

**Chief Executive's Report**  
on the  
Public Consultation  
regarding the  
**Proposed Variation**  
to the  
**County Donegal Development Plan 2018-2024**  
**(As Varied)**  
in respect of a  
**Wind Energy Policy Framework**



**Comhairle Contae**  
**Dhún na nGall**  
Donegal County Council

**Community Development**  
**& Planning Services,**

**June, 2022**



## 1.0 Introduction/Background

On the 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2022 the Council published for consultation purposes a Proposed Variation to the Donegal County Development Plan, 2018-2024 (As Varied) ('the Plan') in respect of a Wind Energy Policy Framework. The purpose of the Proposed Variation is to address a policy lacuna in the Plan in relation to wind energy. This gap in the Plan's policy framework was created following a High Court Order made on the 5th day of November, 2018, that removed certain critical provisions of the Plan relating to Wind Energy from that adopted by a resolution of the Members in May, 2018.

This Chief Executive's Report has been prepared pursuant to Section 13(4) of the Planning and Development Act 2000(as amended). In summary the purpose of this report is to:

- List the persons or bodies who made submissions or observations during the public consultation period.
- Provide a summary of:
  - The recommendations, submissions and observations made by the Office of the Planning Regulator
  - The Submissions and observations made by any other persons.
- Summarize the issues raised and recommendations made by the Regional Assembly.
- Give the response of the Chief Executive to the issues raised and provide recommendations arising.

## 2.0 Summary of the Proposed Variation and Associated Documents.

The Proposed Variation specifically:

- Inserts a new Wind Energy Map 8.2.1 that designates areas as (a) Acceptable in Principle; (b) Open to Consideration; and (c) Not Normally Permissible.
- Inserts new policies to provide a framework for the development of windfarms at appropriately sited locations. A key policy in this regard is the policy dealing with minimum setback distances of turbines from residential properties.
- Inserts new background and contextual text updating the legislative framework and guidelines within which policy must be developed.
- Deletes outdated background and contextual text.
- Deletes outdated policies.

Following Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) screenings, the Planning Authority determined that both an Environmental Report (ER) and a Natura Impact Report (NIR) of the Proposed Variation were required. Consequently, said reports were prepared and accompanied the Proposed Variation.

The ER identifies, describes and evaluates the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the Proposed Variation. It describes the current state of

the environment, identifies relevant Environmental Protection Objectives, assesses the impact of each element of the proposed variation on a wide range of environmental criteria, describes how such impacts will be mitigated, evaluates the alternatives to the Proposed Variation and details environmental monitoring measures.

The NIR identifies and classifies the implications of the Proposed Variation on Natura 2000 Sites comprised of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas in view of the conservation objectives of the sites. The NIR includes an assessment of the potential impact of the Proposed Variation on specific Natura 2000 sites (both individually and in combination with other plans and projects) and outlines possible measures to mitigate any potential impacts. The NIR concludes beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the Proposed Variation will not adversely affect the integrity of any Natura 2000 site having regard to the mitigation measures outlined in the report.

### 3.0 Public Consultation

The public consultation period commenced on 29<sup>th</sup> April and concluded on 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 2022. The consultation strategy included:

- Sending notices and copies of the Proposed Variation, ER and NIR to the Minister and other prescribed bodies in accordance with S.13(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2000(as amended) [refer to Appendix A for list of prescribed bodies].
- Publishing Newspaper Notices in local newspapers in accordance with S.13(2) and S.13(3) of said Act stating: the reasons for the Proposed Variation; the places and times at which it could be inspected; advising that hard copies of the abovementioned documents could be issued on request; inviting written or emailed submissions or observations; and advising that said submissions or observations would be taken into consideration before the making of the Variation.
- Publishing the Proposed Variation, an Introduction/Explanation document, an interactive map, the Environmental Report and Natura Impact Report on the Council's website.
- Advertising the public consultation via: Press Release to news outlets; the Council's social media pages; and via an interview on Highland Radio.
- Eleven public drop-in events around the County (shared with pre-draft public consultation events on the County Development Plan Four-Year Review).

#### Extent of Public Participation

**Submissions:** A total of 342 submissions were received comprised of: 302 submissions from members of the public/community; 20 from the wind energy industry/representatives of; 11 from statutory agencies. The names of those that made submissions, together with the submission ref. no. allocated to each, are listed in Appendix C.

**Drop-In Event Attendance:** Attended by circa 200 people although it should be acknowledged that the Buncrana event, at which several other concurrent projects were also promoted, provided a significant proportion of those numbers.

Website Visits: 484 page visits; and 251 submissions sub-page visits.

Document Downloads: 85

## 4.0 Overview of Submissions

### 4.1 Public Submissions

The vast majority of the 302 submissions from the public express support for the Proposed Variation either in its entirety, or with regards to specific elements of the document. The most notable elements of these submissions include:

- support in 246 submissions for proposed Policy E-P-23 (Amendment Item No. 14);

Policy E-P-23: It is a policy of the Council that wind farm developments:

(1) (i.) Must not be located within:

(a.) the zone of visual influence of Glenveagh National Park;

(ii.) Must not be located within the following areas, subject to the possible exceptions set out in Policy E-P-12(1)(c)(ii):

(b) the Gweebarra River Basin;

(c) areas contained within 'Especially High Scenic Amenity' on Map 7.1.2 'Scenic Amenity';

(d) Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments; and

(e) St. John's Point.

- support in 200 submissions for the positive approach to augmentation/re-powering of 'existing' sites as contained in proposed Policy E-P-12 (Amendment Item No. 9);
- broad support in 143 submissions for proposed Map 8.2.1 (Amendment Item No. 20);
- broad support in 117 submissions for the proposed Ten Times tip height setback from residential receptors policies as contained in proposed Policies E-P-23 and E-P-24; and
- broad support in 92 submissions for the inclusion of landslide susceptibility areas in the 'Not Normally Permissible' area contained in proposed Map 8.2.1.

Another issue to receive broad support was the need to protect the County's bogs/peatlands with some 145 stating that there should be no further development in such areas.

