

From: [John Ryan](#)
To: [SIDS](#)
Subject: Observation John Ryan - ABP 320705-24
Date: Wednesday 5 August 2026 11:57:49
Attachments: [ABP_320705-24 \(1\).pdf](#)

You don't often get email from eqgrass@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.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I trust this email finds you well.

Please find attached my submission of observation in response to the proposed development of wind turbines, as detailed in submission.

Kind regards,
John.

Neilstown
Cloontra
Sixmilebridge
Co. Clare
V95XY2Y

John Ryan
Cahernalee
Kiltullagh
Athenry
Co. Galway
H65CY26

Date: 4 August 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to the above-mentioned case and enclose a response to the " further information received from the applicant. "

Background

As the submission states, "Ireland must decarbonise by 2050." With a lifespan of 35 years, this windfarm could be obsolete by 2061 leaving a gap in supply and a large industrial site with thousands of tons of concrete buried at the top of Knockshanvo. Research points to offshore windfarms as being more reliable, sustainable and a more consistent source of energy supply for the future. The studies used in the EIAR by MKO are international and based in countries much larger than Ireland. Land is a finite and more limited resource in Ireland than in these countries. With the proliferation of data centres, the demand for energy will outstrip the supply from the smaller windfarms. There is time, with government foresight to exploit the offshore wind potential that can provide a more reliable answer to decarbonisation than this present proposal.

The windfarm, as proposed, will need significant fossil fuel energy support to maintain a constant supply that the data centres require (leading to higher electricity prices). We need vision and forward thinking to look beyond short term proposals.

Compliance with CDP

CDP 8.4 Agriculture (promoting agricultural development)

No exact details are provided as to how the windfarm would contribute to " the economic vitality and diversification of rural areas by complementing this rural agricultural area and enhancing socio-economic resilience in the surrounding area. "

The site is in contravention of policy 8.4 in this regard;

- By installing an industrial site adjacent and within agricultural and residential areas,
- By discouraging residential , agricultural and horticultural development and activity with interference of noise and flicker,
- By not supporting the residents and farmers directly affected by the windfarm site.

As a house owner/farmer within 950m of the nearest proposed turbine, the communication, information and support has been minimal and superficial. If planning is granted, it will become impossible to communicate any issue that may arise. We need statutory assurance and guarantee that any health or interference issue will be addressed.

This option is already mooted by the applicant, inviting the commission "to condition the implementation of the compensation & enhancement plan as part of any grant of permission." This was in relation to the relocation of hen harrier habitat. This should also be applied to the negative effects on adjacent residents and landowners. [3.1.7.7]

3.1.9. Public Consultation and Engagement

"Detailed and systematic engagement with all 'near neighbours' to the project (within 2km) from a very early stage of the project design.' The only public consultation offered was an evening meeting to announce and explain the proposed application.

We requested a meeting with the Liaison officers who duly obliged but were vague as to details and implications; we were informed that the nearest proposed turbine would be over 1km from our house. On examining the plans, we discovered that it was 950m. On explaining our concerns over the line of sight, the response was that "at least it was behind the house".

Devaluation of Property

One of the studies quoted by the applicant is "the impact of onshore and offshore wind turbine farms on property prices". by Dr. S. Heblich. The conclusion drawn by the applicant is at odds with that of the study and is out of context; offshore figures are included in surveys. Note that at a shorter distance, confidence in results is weak. " (There are not many houses very close to turbines) and so there will necessarily be more uncertainty in our estimates at close distances" (less than 2km).

The US LBNL study on house devaluation was carried out in 2009 and covered 7500 homes within 10 miles of a windfarm. It could not conclude that individual receptors would not be negatively impacted, with no data on close proximity (i.e. less or equal to 1 to 2km).

The 2016 report covered 500,000 houses and the Steve Gibbons conclusions (used in the study) "finds significant negative effects on house prices where the turbines are visible"¹. The study indicates a "large lack of preciseness of data in the equal or less than 2km distance from turbine." The study is based on house sales and does not accommodate houses for sale which are not sold. This study is on over 500,000 property sales in Scotland between 1990 and 2014, a period of 24 years within which inflation and appreciation of value with time and demand are not factored. The study acknowledges that most of the windfarms in the surveys were in remote areas of Scotland.

Householders, close to the Cloghan windfarm in Offaly, have consistently lodged complaints with the county council concerning noise, flicker, sleep deprivation, health and wellbeing.

¹ full paper Stephen Gibbons Papervio. Cerp 433

These complaints were passed from department to department and finally sidelined when the windfarm was post 7 years in place. Please refer to submission on Ballina windfarm ref 523579 : concerns regarding noise, health impact and compliance with planning permission. These issues , between the applicant and the affected residents , need to be resolved before planning is considered

4.1.2.

The applicant claims to remain firmly committed to resolving the issues highlighted by Airnav & SAA. But how can planning be granted with these issues outstanding. The use of satellite tracking is suggested in 2030 to replace the present radar system . The satellite service would be controlled from outside the jurisdiction . In the event of service failure , outside of jurisdiction control , the radar on woodcock hill would ensure aviation safety . In the interests of safety and Shannon Airport going forward , this facility should not be compromised .

5.1.2.

The LVIA reports the “significant” visual effects which are likely to occur will be highly localised, only occurring for a very small number of residential receptors in very close proximity to the proposed turbines. “Impacts are limited to a low number of receptors”. The applicant admits that there is significant impact on a low number of receptors but has not suggested mitigations, compensation or resolution to address the concerns of these receptors.

Again the issues between the applicant and the affected residents need to be resolved before planning is considered .

In Sweden² “ to ensure those affected (by noise and shadow) share in the value created by wind power, there is now (since June 2026) a statutory wind power compensation scheme. The new legislation provides a clear and long term model for compensation to nearby residents while the operator continues to contribute to local development through its community fund. “

Residents would not feel as aggrieved or exploited if involved in this way with the windfarm. There is a history of windfarm ownership change. A statutory requirement could guarantee a better relationship between the windfarm and its near neighbours into the future .

With the hope of continuing constructive dialogue and that the above concerns will be duly taken into consideration going forward.

Sincerely,
John Ryan

086 24 92 992
eqgrass@gmail.com

² [SCA.com](https://www.sca.com) windpower compensation