

OBSERVATION / OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

To:

An Coimisiún Pleanála (formerly An Bord Pleanála)

Re: Proposed Wind Energy Development – Observation/Objection

Name: Ann Marie Brennan

Address: E41 TF25, Co. Tipperary

Submission: Objection to the proposed development

1. INTRODUCTION

I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed wind energy development and respectfully request that **An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the proposed development.**

My home is located at **E41 TF25**, in close proximity to the proposed turbine development. The location of my home in relation to the proposed turbines gives rise to serious concerns regarding residential amenity, noise, visual impact, landscape character, biodiversity, peatland, archaeology and cultural heritage.

I ask the Board to consider the particular circumstances of my property and not simply assess the impacts on surrounding residents on the basis of generalised distances or broad conclusions contained within the planning documentation.

2. PROXIMITY OF MY HOME TO THE PROPOSED TURBINES

My home at **E41 TF25 is located approximately along the 1,000 metre distance contour from the proposed turbines.**

The submitted mapping demonstrates that my property is among the dwellings located relatively close to the proposed turbine array, with a number of turbines situated to the east/south-east of my home.

This proximity is of particular concern because my property is situated on

elevated ground. Its elevated and relatively exposed position has the potential to increase the prominence of the proposed turbines in views from the property and surrounding lands.

The combination of **proximity and elevation** is therefore highly relevant when assessing the likely effects on residential amenity.

I am concerned that the proposed turbines could become a dominant and persistent feature of the outlook from my home, rather than being a distant or insignificant element within the landscape.

The visual effects should consequently be assessed specifically from my property and not solely from generic viewpoints selected by the developer.

Figure 1 – Location of E41 TF25 in relation to the proposed turbine array and the approximately 1,000 m distance contour.

3. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND NOISE

I have serious concerns regarding the potential noise impacts arising from the proposed turbines.

For a resident living at approximately the 1,000 metre distance from a turbine development, noise is not merely a theoretical consideration. Turbine noise can be experienced differently depending on topography, wind conditions, atmospheric conditions and the characteristics of the receiving property.

My concerns are heightened by the elevated location of my home and its proximity to the proposed turbines.

Of particular concern is the issue of **site-specific noise monitoring**.

I understand that the requested site-specific noise monitoring was not carried out. In my view, this creates a significant evidential gap when attempting to establish the existing acoustic environment and predict the likely impact of the proposed development on nearby residential properties.

A proper assessment should establish the existing baseline noise environment and consider whether the predicted operational noise levels will provide adequate protection for nearby residents under the full range of relevant operating and meteorological conditions.

I therefore ask the Board to carefully scrutinise:

- the adequacy of the baseline noise assessment;

- the methodology used to predict turbine noise;
- the assumptions made regarding background noise;
- the potential effects of topography and elevation;
- cumulative noise from multiple turbines;
- low-frequency noise and amplitude modulation;
- night-time noise impacts; and
- the adequacy and enforceability of proposed noise limits and monitoring arrangements.

I respectfully submit that where a dwelling is located in close proximity to a large turbine array, the protection of residential amenity must be given significant weight.

4. VISUAL IMPACT AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

The proposed turbines will introduce very large industrial structures into the existing rural landscape.

The visual impact on my property is of particular concern because of its **elevated position and proximity to the proposed turbines.**

The turbines will not be experienced simply as isolated structures. Their height, rotor movement, aviation lighting where applicable, access infrastructure, hardstanding areas, electrical infrastructure and associated development will collectively alter the character of the surrounding landscape.

The moving blades may also make the turbines particularly noticeable from a residential property.

I ask the Board to assess the development from the perspective of an actual nearby resident, including views from:

- the dwelling;
- the garden and private open spaces associated with the dwelling;
- approaches to the property; and
- the surrounding local road network.

The assessment should take account of the cumulative effect of the entire turbine array rather than considering each turbine in isolation.

5. PEATLAND, EXCAVATION AND CARBON

RELEASE

I have serious concerns regarding the proposed excavation and disturbance of peat and other carbon-rich soils associated with the development.