The reasons given in support of all of the above include: the importance of the landscape for the County in terms of tourism; the fact that Donegal has already 'more

than played its part' in delivering renewable wind energy for the country; the divisive nature of such developments leading to disharmony in communities; the inherent value of bogs/peatlands in terms of biodiversity and their carbon sink qualities; the risk of siting such developments in peatlands as evidenced at Meenbog; and the risks to the preservation of traditional farm practices.

Some 27 submissions proposed that there would be no restrictions in the following areas: 'Termon' (18 submissions); 'Termon/Kilmacrennan' (8 submissions); and 'Lands in Letterkenny'. None of these submissions contained any rationale in support of the proposals. A further submission suggested that the 'Meenlecknalore' area should be considered as it was 'beside the 110kv line'.

A small number of submissions (6) expressed concerns at the Proposed Variation with the main reasons given as: the need for greater energy security in light of the geo-political situation; much of the County's land is suitable for 'marginal farming' only; the proposed ten times tip height setback policy combined with the Proposed Map 8.2.1 would render windfarm development 'impossible'. A further submission suggested that the process should be suspended until the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines were finalized.

#### 4.2 Wind Energy Sector Submissions

A total of 20 submissions were made by this sector, or agents/landowners for the sector. Five submissions were general in nature/non-site specific. The main thrust of these submissions was to set the sector in the context of national policy on climate change and wind energy and to identify where the published document diverged from such policy, inclusive of set-back policy, the mapping methodology and the absence of a calculation setting out how the County would contribute to the overall national renewable energy targets (in megawatts). Fourteen of the submissions referenced thirteen site specific cases and set out the case as to why the sites should be given a more favourable designation on Map 8.2.1.

The wind energy industry, and agents for the industry, express concern that the Proposed Variation is at variance with national policy and legislation in respect of renewable energy targets. They note that it is a goal of the government to enable Ireland, within EU and global frameworks, to achieve a transition to a low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sustainable economy. By 2020, the government aims to meet the following targets:

- ~ up to 80% renewable electricity;
- ~ 30% reduction in CO2 emissions;
- ~ 32.5% improvement in energy efficiency.

Reference is also made to:

- ~ the Minister's advice in Planning Circular letters PL 20-13: Review of Wind Energy and Renewable Energy Policies in Development Plans; and PL 5/2017: Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change and Wind Energy Development Guidelines, 2006 where it was advised that the preparation of a variation must take account of all relevant and up-to-date national policy; and

~ Section 10(2)(n) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended) wherein development plans are required to include practical objectives to mitigate against climate change and reduce reliance on fossil fuels.

The above, it is contended by the industry, implies facilitating renewable energy such as wind energy.

The industry also refers to key national policy documents – the National Planning Framework (NPF) and the National Development Plan (NDP) and note the strong policy content with respect to renewable/wind energy. The NPF, for example, acknowledges that: ‘transition to a low carbon economy from renewable sources of energy is an integral part of climate change strategy and renewable energies are a means of reducing our reliance on fossil fuels. The NDP, the industry notes, states that: ‘Action in the energy sector will be critical to the achievement of Ireland’s climate targets and the transformation to a high-renewable, net-zero emissions future’ and highlights the delivery of renewable energy as a strategic priority in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector.

The industry also urges that the Planning Authority; *‘must recognize the urgent requirement to tackle climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions to minimize future global warming and by facilitating indigenous energy generation to improve energy security and lessen the economic impact of fossil fuel price volatility’*; and that *‘one important way to do this in the short to medium term, is to accommodate the sustainable development of more onshore wind energy.’*

The conclusions of the industry might be summarized as: *‘In general, the Proposed Variation is very restrictive to new development’* and that: *‘The approach ... seems to miss the primary requirement of the County wind energy policy at this stage, which should be to facilitate the responsible and sustainable expansion of wind across County Donegal in order to capitalize on Donegal’s competitive advantage for wind power.’*

#### 4.3 Statutory Bodies Submissions

Eleven statutory bodies made submissions. The Department of the Environment, Climate Action and Communications; the OPR; and the NWRA all emphasized the national policy agenda in terms of climate change and the absence of any calculations regarding the contribution the county would make to overall national renewable energy targets. All three also referenced the proposed mandatory ten times setback distance as being contrary to national guidelines. The Environmental Protection Agency’s submission was a generic document that identifies the range of environmental issues that any/all plans should consider. The submissions of the OPW; TII; the Department of Education; and the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine all made specific comments relevant to their respective portfolios. Finally, two submissions were received from N. Ireland agencies. The Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs; and Derry City & Strabane District Council submissions were broadly supportive of the approach to transboundary environmental issues taken in the project.

## 5.0 Key Themes

### 5.1 Set-Back Distances

This specific issue was addressed in a large number of the submissions received.

**Members of the Public:** Some 117 members of the public specifically referred to the issue with 111 supporting the ten times tip height set-back policy contained in the Proposed Variation, whilst 6 were broadly opposed.

**Wind Energy Industry (or Representatives Of):** All 20 express strong opposition to the proposed set-back policy. The main reasons given are that such a policy is contrary to national guidelines, particularly the 2006 Guidelines and the 2017 Interim Guidelines; and that such a policy when combined with the Proposed Map 8.2.1 will, in reality, effectively close down new wind energy development in the County.

**Office of the Planning Regulator and the Dept. of the Environment, Climate Action and Communications:** The OPR firstly notes that: the Proposed Variation 'places significant emphasis on the Section 28 *'Draft Revised Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2019)'*'; that (they) 'hold no statutory status'; and that compliance with the Special Planning Policy Requirements (contained therein) have been incorrectly applied. The OPR goes on to state that the relevant Guidelines to be considered are the *'Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2006)'*; and the *'Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change (2017)'*. (I address this matter in the section headed: *'Chief Executive's Response'* below).

