

Name: _____ Ann Barnicle _____

Address: _____ Ballyglass, Claremorris, Co Mayo _____ (land owner at Mayo Abbey) _____

Date: _____ 30.08.26 _____

An Coimisiun Pleanála
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Re: Observation on the proposed Cloonbaul 110 kV substation and grid connection

ACP Case: VA16.324429 | Applicant: Cunlaghfadda Green Energy Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object because the proposed 110 kV substation would introduce a permanent industrial compound into a quiet agricultural landscape.

Electrical plant, control buildings, gantries, hardstanding, fencing, access roads and lighting cannot be made rural by planting around their edges. Screening takes time, may fail and does not remove the change in land use or the experience of the compound from nearby roads and properties.

The landscape also forms part of the setting of Mayo Abbey's historic and archaeological hinterland. Further industrialisation should not be accepted where the same infrastructure can be located on land with lower landscape and heritage sensitivity.

I ask the Commission to ensure that the environmental effects of the related energy projects have not been divided between separate applications.

The substation exists to serve the proposed wind farm and is now also physically close to a proposed BESS connection. Functional links, shared access, cabling, drainage, construction traffic and cumulative ecological or heritage effects do not disappear because each element has its own planning file.

The public and decision-maker need one honest account of the total works and their interactions. If significant combined effects cannot be excluded on the basis of complete information, the precautionary principle supports refusal.

I object because the assessment must include every temporary and enabling work, not only the completed substation.

Construction compounds, soil storage, machinery movement, widened accesses, drainage, welfare areas and temporary tracks can compact, truncate or remove archaeological deposits. The damage is permanent even if the temporary surface is later reseeded.

The Commission should require a clearly mapped total construction envelope and complete archaeological investigation of that envelope before deciding the application. Unspecified temporary works should not be allowed to transfer the real assessment until after permission.

My objection concerns the underground 110 kV cable route as well as the substation compound.

The applicant describes approximately 982 metres of underground cabling across private agricultural land to the existing Castlebar-Cloon 110 kV overhead line. A long service trench, jointing areas, access and

drainage can disturb a continuous archaeological transect through the landscape even where no structure is visible at the surface.

The entire corridor must be surveyed and assessed before permission, not merely monitored while excavation proceeds. The risk cannot be reduced to the footprint of the control building or electrical equipment.

Your sincerely

Ann Barnicle