings in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, justify a refusal of permission for this project.

Having reviewed the public information provided and engaged with the community consultation materials, I wish to raise the following concerns:

- 1.

My home is identified as **H174** within the EIAR for the proposed wind energy development.

My dwelling is located approximately:

1.67KM from Turbine AT08

1.78KM from Turbine AT07

While my home is not the closest receptor assessed within the EIAR, I am concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple turbines surrounding my home and the resulting effect on residential amenity.

Operational Noise

I note that my home H174 has been included within the operational noise assessment as a residential receptor.

This demonstrates that the applicant recognises that operational turbine noise has the potential to affect my home.

I am concerned that the assessment relies primarily on predicted modelling and does not fully reflect the long-term experience of residents living in a quiet rural environment.

Particular consideration should be given to:

- cumulative noise from multiple turbines operating simultaneously;
- night-time impacts when background noise levels are lowest;
- changing wind directions and atmospheric conditions;
- amplitude modulation and fluctuating turbine noise characteristics;
- the overall change from the existing rural sound environment.

While compliance with numerical limits may be predicted, such compliance does not necessarily ensure protection of residential amenity.

H170	516834	833111	23.9	28	31.8	34.1	34.4	34.4
H171	518315	838186	23.4	27.5	31.3	33.6	33.9	33.9
H172	517402	836199	26.5	30.6	34.4	36.7	37	37
H173	516765	832999	23.9	28	31.8	34.1	34.4	34.4
H174	517625	836280	25.6	29.7	33.5	35.8	36.1	36.1
H175	518215	838553	22.9	27	30.8	33.1	33.4	33.4
H176	516021	831560	22.6	26.7	30.5	32.8	33.1	33.1
H177	517457	835933	25.8	29.9	33.7	36	36.3	36.3

Shadow Flicker

My home, H174 has been excluded from detailed shadow flicker assessment, I request clarification regarding the basis for that exclusion and confirmation that no shadow flicker impact can occur at the dwelling.

Where turbine control and shutdown systems are proposed under Section 15.2.9.3 of the EIAR, these measures should be available to protect all potentially affected dwellings and not only those included within the detailed modelling area.

The Draft Revised Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2019) indicate that modern turbine technology can prevent shadow flicker impacts and support a zero-shadow-flicker approach at sensitive residential receptors.

Cumulative Residential Amenity Impact

My principal concern relates to the cumulative effect of two turbines located between approximately 1.67KM and 1.78KM from my home.

The combined impact of:

- turbine noise;
- visual presence;
- continuous blade movement;
- aviation lighting where applicable;
- and the industrialisation of the surrounding rural landscape,

should be considered together rather than in isolation.

The assessment of residential amenity should take account not only of compliance with individual technical standards but also of the overall effect on those living permanently within the area.

2. Residential and Property Impact

The proposed wind turbines are located uncomfortably close to existing homes. Despite the stated 540m buffer, the visual impact, noise pollution, and potential shadow flicker effects will significantly disrupt our residential amenity and quality of life. There is also a genuine concern about the likely devaluation of property prices due to proximity to large-scale industrial turbines.

(Reference: Appendix 1.6 Community Engagement Report, Pages 7-13)

3. Site Suitability and Landscape Impact

The location has been described as scattered and not suitable for a development of this scale. The area includes sensitive landscapes, visible from the Wild Atlantic Way and other designated scenic routes, which would be adversely affected by this wind farm. The visual intrusion on the unique coastal and rural landscape is unacceptable and

contrary to the policies outlined in the Mayo County Development Plan regarding landscape protection and visual amenities.

(Reference: Mayo County Council submission, EIAR Chapter 17 - Traffic and Transport, Pages 9-10; Planning Statement, Pages 69-71)

4. Environmental and Ecological Concerns

The site includes sensitive habitats such as blanket bogs and areas with ecological significance under the Habitats Directive. The large volumes of peat to be extracted and the disturbance to these habitats could have long-term detrimental effects on biodiversity and peatland restoration efforts.

(Reference: Appendix 1.6 Community Engagement Report, Pages 13-14; Planning Statement, Pages 69-71)

5. Impact on Hen Harrier Habitat

I am particularly concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the hen harrier, an Annex I protected species under the EU Birds Directive and one whose Irish population has declined significantly in recent years. The EIAR acknowledges that hen harriers are present within the study area and that the site provides suitable autumn and winter foraging habitat. The site contains a combination of blanket bog, scrub, wet grassland, semi-improved grassland and hedgerow networks, all of which are important habitats for foraging and roosting hen harriers.

Of particular concern is that a winter hen harrier roost was recorded within the study area, yet no comprehensive winter roost survey appears to have been undertaken across the wind farm site itself. The applicant's roost surveys focused primarily on areas outside the development footprint, despite evidence that hen harriers utilise habitats within the proposed development area. In the absence of a robust assessment of winter roosting activity, it is difficult to conclude that the impacts on this protected species have been fully assessed.

The development will result in the permanent loss and fragmentation of habitats used by hen harriers, including substantial hedgerow removal, loss of blanket bog habitat, forestry felling and the construction of extensive site roads and infrastructure. While mitigation is proposed, there remains uncertainty as to whether replacement habitats can adequately replicate the ecological value of the habitats being lost, particularly in the short to medium term.

I am also concerned about the cumulative effects of habitat loss, construction disturbance and operational displacement. Research has shown that hen harriers may avoid otherwise suitable habitat in the vicinity of operational turbines, resulting in a reduction in available foraging area. The application does not appear to adequately assess or mitigate this displacement effect.

Given the conservation status of the species, the acknowledged presence of suitable habitat and recorded winter roosting activity within the study area, I do not believe sufficient scientific certainty has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will not adversely affect the hen harrier population using this landscape. The precautionary principle should therefore apply.

6. Traffic and Infrastructure Impact

The construction phase will bring significant disruption to the local road network due to the delivery of abnormal loads and turbine components. The existing roads will require widening and modifications that will impact local traffic flow and road safety. The scale of this impact has not been adequately mitigated in the proposal.

(Reference: EIAR Chapter 17 - Traffic and Transport, Pages 6-10; Appendix 1.6 Community Engagement Report, Pages 11-12)

7. Community and Socio-Economic Issues

While I acknowledge the need for renewable energy and some regional economic benefits, the socio-economic impact on sustainable family farms and local amenities is concerning. The proposal does not sufficiently address the community's needs or provide clear, direct benefits to local residents. The proposed community benefit package remains vague and unconvincing.

(Reference: Appendix 1.6 Community Engagement Report, Pages 7-14)

8. Cumulative Impact and Strategic Considerations

The project overlaps with areas where other developments are planned or existing, increasing cumulative environmental, visual, and infrastructural pressures. The scale and height of modern turbines, as noted by Mayo County Council, raise questions about the suitability of this site compared to previous assessments.

(Reference: Mayo County Council submission, EIAR Chapter 17, Pages 9-10)

In conclusion, I respectfully submit that the proposed Tirawley Wind Farm project is not appropriate for this location due to the significant negative impacts on residential amenity, local landscape, ecology, infrastructure, and the community. I urge An Coimisiún Pleanála to refuse permission for this development in the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours faithfully,

Nonie and Gerry McGee