In this context, the OPR advises that the setback distances as contained in the Proposed Variation has 'no basis in any statutory guidelines and *'is inconsistent with the Wind Energy Development Guidelines (2006)'* and at Recommendation 1 (ii.) 'recommends' that **'the Planning Authority is required to'**:

**'demonstrate that the Plan is consistent with the delivery of part (i), including through the omission of the setback standard for wind energy development under Policy E-P-23 and Policy E-P-24 of the proposed Variation and ensure that any provision for mandatory setback are consistent with the Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2006).'**

(nb. earlier in its submission the OPR clarifies that: *'Recommendations issued by the Office relate to clear breaches of the relevant legislative provisions, of the national or regional policy framework and/or of the policy of Government, as set out in the Ministerial guidelines under section 28. As such, the planning authority is required to implement or address recommendation(s) made by the Office in order to ensure consistency with the relevant policy and legislative provisions.'*)

**Northern and Western Regional Assembly (NWRA):** Makes similar observations as those of the OPR in relation to the application of Guidelines. In addition, the NWRA notes that: *'Notwithstanding the potentially excessive setback distance of 10 times the turbine tip height, it is considered that the revised Wind Energy Policy Variation is not*

*inconsistent with the RSES per se, but it will limit the opportunity for Donegal to realise its potential to deliver renewable energy through wind energy sources. The implication of the proposed policy has not been clearly set out in the Variation and suitable justification needs to be provided if it is to be supported – different setback scenarios could have been provided.'*

The NWRA concludes in relation to this issue with the following 'observation':

*'Review the policy setback of ten times the tip height as the inclusion on such mandatory separation distances between wind turbines and the curtilage of residential dwellings would restrict in principle the potential for windfarm development in the County, the bona-fides of which could otherwise be considered at application stage.'*

### **Chief Executive's Response**

With regards to the comments of both the OPR and the NWRA in respect of the application of Guidelines, I would refer firstly to the relevant section of the Director of Service's report to the Plenary Council meeting of November, 2021 (inserted below for ease of reference), at which meeting the setback distance issue was considered and Members resolved to proceed with policy requiring ten times tip height setback:

## 2.0 Setback Distances

Guidelines Requirements: The 2006 Guidelines, whilst advising that ‘noise was unlikely to be a significant problem where the distance from the nearest turbine to any noise sensitive property is more than 500m’, did not specify minimum or maximum separation distances. A key aspect of the Preferred Draft Approach, 2017 was to identify a preferred visual amenity setback of 4 times the turbine height between a wind turbine and the nearest residential property, subject to a mandatory minimum distance of 500 metres. The Interim Guidelines, 2017 do not contain any specific requirements in relation to setback. The Draft Guidelines, 2019 include an SPPR (SPPR2) stipulating that:

*‘With the exception of applications where reduced setback requirements have been agreed with relevant owner(s) ... planning authorities and An Bord Pleanala shall ... ensure that a setback distance for visual amenity purposes of 4 times the tip height of the relevant wind turbine shall apply between each wind turbine and the nearest point of curtilage of any residential property in the vicinity of the proposed development, subject to a mandatory setback of 500 metres from that residential property.’*

The SPPR goes on to further stipulate that:

*‘The planning authority or An Bord Pleanala (where relevant), shall not apply a setback distance that exceeds these requirements for visual amenity purposes.’*

**Comment: On the basis that a setback distance of 4 times tip height or 500m (whichever is the greater) for visual amenity purposes is specified in the Preferred Draft Approach, 2017 and the Draft Guidelines, 2019, and that there is no indication that the setback provision will change in the finalized Wind Energy Guidelines, the submitted Proposed Variation includes the 4 times setback for visual amenity purposes as proposed policy nb. greater setback distances may still be required for technical reasons such as noise.**

As can be seen from the extract above, all four draft and finalised Guidelines were referenced in the report, and the rationale for recommending the four times tip height setback was clearly set out in the ‘Comment’ subsection (although Members resolved to proceed with the ten times tip height policy in the Proposed Variation).

I consider that the recommendation was reasonable, particularly given the time that has elapsed since the 2006 Guidelines were published and that more recent national documents (albeit in Draft form) indicate a move at the national policy level towards a four times tip height approach. Notwithstanding, and whilst those members of the public that made submissions are clearly generally/overwhelmingly in support of the ten times tip height policies, as is the strong majority of Members of the Council, the clear direction of the OPR must be recognized and adhered to. This requires the omission of any setback distance policies. It would be in order to insert a broader policy that flags the key issues to be considered by the Planning Authority in the assessment of planning applications. The recommended replacement policy is as follows:

**Policy ???:** It is a policy of the Council to ensure that the assessment of wind energy development proposals will have regard to the following:

- sensitivities of the county’s landscapes;
- visual impact on protected views, prospects, designated landscapes, as well as local visual impacts;
- impacts on nature conservation designations, archaeological areas, county geological sites, historic structures, public rights of way and walking routes;
- local environmental impacts, including those on residential properties, such as noise and shadow flicker;
- visual and environmental impacts of associated development, such as access roads, plant and grid connections from the proposed wind farm to the electricity transmission network;
- scale, size and layout of the project and any cumulative effects due to other projects;
- the impact of the proposed development on protected bird and mammal species.

The above-noted approach is reflected in **Recommendation 1** in Section 11 below.

## [5.2 Map 8.2.1](#)

**Members of the Public:** Some 142 members of the public expressed broad support for the proposed Map. 223 submissions supported the mapping (and policy approach) as contained in proposed Amendment Item No. 14 (Policy E-P-23) to generally exclude the principle of windfarm development in the EHSA areas; Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments; St. John’s Point; and the Gweebarra River Basin. 92 of the submissions supported how landslide susceptibility was incorporated into the mapping. Some 27 submissions proposed that there would be no restrictions in the following areas: ‘Termon’ (18 submissions); ‘Termon/Kilmacrennan’ (8 submissions); and ‘Lands in Letterkenny’. None of these submissions contained any rationale in support of the proposals. A further submission suggested that the ‘Meenlecknalore’ area should be considered as it was ‘beside the 110kv line’.

**Wind Energy Industry (or Representatives Of):** The industry expresses strong concerns regarding Map 8.2.1. It places these concerns in the context of national climate change policy and the drive towards greater amounts of renewable energy and that, combined with the proposed setback policy, the County will be unable to make any meaningful contribution to national renewable energy targets going forward. A number of specific issues are also raised in relation to how the following issues were incorporated/not incorporated into the map-making process: the absence of windspeed information and landscape sensitivity mapping; the absence of any consideration for recently-expired permissions; projects being prepared for application, and the potential expansion of existing windfarms; freshwater pearl mussel catchments; landslide susceptibility; Natura

2000 sites; the fact that much of the ‘Open to Consideration’ areas are ‘disbursed’ around the county and are of a size that renders them unusable for windfarm purposes; and the proposed 500m buffer around settlements.

