

An Coimisiún Pleanála

64 Marlborough Street

Dublin1

Date:24/7/2026

RE: Formal Planning Objection/Observation

-Planning Reference: PAX16.324387

-Proposed Development:13 wind turbines (180-metre tip height each), 110kv substation, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated infrastructure at Muingmore, Doolough and Tristia townlands Co. Mayo.

-Developer: RWE Renewables Ireland Limited

-Objector: Geraldine Howard, Cashel Lodge, Kilmurry, Sixmilebridge, Co. Clare/ Muingmore, Belmullet, Ballina, Co. Mayo.

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application for a wind turbine development located approximately 800 metres from Muingmore, where my husband grew up and where we visit regularly. My daughter has special needs and she is very relaxed in this house. I ask that the Planning Authority refuse permission.

1. Noise

The proposed turbines would be sited close enough to cause a material and ongoing noise nuisance. I request that the applicant be required to submit a full noise impact assessment specific to this dwelling, and that any permission be conditioned on continuous, independently monitored compliance — not just modelled predictions.

2. Shadow Flicker

At 800 metres, our family home will fall within the shadow flicker zone depending on the turbine's rotor diameter. Shadow flicker is a genuine and recurring disturbance to residential amenity, and I request that the applicant be required to submit a shadow flicker assessment specific to this property, with a condition that turbines be curtailed automatically if flicker at the dwelling exceeds accepted limits.

3. Impact on Vulnerable Household Members

Our household includes two children with additional needs, including sensitivities that make a stable, quiet, and predictable home environment particularly important. Noise disturbance, shadow flicker, and construction-phase disruption (traffic, blasting/piling noise, dust) would have a disproportionate impact on their wellbeing compared with an average household. I would ask the Planning Authority to give this weight as a material consideration under residential amenity policy, and, should permission be granted, to impose the strictest available construction-hours and noise conditions.

4. Devaluation of Property

The presence of a wind turbine within 800 metres is a well-documented factor in reduced residential property values, both through direct amenity loss (noise, flicker, visual dominance) and through reduced buyer interest. I ask the Authority to weigh this economic harm to an existing settled household against the benefit of the proposed development.

5. Visual and Landscape Impact / Proximity to Beaches

This part of Mayo relies significantly on its unspoiled coastal landscape, including nearby sandy beaches, for tourism and amenity value. Similar developments elsewhere in the county have been opposed on the basis that industrial-scale turbines are incompatible with protecting that landscape and tourism offering. I would ask the Authority to consider the cumulative visual impact of the proposed turbines on the coastal landscape setting, and on the amenity of beach users and visitors, consistent with the Council's own recognition elsewhere in the county that scenic coastal areas warrant protection from turbine development.

6. Ecological and Wildlife Impact

I am concerned about the impact of construction and operation on local wildlife, including birds and bats using the coastal and countryside habitat in this area, and request that a full, independent ecological impact assessment (including bird/bat surveys across all seasons) be required before any decision is made, along with appropriate mitigation conditions if permission is granted.

7. Policy Context

I would draw the Authority's attention to:

- The Mayo Renewable Energy Strategy's own recognition that not all parts of the county are suitable for wind development, including areas excluded on landscape, ecological, and tourism grounds.
- The one-kilometre buffer zone from settlements adopted by Mayo County Council in its Renewable Energy Strategy.

Mayo County Development Plan & Variation No. 2

I note that Mayo County Council formally adopted the Renewable Energy Strategy for County Mayo as Variation No. 2 to the County Development Plan 2022–2028 on 13 July 2026, during the observation period for this application. The applicant's own EIAR (Chapter 10) admits that the site is located within an area deemed 'Unsuitable' for wind energy development under this strategy. This development is therefore in material contravention of the current operative County Development Plan. Under Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, An Coimisiún Pleanála cannot grant permission for development in material contravention of a development plan without specific justification. No such Justification has been provided. The placement of 180-metre-high turbines within 800 metres of an established family home fundamentally conflicts with the protective spirit of this newly enacted variation which seeks to prevent the over industrialisation of sensitive rural and residential areas.

For the reasons set out above, I strongly object to this application in its current form. I would ask that the Planning Authority refuse the application and to require independent assessment of noise, shadow flicker, landscape/visual impact, and ecology specific to this property before any decision is made. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these concerns further and to be kept informed of the progress of this application.

Yours Faithfully

Geraldine Howard