The construction of turbines requires substantial works, including turbine foundations, access roads, hardstanding areas, drainage infrastructure, cable routes and associated construction works.

Where peatland and carbon-rich soils are disturbed, there is potential for:

- direct loss of peat habitat;
- disturbance of stored carbon;
- oxidation and decomposition of exposed peat;
- release of greenhouse gases;
- alteration of natural hydrology;
- increased drainage and drying of peat;
- erosion and sedimentation; and
- longer-term degradation of surrounding peatland habitat.

The Board should therefore ensure that the full carbon consequences of peat excavation and disturbance are properly quantified rather than considering only the carbon benefits associated with renewable electricity generation.

The carbon stored within the existing peatland represents an important environmental resource which should not be dismissed simply because the proposed development is intended to generate renewable energy.

I ask that the Board require a robust assessment of **peat stability, peat excavation, peat storage, drainage, hydrological impacts and carbon loss/release** arising from the development.

6. BIODIVERSITY AND WILDLIFE

I am also concerned about the potential impacts of the development on biodiversity and wildlife.

The construction phase alone could result in significant disturbance through vegetation clearance, excavation, machinery, traffic, drainage works, access road construction and other ground disturbance.

The operational phase presents additional concerns, particularly for birds, bats and other wildlife potentially affected by turbine blades, habitat fragmentation

and disturbance.

I ask the Board to ensure that the biodiversity assessment is based on adequate field surveys and that the full area potentially affected by the development is properly assessed.

7. MARSH FRITILLARY AND INVERTEBRATES

Particular attention should be given to the potential effects on **Marsh Fritillary and other protected or ecologically important invertebrates**.

The Marsh Fritillary is a species of significant conservation concern, and suitable habitat can extend beyond the immediate footprint of a proposed structure.

It is therefore important that the assessment does not simply consider whether a particular species was observed at the precise location of a proposed turbine.

The Board should consider:

- suitable habitat;
- larval food plants;
- habitat connectivity;
- potential disturbance;
- construction impacts;
- drainage impacts;
- habitat fragmentation; and
- indirect effects arising from changes to the hydrology and management of surrounding land.

I am concerned that insufficient weight may have been given to the potential effects on invertebrate species and their habitat.

I ask that the Board satisfy itself that **appropriate seasonal surveys and sufficiently comprehensive ecological investigations** have been undertaken.

8. BIRDS AND OTHER WILDLIFE

The proposed turbine array also has the potential to affect bird populations through collision risk, displacement and disturbance.

The scale of the proposed development means that impacts should be considered at the level of the **whole turbine array and associated infrastructure**, rather than simply on a turbine-by-turbine basis.

The assessment should take into account:

- flight paths;
- breeding areas;
- feeding areas;
- commuting routes;
- seasonal movements;
- collision risk;
- displacement;
- cumulative effects; and
- indirect habitat impacts.

I ask the Board to ensure that the ecological assessment is sufficiently comprehensive to establish that the development will not have unacceptable impacts on protected species or biodiversity.

9. THE DISHEEN / LOCAL CULTURAL HERITAGE

I also wish to raise an important local cultural heritage concern relating to the **Disheen**.

The local place-name is understood to derive from the combination of **Direen**, meaning a little oak wood, and **Lisheen/Disheen**, referring to a burial ground associated traditionally with unbaptised babies.

The approximate location of the Disheen has been identified locally and is shown by a **blue circle on the map accompanying this objection**.

I appreciate that the location shown is approximate and is **not being presented as a surveyed boundary**.

Nevertheless, the existence of such a place-name and local tradition is significant and warrants proper consideration as part of the cultural heritage assessment.

A place associated with the burial of unbaptised infants is not simply an archaeological feature that can necessarily be identified through conventional above-ground inspection. Such sites can be difficult to detect physically and may survive primarily through local knowledge, oral history and place-name evidence.

The Board should therefore ensure that the potential location and setting of the Disheen are properly considered before any ground-disturbing works are permitted.