**Office of the Planning Regulator:** The substantive comments refer to the sieve mapping analysis, particularly the additional considerations of the Members at the November 2021 Plenary Council meeting. The OPR specifically cites the following additional considerations in this regard:

- i) the “Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns”; and
- ii.) “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas.

Having regard to NPF National Planning Policy 55, which promotes the generation of renewable energy, National Strategic Outcome 8 ‘Transition to Sustainable Energy’, and the Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ (2006) which requires the implementation of a plan-led approach to identify suitable or unsuitable area for wind energy development through a systematic, evidence-based approach referred to as ‘sieve mapping analysis’, the OPR at Recommendation 2 ‘recommends’ that **the Planning Authority is required to**:

- i. **remove the “Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns”;**  
**and**
- ii. **remove all “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas.**

**Northern and Western Regional Assembly (NWRA):** In the narrative of its submission, the NWRA makes five comments in relation to Map 8.2.1 and the methodology followed. These observations, and their import, are not readily summarized and thus they are reproduced in full below. The NWRA does not make any formal observations in relation to these matters.

It is noted that the proposed variation has reduced the overall area within which the Plan policy will generally permit in-principle wind energy projects, however there are a number of critical factors which limit scope to retain the parameters which were set down in previous development plans. The proposed variation designates the County into 3 categories for the purposes of Wind Energy designation, these are (i) Acceptable in Principle (ii) Open to Consideration and (iii) Not Normally permissible. This categorisation follows the guidance set out in 3.6 of the Draft Revised Wind Energy Development Guidelines (December 2019).

The proposed revision to the Wind Energy Policy Framework, (which includes certain additional considerations restraining areas from favourable consideration, which were not previously contained in the Plan) has the ultimate effect of omitting significant areas of the County for future wind energy projects.

A number of specifically identified locations in the County are referenced in No.14 of the Variation as being inappropriate for wind energy developments, including Visual Zone of Glenveagh National Park, St. Johns Point, the Gweebarra River Basin & Fresh Water Pearl Mussel catchments. The areas in question are either of High Scenic or Strategic Landscape value, as well as habitats of National importance, and the Assembly does not have issue with their exclusion.

RSES Regional Policy Objectives (RPOs 4.16 – 4.22) aim to position the Region as a Low Carbon location over the next decade, and part of the mix of measures is additional onshore and offshore wind energy projects. The RSES additionally seeks to manage and conserve the Region’s distinctive landscapes and seascapes, and its habitats (Natura 2000 sites) - see RPO 5.2 & RPO 5.4. This variation can certainly be considered to achieve the goals of the latter objectives (management and conservation of landscapes).

The Assembly recognise the extent of EHSA (Especially High Scenic Amenity) designation within the current CDP, which accounts for approximately 23% of Donegal’s total landmass. Allied to Environmental designations relating to Freshwater Pearl Mussel, and other Natura 2000 Habitats, including blanket bog, the Zone of Glenveagh National Park and sensitivities around the coastline (including WAW), the ultimate scope for designating areas ‘Open to Consideration’ is significantly constrained.

**Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications:** Questions the manner in which the Geological Survey of Ireland’s (GSI) landslide susceptibility mapping was used in the formulation of proposed Map 8.2.1, and also that the Proposed Variation and Introduction document were open to misinterpretation by the public as to the influence of the GSI executive on the map production.

### **Chief Executive’s Response**

Having regard to the range of map-related issues raised in the submissions, I address each one individually in the table below.

