

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: Sean Howard, Muingmore, Belmullet, Ballina, Co. Mayo/ Cashel Lodge, Kilmurry, Sixmilebridge, Co. Clare.

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application for the erection of 13 wind turbines, each approximately 180 metres to blade tip on the Grassmeal Road. This application directly affects Muingmore, a property that has been in my family for three generations, and I ask that the Planning Authority give full weight to the following grounds of objection.

1. Heritage and Long-Standing Family Connection to the Land

Our family has owned and lived at Muingmore for three generations, the land and surrounding landscape form an integral part of our family history and identity. This long-standing connection is a material consideration that risks being permanently and irreversibly diminished by the introduction of large-scale industrial structures in the surrounding area to our home. Once erected, turbines of this scale would fundamentally and permanently alter the character of a place that has meaning far beyond its market value. Our family home in Muingmore is not just a building, it is the anchor to our family's history. My grandparents first resided at the house then my parents who raised their family of four children there. My father passed away in 2014 and My mother sadly only passed away last year, I then inherited the family home and land. My wife and I along with My son and daughter visit every second week.

2. Noise and Health Impact

My daughter who has special needs is also non-verbal and unable to walk. She experienced infantile seizures as a baby, together these mean she is entirely dependent on her immediate environment remaining stable and predictable. She has no means of verbally expressing distress, discomfort or overstimulation meaning any negative impact from noise, flicker or disruption may go unrecognised or unaddressed until it manifests as significant behavioural or physical distress. Her mobility needs also mean she cannot simply remove herself from a stressful environment making the respite she gets going to Muingmore especially critical. My son has a medical condition called Hypopituitarism and does not produce stress hormone cortisol. This is not a minor sensitivity it means his body lacks the normal physiological stress response that protects most people during periods of acute physical or psychological stress. Where such stress would trigger a hormonal response to help the body cope, in My son's case this response is absent and without its acute stress can trigger a life-threatening

adrenal crisis requiring emergency medical treatment. Sustained or repeated environmental stressors including construction during the build phase and on-going operational noise and shadow flicker from the turbines of this scale represent a genuine medical risk to him not simply a quality-of-life concern. Wind turbines of the scale proposed are known to generate both audible noise and low-frequency/infrasound emissions. Given the proximity of the proposed turbines to our home — approximately 800 metres — there is a real risk of noise nuisance, sleep disturbance, and associated health effects, particularly during night-time operation and under certain wind conditions. I would ask the Authority to require independent, robust noise assessment against the relevant national guidance before any consent is granted, and to consider the cumulative effect on residential amenity.

3. Visual and Landscape Impact

The proposed turbines would be clearly visible from our home and garden and would dominate views that are currently open countryside and sea views. Structures of this height are, by design, highly prominent, and their industrial character is fundamentally at odds with the rural setting and is straight across the road from where the family bog is. The Grassmeal Road where these wind turbines are proposed to be built is along a lovely country road where we can go for a nice walk and hear all the various birds. We can go to where My family would have cut turf for many generations. I ask the Authority to assess the Landscape, wildlife and Visual Impact Assessment critically, including night-time lighting/aviation warning lights where relevant, and to.

4. Shadow Flicker

Depending on the turbine layout, time of year, and time of day, our property may be subject to shadow flicker caused by the rotating blades passing between the sun and the house. This effect is well documented as a source of significant nuisance and can affect daily life, including for anyone in the household with photosensitive conditions. Given my daughters seizure history I ask that a full shadow flicker assessment be carried out for this property specifically, and that appropriate mitigation or refusal be considered if unacceptable effects are identified. consider whether the harm to visual amenity is justified by the public benefit claimed.

5. Impact on Wildlife and the Local Environment

The site and surrounding area support many varieties of birds and wildlife, and turbines of this scale present a recognised risk of collision and habitat disturbance. Across the road from the site also is bogland which is an ecosystem in its own right. I would ask the Authority to ensure that a thorough ecological assessment has been undertaken, covering breeding, foraging and migratory patterns, and that appropriate survey seasons have been observed, before determining this application.

6. Impact on Property Value

While I recognise that impact on property value alone is not typically a formal planning consideration, it is a direct and foreseeable consequence of the noise, visual, and amenity impacts described above, and I raise it here as evidence of the real-world harm this development would cause to a home that has been in my family for generations.

Planning Policy & Procedural Concerns

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 either refuse the application or, at minimum, 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

Sean Howard