Particular caution is warranted in relation to:

- excavation;
- access roads;
- drainage;
- underground cabling;
- construction compounds;
- vehicle movements; and
- any other works that could disturb previously unidentified archaeological or burial remains.

I respectfully request that the Board give appropriate weight to this local cultural heritage evidence and ensure that **no ground-disturbing works take place in an area where there is a reasonable possibility of affecting the Disheen or associated remains.**

10. LITTLETON BOG AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

I am also concerned about the potential impact of the development on the wider archaeological and cultural heritage of the area, including **Littleton Bog** and the surrounding landscape.

The bog landscape is part of an area with a long history of human interaction and land use. Peatlands can preserve archaeological remains and palaeoenvironmental evidence exceptionally well.

Ground disturbance associated with major infrastructure can potentially damage archaeological deposits that have not previously been identified.

The Board should therefore ensure that the archaeological assessment is sufficiently comprehensive and that the potential for previously unknown

archaeological remains is properly addressed.

Particular attention should be given to the cumulative effect of the proposed infrastructure rather than considering individual works in isolation.

11. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

I ask the Board to consider the **cumulative impact** of all aspects of the proposed development.

The effects of the turbines cannot reasonably be considered separately from:

- access roads;
- turbine foundations;
- crane hardstandings;
- electrical infrastructure;
- underground cabling;
- drainage works;
- peat excavation and storage;
- construction traffic;
- noise;
- visual effects;
- habitat loss and fragmentation; and
- archaeological and cultural heritage impacts.

For a resident living close to the development, these impacts will be experienced collectively.

The Board should therefore assess the overall effect of the development on residential amenity, landscape, biodiversity, peatland, archaeology and cultural heritage.

12. REQUEST TO AN COIMISIÚN PLEANÁLA

Having regard to the matters outlined above, I respectfully request that **An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the proposed development.**

In particular, I ask the Board to have regard to:

1. The close proximity of my home at **E41 TF25** to the proposed turbines;
2. The fact that my property is located approximately on the **1,000 metre**

distance contour;

3. The elevated and relatively exposed position of my property and the resulting potential for significant visual impact;
4. The potential impact of turbine noise on residential amenity;
5. The absence/failure to undertake the requested site-specific noise monitoring;
6. The potential impacts associated with peat excavation and disturbance, including carbon release and changes to peatland hydrology;
7. Potential impacts on biodiversity, birds and other wildlife;
8. The need for adequate surveys and assessment of **Marsh Fritillary and other invertebrates;**
9. The potential effects on the **Disheen**, including its local cultural and burial-ground significance;
10. Potential impacts on archaeological heritage, including the wider **Littleton Bog** area; and
11. The cumulative impact of the entire development on the surrounding rural environment and the residential amenity of nearby homes.

I believe these matters warrant careful and independent consideration before any decision is made.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that An Coimisiún Pleanála refuse permission for the proposed wind energy development.

Signed:

Ann Marie Brennan

Address:

E41 TF25, Co. Tipperary

Date:

11 August 2026

Suggested attachments

I would upload the objection **as the main document**, and then, if the portal permits supporting attachments, include:

Appendix 1 – Location/proximity map

The photograph you have just sent, showing E41 TF25 in relation to the turbine array and the approximately 1,000 m contour.

Appendix 2 – Disheen location map

The earlier map on which you marked the approximate location of the Disheen with the blue circle.

For Appendix 1, I would caption the photograph:

Figure 1: Approximate location of E41 TF25 in relation to the proposed turbine array. The property is located approximately on the 1,000 m distance contour and is situated on elevated ground relative to the surrounding turbine development.

And for the Disheen map:

Figure 2: Approximate location of the Disheen, identified through local place-name and cultural heritage knowledge. The location shown is approximate and is not intended to represent a surveyed site boundary.

This version is deliberately **formal and evidence-based**, while avoiding claims of exact distances or archaeological certainty that the material you have available doesn't establish. It is therefore much safer to submit than overstating what can actually be demonstrated from the maps.