Issue	Response
Broad public support for Map 8.2.1 as published.	<p>In the original draft Proposed Variation considered by Members at the November, 2021 Council meeting, the submitted less restrictive Map 8.2.1 than that ultimately agreed for publication by resolution of the Elected Members, together with the recommended four times mandatory setback distance sought to strike a reasonable balance between the national policy agenda and the expressed environmental sensitivities and concerns of the local population and Members.</p> <p>The specific areas of concern with respect to the mapping are addressed in the rows below.</p>
Concerns of the OPR, NWRA and Department and the windfarm industry re the national climate change policy agenda, and the low potential of the County to contribute towards meeting national renewable energy targets would be constrained by Map 8.2.1 in tandem with other elements of the policy framework.	
Concerns of some of the windfarm industry re the absence of <b>wind speed analysis</b> in the production of Map 8.2.1	<p>The use of wind speed mapping was considered during the preparation of the Proposed Variation but ultimately not used. During consultation and research on the project it emerged that advances in wind energy technology (including, for example, larger, higher, and more efficient turbines) are such that areas with the highest wind speed are not necessarily those most suitable for wind energy development. For this reason it was concluded that trying to incorporate such data would be of little benefit and, indeed, potentially misleading.</p>
Concerns of some of the windfarm industry re the absence of <b>landscape sensitivity mapping</b> in the production of Map 8.2.1	<p>Chapter 7 of the CDP contains objectives and policies relating to landscape amenity including Map 7.1.1 showing three scenic amenity designations (Especially High Scenic Amenity, High Scenic Amenity and Moderate Scenic Amenity). This evidence was fully incorporated into the map preparation process. The Landscape Character Assessment and Seascape Character Assessments, 2016 are neither a policy document in themselves nor part of any objectives and policies of the CDP. Rather, they are an analysis, characterisation and narrative of the component parts of Donegal's landscape and seascape only.</p>
Concerns of some of the windfarm industry re the incorporation of all <b>Natura 2000</b> sites into the 'Not Normally Permissible Area'.	<p>Natura 2000 sites comprise both Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) that are offered protection through the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), the EU Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and national legislation. Within County Donegal there are 47 SACs and 26 SPAs and within the zone of influence of the</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>proposed Variation there are a further 41 SACs and 12 SPAs.</p> <p>Through the EU Habitats Directive, Natura 2000 sites are given the highest level of strict protection. Having regard to the scale and nature of windfarm developments, and to the aforementioned legal EU legal imperative of ensuring protection of Natura sites and their conservation interests/objectives, the precautionary approach taken is considered reasonable in this instance. It is in this regard that all Natura 2000 sites are included within areas designated as 'Not Normally Permissible' on Map 8.2.1.</p>
<p>Concerns of some of the windfarm industry re the incorporation of all '<b>Especially High Scenic Amenity</b>' areas into the 'Not Normally Permissible Area'.</p>	<p>Especially High Scenic Amenity Areas (EHSAs) are described in the County Donegal Development Plan 2018-2024 as "sublime natural landscapes of the highest quality that are synonymous with the identity of County Donegal", and the extent of these areas is shown on Map 7.1.1, Scenic amenity. These areas have extremely limited capacity for development and this approach is supported in Objective NH-O-7 and Policy NH-P-6 of the CDP.</p> <p>Having regard to the scale and nature of windfarm developments, it is considered very unlikely that windfarm development could be accommodated in EHSAs without detrimental effect. In this regard it is considered necessary to include EHSAs within Not Normally Permissible areas as delineated in Map 8.2.1.</p>
<p>Contrasting opinion of the public on the one hand, and the industry and OPR on the other hand, re the appropriateness of the incorporation <b>of landslide susceptibility data</b> into the formulation of Map 8.2.1. Moderately High and Moderately Low Landslide susceptibility areas being included in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation in Map 8.2.1.</p>	<p>In the original draft Proposed Variation submitted to Members at the November, 2021 Council meeting, only the 'High Landslide' susceptibility areas were included in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation, whilst and the 'Moderately High' and 'Moderately Low' areas were included in the 'Open to Consideration' designation. Subsequently, the Elected Members decided by resolution to incorporate the 'Moderately High' and 'Moderately Low' areas into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation. Members also added the 'Lifford - Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns' to the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation.</p> <p>On the basis of submissions received, the public would appear to broadly support the approach taken</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>by the Members, whilst the windfarm industry has concerns regarding the incorporation of any landslide susceptibility data into the formulation of Map 8.2.1.</p> <p>The sector suggests that, in relation to landslide susceptibility, consideration of potential wind energy developments would be better considered in detail on a case by case basis rather than applying a blanket designation of lands identified as having ‘Moderately High’ and ‘Moderately Low’ landslide susceptibility. They suggest that removal of these designations would result in focused, detailed and development-specific assessments, inclusive of site-specific geotechnical peat stability assessments, and that this is considered a more accurate way to avoid development within areas of slippage.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, on the basis of consultations with environmental agencies during preparatory work on the project, and having regard also to the submissions of statutory bodies on foot of the public consultation I consider the original approach of the Executive ie. the placing of the ‘High Landslide Susceptibility’ in the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation, and the ‘Moderately High’ and ‘Moderately Low’ areas and the ‘Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns’ in the ‘Open to Consideration’ designation to be reasonable and balanced.</p> <p>Finally, it must be noted that the OPR has issued a clear direction in respect of this issue. <b>Thus at OPR Recommendation 2 it requires the removal of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <b>‘the Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns’; and</b></li> <li>ii) <b>all “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas from the area defined as ‘Not Normally Permissible’.</b></li> </ul> <p>This approach is consistent with that of the Executive when submitting the original draft</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>Proposed Variation and this is reflected in <b>Recommendation 2.a.i)</b> in Section 11 below.</p>
<p>Contrasting opinion of the public on the one hand, and the industry on the other hand, re the appropriateness of the incorporation of <b>Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments (FWPMC's)</b> into the 'Not Normally Permissible' (NNP) designation in Map 8.2.1.</p>	<p>In the original draft Proposed Variation considered by Members at the November, 2021 Council meeting, the FWPMC's were included in the 'Open to Consideration' (OtC) area on the basis that the size and extent of these areas was such that it would be unreasonable to determine that the principle of windfarm development should be precluded but that the potential for impacts on this resource should be flagged for potential developers, authorities and all other interested parties by inclusion in the 'Open to Consideration' designation. Thus detailed project level assessments could inform decisions on a case-by-case basis. This conclusion was informed by consultation with environmental agencies during preparatory work on the project.</p> <p>Subsequently, the Elected Members decided by resolution to incorporate the FWPMC areas into the 'NNP' designation.</p> <p>Those members of the public that made submissions on this issue are clearly generally in support of the published Map 8.2.1, as is the strong majority of Members of the Council,</p> <p>Some industry submissions request the removal of the FWPMC's from the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation, suggesting that each proposal for wind energy development be assessed on it's merits at a detailed and development-specific scale. One submission refers to the fact that by virtue of the FWPMC's catchments being in NNP areas that windfarm developments are being unnecessary restricted, suggesting this is not the case for other large-scale developments within these same FWPM catchments within existing policies of the CDP.</p> <p>On the basis of consultations with environmental agencies during preparatory work on the project, and having regard also to the submissions of statutory bodies on foot of the public consultation I consider the placing of these areas in the 'Open to</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>Consideration’ designation, consistent with that of the Executive when submitting the original draft Proposed Variation, to be a more reasonable approach and this is reflected in <b>Recommendation 2.b. and 3</b> in Section 11 below.</p>
<p>The fact that much of the ‘Open to Consideration’ areas are ‘disbursed around the county and are of a size that renders them unusable for windfarm purposes;</p>	<p>The ‘Open to Consideration’ areas in the published Proposed Variation are significantly more fragmented than those as contained in the recommended mapping submitted by the Executive to the November, 2021 Plenary Council meeting.</p> <p>Compliance with the requirements of the OPR in relation to removing the “Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns”; and removing all “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas from the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation (and moving them to ‘Open to Consideration’), together with moving the FWPMC’s from NNP to OtC would significantly improve this scenario.</p>
<p>Contrasting opinion of the public on the one hand, and two industry representatives on the other hand, re the appropriateness of the incorporation of the <b>Gweebarra River Valley</b> into the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation in Map 8.2.1.</p>	<p>In the original draft Proposed Variation considered by Members at the November, 2021 Council meeting, the Gweebarra River Valley was included in the ‘Open to Consideration’ area on the basis that that broad area was designated as ‘Moderate Scenic Amenity’ in Map 7.1.1: ‘Scenic Amenity’ (ie. the least valuable of three landscape designations in the County) and that the sieve mapping analysis did not evidence any other major considerations pertaining to this area. Subsequently, the Elected Members decided by resolution to incorporate the ‘Gweebarra River Valley’ into the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation.</p> <p>I note that those members of the public that made submissions are clearly generally in support of the published Map 8.2.1, as is the strong majority of Members of the Council. The reasons given by the public for supporting the published map include:</p> <p>All of the public submissions, bar the Gweebarra Conservation Group, simply state support for inclusion of the Gweebarra River in areas ‘Not Normally permissible’ but give no rationale.</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>The Gweebarra Conservation Group state that the river is a Natura 2000 site with its source in Glenveigh National Park, and that the entire valley and wilderness must be preserved for environmental and tourism reasons.</p> <p>The two industry submissions (ref WEPF 313 and 324) make the following observations in support of the area being placed back into ‘Open to Consideration’. They state that it is ambiguous why sensitive and visually vulnerable parts of the County, including the Gweebarra Estuary and coastline are within areas Open to Consideration, whilst the site of the Gweebarra River is proposed to be within areas designated as ‘Not Normally Permissible’.</p> <p>They also suggest there is no scientific basis for this proposed policy, and that excluding this area from consideration for wind energy development should only take place where there is a supporting statement and scientific basis from an appropriate expert.</p> <p>I consider the placing of this area in the ‘Open to Consideration’ designation, consistent with that of the Executive when submitting the original draft Proposed Variation, and consistent with the established policy of the Council in relation to scenic amenity designation, to be a more reasonable approach and this is reflected in <b>Recommendation 2c. and 3</b> in Section 11 below.</p>
<p>Strong support in submissions from the public for the St. John’s Point headland being included in the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation</p>	<p>Having regard to: the relative narrowness of the headland; the scattered rural settlement pattern; the existence of a Special Area of Conservation around the coastline of the headland and at its southern end and the designation of this same area as Especially High Scenic Amenity; and the outcome of the public consultation exercise, it is considered reasonable to retain the designation of this area as ‘Not Normally Permissible’.</p> <p>This is reflected in <b>Recommendation 3</b> in Section 11 below.</p>

