

re: PLO4

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
LDG: 307939	
ABP: 030828-20	
17 SEP 2020	
Fee: €	Type:
Time:	By: Post

CLOGHER

DUNMANWAY

CO. CORK.

P47 EP 89

14. 9. 2020

Dear Sir / madam,

I am writing the following observations re PLO4.30793 re Cleenrath wind farm. The Supreme Court considered this case, and denied planning permission for it, as it ruled that An Bord Pleanála had failed to consider evidence submitted to them on the impact of turbine noise on local residents. This is the 3rd time this developer has applied for permission for this windfarm.

The noise impact on local residents, particularly Klaus Balz and Hanna Heubach who live and work a mere 637m from the development, has still

not been addressed.

Even the Irish Times are reporting that the Supreme Court rules "substitute consent" inconsistent with EU environmental law. (July 1 2020)

How is it that the Supreme Court makes a ruling, yet the developer can still reapply, without addressing this issue? (in any way.)

One wonders if it is even legal for the board to keep granting "substitute consent" when there are no meaningful "exceptional circumstances".

Surely An Bord Pleanála can't act against the Supreme Court ruling?

Yours sincerely
Wendy Mites

AN BORD PLEANALA

17 SEP 2020

LTR DATED _____ FROM _____

LDG- _____

ABP- _____