
Arklow 319864

From Philip Wheatley <pajwheatley@gmail.com>

Date Tue 7/28/2026 9:45 AM

To Marine <marine@pleanala.ie>

 1 attachment (89 KB)

Arklow PWheatley.pdf;

You don't often get email from pajwheatley@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This is an **External Email** and may have malicious content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the ICT Helpdesk.

Please find attached a letter in relation to this file.

Thank you

Philip

Philip Wheatley
8 Florence Terrace
Bray

Planning Commission
Via Email
Date: 27 July 2026

Re: Arklow Bank Wind Park 2 – Case 319864-24

Dear Sir / Madam

You wrote to me on 29 May following my initial submission on this file informing me of the supplementary material made available by the developer and inviting follow-up comments.

I have now reviewed the supplementary material. In general I find the developers response to be disappointing which I would characterise as trying to justify its plans as being perfect regardless of how many observations or criticisms it received.

There are many elements in the response I find completely inadequate. For example, many observations or questions in my own submission seem to have simply been ignored.

There is one point in particular topic I would like to highlight as an example of how this response is completely inadequate. On Section 3.4.4.2 (page 163), the report addresses critics who highlight the windfarms close proximity to the coast, and how that would be contrary to planning in other jurisdictions. **The response states “Britain has no distance-to-shore restriction in place for offshore wind development”**. There is no other statement in the document to put this sentence in context.

I believe this is a false statement. Perhaps there is no “law” against near-shore wind farm development. What is very clear however is that the UK does have planning guidelines for proximity to the shore. While a guideline may not be a law, it is completely misleading for the developer to position its response in this way, implying the Arklow development could be undertaken in the UK today. The reality, as the developer well knows it, is there is zero chance that such a development would have any prospect of getting planning in the UK or Northern Ireland. They have learned their lessons after such disastrous environmental vandalism such as Black Dog beach in Aberdeenshire, which this proposal is quite consistent with as regards the scale of visual pollution from over-sized near shore developments.

I attach for your consideration a report from the Welsh Government entitled “Guidance on siting offshore windfarms” from 2019. In this report on page 17 for example it notes among its tests:

“Is the proposed development beyond the low magnitude buffer distance for the maximum expected turbine height to blade tip eg beyond 22.6km for turbines up to 145m high, beyond 28.5km for turbines 176–225m high or beyond 44km for turbines 301-350m high?”

There are a whole series of tests within this Welsh document which this proposal would fail. I am left to wonder why something that would nowhere near good enough to pass Welsh planning is

even able to be proposed for Wicklow, and how it is ok for the developer to simply dismiss out of hand the criticisms it received as the development being too close to the shore.

I hope the Planning Commission will protect the people of Wicklow who should have a reasonable expectation that their coast line will not be permanently wrecked by this horrific proposal and those further north along the coast. The whole proposal unfortunately is fundamentally flawed by its near shore location. If this proposal would fail everywhere else in Europe why is it considered ok to be foisted upon the people of Wicklow?

Yours faithfully

Philip Wheatley