### 5.3 Treatment of Existing and Permitted Windfarms

In various submissions (refs 317, 318, 336, 337 and 338), agents acting on behalf of the industry question why existing windfarms or sites with permission previously designated as 'Acceptable for Augmentation' are proposed to be now designated as 'Not Normally Permissible' and express deep concern that this may have 'potentially profound and harmful effects' on existing windfarms. It is submitted that existing windfarm sites should be given a designation that 'reflects their planning/developed status and should be designated as 'Acceptable in Principle'.

One submission also challenges the approach to repowering contained in proposed Policy E-P-12(2)(c)(ii) of the Proposed Variation, wherein for 'Not Normally Permissible' areas it provides that: '*The augmentation, upgrade and improvements of: existing windfarms; windfarm developments under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed, or on sites with an extant planning permission will be open to consideration where such proposals shall be generally confined to the planning unit of the existing development.*' The submission goes on to consider that: 'extensive lands adjoining such windfarms should also be designated as 'Open for Consideration' in the interests of properly optimizing the renewal potential of such sites and the county' or delete; or that' any reference to augmentation/repowering should delete any reference to the planning unit of the existing development.

#### **Chief Executive's Response**

The agents' proposition in respect of the mapping of such sites is generally agreed. Indeed, the Proposed Variation already contains support for this approach in Amendment Item No. 9, proposed Policy E-P-12(1)(c)(ii) wherein, in 'Not Normally Permissible' area, it would be the policy of the Council that the principle of the following would be open to consideration: augmentation, upgrade and improvements of existing windfarms; windfarms under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed, or on sites with an extant planning permission.

Turning to the agent's points regarding the restriction in the said policy to the consideration of proposals being '*generally confined to the planning unit of the existing development*', this matter has been reviewed by the Planning section. On foot of this review, and in the context of the national renewable energy policy direction as referred to above, and to the fact that detailed environmental studies will have already been carried out for the original permissions, it is considered that the policy could be adjusted to some degree. I do not agree with the suggestion that 'extensive lands adjoining such windfarms' should also be designated as 'Open for Consideration'. Rather, a more balanced approach would be as set out in the suggested amended policy below (proposed additional text in red):

- (c) Not Normally Permissible
- (i) Windfarm development proposals on previously undeveloped sites, inclusive of sites with a lapsed un-implemented permission (and where substantive works have not been undertaken) will not normally be permissible.
  - (ii) The augmentation, upgrade and improvements of: existing windfarms; windfarm developments under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed, or on sites with an extant planning permission will be open to consideration where such proposals shall be generally confined to the planning unit of the existing development, **or where a modestly-proportioned projection (relative to the established unit) beyond the established footprint can be demonstrated to be essential and unavoidable for the augmentation project in terms of operational efficiencies, and can demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that all environmental issues can be adequately mitigated.**

These conclusions are reflected in **Recommendation 4** in Section 11 below.

## 6.0 Other Project-Specific Industry Proposals for Re-designation

A number of industry submissions request the re-designation of proposed project sites where these sites do not have a live planning permission and/or no planning history. These requests are addressed in the table below.

