Aisling Fitzgerald,
Knocknagappagh,
Inch,
Killeagh,
Co. Cork
26-10-2026

The Secretary
An Coimisiun Pleanala
64 Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
D01 V902

Planning application reference: 324632. Observation on SID
Site/location: Ballyneague, Ballydaniel and Knocknagappagh, County Cork
Applicant: Perigus Energy Ireland Midco Ltd
Proposed Development: 220kV Air Insulated Substation, loop-in grid connection and related works

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to formally object to the proposed 220 kV substation forming part of the Greenhills solar farm development. I live in close proximity to the proposed development site and am concerned that the substation, together with its associated electrical equipment and infrastructure, would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, the rural landscape and the environment.

My objection is directed specifically at the scale, siting and effects of the 220 kV substation. I ask the planning authority to assess it as a major piece of electrical infrastructure in its own right, as well as considering its cumulative effects with the solar panels, inverter stations, battery energy storage systems (BESS), access roads, fencing and other elements of the wider project.

1. Scale, siting and residential amenity

A 220 kV substation is substantial electrical infrastructure and is materially different in character from solar panels spread across agricultural land. Its transformers, switchgear, gantries, control buildings, lighting, security fencing and associated equipment would create an industrialised feature in a rural setting. Given the proximity of my home, I am concerned that the substation would be visually intrusive and would diminish the quiet enjoyment of my home and garden that I currently enjoy.

The planning authority should be satisfied that the selected location is necessary and appropriate, that alternative locations farther from homes have been properly considered, and that the layout provides an adequate separation from nearby dwellings. Any assessment should consider actual views from neighbouring homes and gardens, not merely views from public roads or distant viewpoints that have been provided in Perigus' photomontages.

2. Noise and vibration

Transformer hum, cooling fans and other electrical equipment can produce continuous or tonal noise. Construction may also involve heavy vehicles, excavation, piling and other noisy works. In a quiet rural area that I live in, these sources could be intrusive, particularly at night when background noise is lower. I am concerned about the potential for disturbance, sleep disruption and loss of residential amenity.

I ask that the application be supported by a robust, site-specific noise assessment that identifies each relevant source, establishes representative background levels, assesses tonal and low-frequency noise and considers night-time

operation and cumulative noise from the substation, inverters and BESS cooling systems. Any permission should include clear, measurable and enforceable noise limits at the nearest homes, independent verification after commissioning, ongoing monitoring where needed, and a requirement to take corrective action if limits are exceeded.

I would like to point out on the first invalidation letter 25/6876 for Orsteds/Perigus Greenhills Solar Farm, Cork County Council made the point:

2. Noise Assessment With regard to noise and vibrations impacts, a suitably scaled map should be submitted as part of the assessment showing the location of all noise sensitive locations in the vicinity of the proposed development. The respective distances of such locations should also be presented in tabular form. In addition, this map should also show the locations where all noise monitoring took place. Please note also in relation to the noise assessment, page 36 states, " it is considered that noise sources associated with the proposed development are likely to be broadband in nature, with no distinguishable tones. On this basis a tonal penalty is not applicable. Also, impulsive noise as a result of the proposed development is not considered likely at the closest sensitive receptors." This submission should be further expanded and detailed with any information to support the above claims submitted

As far as I'm aware this wasn't addressed with their second planning application 26/2133 to CCC. I would request the Bord take this into consideration when assessing noise on local receptors.

3. Visual impact and landscape character

The substation would introduce large-scale electrical infrastructure into open countryside and could have a greater localised visual impact than the solar panels themselves. The effect will depend on the height and arrangement of equipment, ground levels, lighting and the visibility of the site from nearby houses. Landscaping will take years to mature and will not screen taller structures or equipment effectively throughout the year.

I would like to point out on the first invalidation letter 25/6876 for Orsteds/Perigus Greenhills Solar Farm, Cork County Council made the point:

4. Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment The LVIA does not include a cumulative impact assessment. The permitted SID windfarm (ABP ref: 309121-21) is approximately 2kms from the site and a cumulative assessment relating to this is included in the traffic assessment. One should also be included in the LVIA.

As far as I'm aware this wasn't addressed with their second planning application 26/2133 to CCC. I would request the Bord take this into consideration when assessing this application.

The authority should require accurate visualisations and verified viewpoints from nearby residences, together with details of equipment heights, lighting, fencing, planting and long-term landscape management. Screening should not be treated as a substitute for choosing a less harmful location or reducing the scale of the installation where feasible.

4. Electrical infrastructure, safety and environmental assessment

The application should clearly describe the substation's full design and operation, including transformer capacity and location, any insulating or cooling oils, drainage, bunding, fire detection and response measures, emergency access, maintenance and arrangements for managing spills or other incidents. The potential interaction with any proposed battery storage beside the privately owned forestry should also be assessed, including whether the layout and emergency arrangements remain adequate when the components are considered together.

I am not asserting that an incident will occur; rather, the scale of the infrastructure and its proximity to homes make it important that credible risks are assessed transparently and that appropriate safeguards are specified before permission is granted. The authority should also be satisfied that the proposed drainage and pollution-control measures protect nearby watercourses specifically the river Tourig, groundwater, habitats and any relevant protected sites.

5. Cumulative effects and construction impacts

The substation cannot be assessed in isolation from the wider solar farm. The combined effects of transformer noise, inverter and battery-system noise, security lighting, vehicle movements, fencing and the wider industrial appearance may be materially greater than the effect of any single component. Construction traffic, working hours (requires greater clarity), dust, vibration and access arrangements should be assessed with particular regard to nearby residents and the capacity of local roads specifically the L7829.

I ask that the planning authority examine the cumulative effects over the full operational period, and not rely solely on general statements that impacts can be mitigated. Any mitigation should be specific, technically justified, secured by planning conditions and capable of being monitored and enforced.

6. Information and safeguards required

Before granting permission, I respectfully ask the authority to ensure that the application provides sufficient information on: (a) alternative siting and separation distances from homes; (b) verified visual and lighting assessments; (c) construction and operational noise, including tonal and low-frequency components; (d) drainage, pollution prevention and emergency response; (e) cumulative effects with the solar farm and BESS; and (f) maintenance, decommissioning and restoration of the substation site. Where information is incomplete or impacts cannot be shown to be acceptable, permission should not be granted on the assumption that the issues can be resolved later.

Conclusion

Given the proximity of my home and the scale and nature of a 220 kV substation, I am concerned that this proposal could cause significant and long-term harm to residential amenity and rural landscape character. I request that the planning authority give the substation separate and careful consideration within the overall application, require adequate evidence and enforceable safeguards, and refuse permission for the proposed substation if its impacts cannot be satisfactorily avoided or mitigated.

Yours faithfully,

Aisling Fitzgerald.