### 6.1 Previous Planning History But Now Expired

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
321/ Upper Illies/ 2 turbines @ 126m tip height/ PP 14/51149 expired Nov. 2019	Executive Recommended Map: Open to Consideration Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'. Reason for Change: Incorporation of 'Moderately High' and 'Moderately Low' Landslide Susceptibility into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation.	Whilst planning permission expired in November, 2019, substantial works have been completed on-site and various environmental studies were submitted with the planning application. Whilst there is a marginal area of High Landslide Susceptibility adjacent the site, having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the national climate change policy agenda;</li> <li>2) previous, but now expired, planning permission for 8 turbines (ref. 07/50478);</li> <li>3) the absence of any submitted objections to this particular proposal;</li> </ul> <p><b>It is recommended that this site is incorporated into the 'Open to Consideration' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b></p>
339/ Garrymore, Milford/ 8 turbines PP 07/50478 expired Dec. 2017.	Executive Recommended Map: 'Open to Consideration' Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'. Reason for Change: Incorporation of 'Moderately High' and 'Moderately Low' Landslide Susceptibility into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation.	Proposal for two turbines. It is noted that one turbine would be located in an area of 'High Landslide Susceptibility' and the other in an area of 'Moderately High Landslide Susceptibility, and that both turbines would be located at the edge of an EHSA area.  However, having regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the national climate change policy agenda;</li> </ul>

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
		<p>2) previous, but now expired, planning permission for 8 turbines (ref. 07/50478);</p> <p>3) the absence of any submitted objections to this particular proposal; and</p> <p>4) to live planning permissions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ access track to neighbouring Glenalla turbine (PP ref 18/51455);</li> <li>~ grid connection (PP ref 17/51115); and</li> <li>~ borrow pit (ref. 17/51509) it is considered that the reasonable way to proceed is to designate as 'Open to Consideration'</li> </ul> <p><b>It is recommended that this site is incorporated into the 'Open to Consideration' designation in Map 8.2.1</b></p>

### 6.3 No Previous Planning History/Projects Being Prepared For Planning Application

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
306 and 305/ Altnapaste, Ballybofey	Executive Recommended Map: 'Not Normally Permissible' on basis of the prevalent 'Especially High Scenic Amenity' and 'High Landslide Susceptibility'. Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'.	Having regard to the absence of any planning history on the site, and to the prevalence of the 'Especially High Scenic Amenity' and 'High Landslide Susceptibility' data layers in this area, the consistent application of the policy approach that places these areas into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation would not allow for the re-designation of this area.  <b>Therefore, it is recommended that this site is retained in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b>
313 and 324/ Cloghercor	(please refer to the assessment of the Gweebarra River Valley issue at Section 5.2 above)	
316/Mulmosog and Altnagapple, Ardara	Executive Recommended Map: Largely 'Open to Consideration' notwithstanding that there was a small area of High Landslide Susceptibility. Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'. Reason for Change: Incorporation of 'Moderately High Landslide Susceptibility', 'Moderately Low Landslide Susceptibility' and ' Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation.	The observation of the Agent that the subject site is ' <i>surrounded by various windfarms developed in the wider region in recent years such as Corkermore and Killin Hill windfarms</i> ' is noted. Also noted is the decision by DCC to grant planning permission for 13 turbines for the subject area, which decision was overturned on appeal by An Bord Pleanala (ref. 09/30327) with the reasons for refusal including the Board being 'not satisfied' on the basis of the information submitted with the application that the site would not be at risk of land slippage.  Having regard to:

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
		<p>1) the national climate change policy agenda; 2) the planning history of the site, which history does not include a definitive refusal; and 3) the absence of any submitted objections to this particular proposal;</p> <p><b>It is recommended that this site is incorporated into the 'Open to Consideration' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b></p>
320/Owenerk, Lifford/		<p>Having regard to the absence of any mapping submitted with the submission, and to the identified Especially High Scenic Amenity area pertaining to the site (as referenced by the agent):</p> <p><b>It is recommended that Map 8.2.1 is unchanged.</b></p>
322/Clare, Redcastle/2 turbines	Executive Recommended Map: Largely 'Not Normally Permissible' due to the site falling within a 'High Landslide Susceptibility' area. Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'.	<p>Having regard to the absence of any planning history on the site, and to the prevalence of the 'High Landslide Susceptibility' data layers in this area, the consistent application of the policy approach that places these areas into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation would not allow for the re-designation of this area.</p> <p><b>Therefore, it is recommended that this site is retained in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b></p>

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
325/Meenagolan, Meenreagh, Lismullyduff, Cronalaghy, Corlea, Corradooey, Ballyarren, and Owennagadragh Mountain/Cornashesk	(please refer to the assessment of the landslide susceptibility issue at Section 5.2 above)	
336/Drumskellan/Crockanure (proposal to incorporate these lands and the site of PP 11/70191)	Executive Recommended Map: Part 'Not Normally Permissible' due to the site falling within a 'High Landslide Susceptibility' area, and part 'Open to Consideration'. Published Proposed Variation Map: 'As above'.	<p>Whilst the incursion of part of this site into High Landslide Susceptibility area is noted, the positive planning history of the immediately adjoining site Re 11/70101 (extant planning permission for 14 turbines until 2023, inclusive of an Environmental Impact Assessment) must also be considered.</p> <p>Having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the national climate change policy agenda;</li> <li>2) the positive planning history of the immediately adjoining site, which history includes a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment; and</li> <li>3) the absence of any submitted objections to this particular proposal;</li> </ol> <p><b>It is recommended that this site is incorporated into the 'Open to Consideration' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b></p>
337 Carrowglen (proposal to incorporate both these lands and the site of PP18/51230)	Executive Recommended Map: Part 'Not Normally Permissible' due to the site falling within	Whilst the incursion of part of this site into High Landslide Susceptibility area is noted, the positive planning history of the immediately

Subm. Ref/ Site Location/ Project Scale	Map 8.2.1 Designation 'History'	Comment & Recommendation
	<p>a 'High Landslide Susceptibility' area and part 'Open to Consideration'.</p> <p>Published Proposed Variation Map: 'Not Normally Permissible'.</p> <p>Reason for Change: Incorporation of 'Moderately High Landslide Susceptibility' and 'Moderately Low Landslide Susceptibility' into the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation.</p>	<p>adjoining site Ref 18/51230 (extant planning permission on appeal for 6 turbines until 2031, inclusive of an Environmental Impact Assessment) must also be considered.</p> <p>Having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the national climate change policy agenda;</li> <li>2) the positive planning history of the immediately adjoining site, which history includes a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment; and</li> <li>3) the absence of any submitted objections to this particular proposal;</li> </ol> <p><b>It is recommended that this site is incorporated into the 'Open to Consideration' designation in Map 8.2.1.</b></p>

## 7.0 Indication of Contribution to Meeting National Renewable Energy Targets

The OPR, Dept. of the Environment, Climate Action and Communications, the NWRA, and the windfarm industry submission all note that Special Planning Policy Requirement (2) of the Interim Guidelines [ie. requiring planning authorities to ie. '*Indicate how the implementation of the relevant development plan or local area plan over its effective period will contribute to realising overall national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation, and in particular wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource (in megawatts)*'] has not been complied with.

### Chief Executive's Response

The reasons for not undertaking such an exercise were set out in the draft revised Section 28 Statement contained in Amendment No, 3 of the Proposed Variation (inserted below for ease of reference):

In the absence of detailed technical guidance, it is not possible to make such calculations with any degree of accuracy for a number of reasons as set out below. The information contained in the reasons also serves to provide a broad overview of the wind energy potential of the County. For a significant part of the County, the development of windfarms is not precluded (refer to the 'Acceptable in Principle' and 'Open to Consideration' designated areas on Map 8.2.1. That said, applying a tip height of 150m, a significant proportion of this area would, in theory, be constrained by the presence of residential receptors in these areas and the need to achieve 10 times tip height distance from them for visual amenity, and noise and shadow flicker purposes in accordance with setback policy. It should also be noted, however, that policy allows for derogation from these minimum setback requirements where written consent of owners is provided. As of 2020 there were 301 operational turbines in Donegal and it is not possible to project how many of these will be replaced and what the generating capacity of any such replacement turbines might be. Of note finally is that Planning staff met the Sustainable Energy Authority Ireland (SEAI) regarding this matter and were advised that the developing technology of wind energy production also makes calculating potential output difficult.

Whilst I consider that the reasons given for not undertaking such an analysis were reasonable, in further engagement with the OPR it was clarified that this requirement must be adhered to. On foot of the said discussions with the OPR, the Council's Executive has now undertaken these calculations for two scenarios.

The methodology and results are set out in Appendix B and the outcome may be summarized as follows.

Scenario 1: For the published Proposed Variation, the calculation provides an estimated output of 526 M'watts.

Scenario 2: For a Variation that would be consistent with the recommendations contained at the end of this report, which version would provide for (a.) compliance with the OPR's recommendation in respect of the removal of 'Moderately High' and

‘Moderately Low Landslide Susceptibility’ Areas; and ‘Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns’ from ‘Not Normally Permissible’ area to ‘Open to Consideration in Map 8.2.1; and b.) the removal of the Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchment Areas’ from ‘Not Normally Permissible’ to ‘Open to Consideration’ area. the calculation provides an estimated output of 1,053 M’watts.

Members are advised that at Recommendation 1(i) the OPR ‘recommends’ that **‘the Planning Authority is required to’**:

***‘indicate, based on relevant and meaningful metrics, how the Plan will contribute to meeting national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation and, in particular, wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource (in megawatts) in the county as required by item (2) of the of the SPPR in the Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change (2017);’***

This is reflected in Recommendation 6 in Section 11.

## 8.0 Miscellaneous Concerns of Windfarm Industry/Agents of; and Statutory Bodies

### 8.1 Statutory Bodies

Issue	Response
<p>TII (Subm ref 17) state their concerns regarding grid connection routes generally favouring national road network corridors, and potential detrimental impact on said corridors with regard to road safety and road maintenance.</p> <p>Whilst they state that the preferred option of utilising National routes for grid connection purposes is not contrary to National policy, TII recommends that grid connection proposals should be developed which safeguard the strategic function of the national road network by utilising available alternatives in the first instance.</p> <p>This submission goes onto suggests the inclusion of an objective to address this matter.</p>	<p>There is a need to ensure the strategic carrying capacity and safety of the county’s National road network. This must be balanced against both the national policy drive towards increasing the delivery of national renewable energy resource and the environmental sensitivities of the County. The policy recommended below seeks to strike the appropriate balance in this regard and this is reflected in <b>Recommendation 7 in Section 11 below.</b></p> <p><i>Policy E-P-???</i></p> <p>It is a policy of the Council to require that proposals for grid connections shall be considered along the national road network only after other potential alternative routes have been reasonably</p>

Issue	Response
	eliminated for reasons of environmental sensitivities.
<p>(OPW submission ref 35 relates specifically to the risk of flooding arising from wind energy developments, and to compliance with The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009). Which the OPW state has not been addressed.</p> <p>Irish Water (subm ref 311) concerns relate to the potential impact of wind energy developments on the contributing catchments of water sources and maintaining security of supply. Irish Water recommend reference be made within the proposed Variation to the need to protect drinking water sources.</p>	<p>Whilst the CDP already includes policies elsewhere in the document aimed at both protecting water catchments and at ensuring that flood risk is fully integrated into planning decisions, it is agreed that the inclusion of such provisions specifically with reference to wind energy would be of benefit to all stakeholders.</p> <p>It is proposed to address this by means of inclusion of provisions in a new criteria-based policy:</p> <p><b>Policy ???:</b> It is a policy of the Council to ensure that the assessment of wind energy development proposals will have regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sensitivities of the county’s landscapes;</li> <li>• visual impact on protected views, prospects, designated landscapes, as well as local visual impacts;</li> <li>• impacts on nature conservation designations, archaeological areas, county geological sites, historic structures, public rights of way and walking routes;</li> <li>• local environmental impacts, including those on residential properties, such as noise and shadow flicker;</li> <li>• visual and environmental impacts of associated development, such as access roads, plant and grid connections from the proposed wind farm to the electricity transmission network;</li> </ul>

Issue	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• scale, size and layout of the project and any cumulative effects due to other projects;</li> <li>• the impact of the proposed development on protected bird and mammal species;</li> <li>• The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009); and</li> <li>• The protection of drinking water sources.</li> </ul> <p>This is reflected in <b>Recommendation 1</b> in Section 11.</p>

## 8.2 Windfarm Industry/Agents

Issue	Response
Industry not consulted	The submissions of the industry in this respect are noted. However, in preparing the Proposed Variation, the Planning Authority has complied fully with statutory consultation requirements as set out in Section 13 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and in so doing, has consulted with statutory bodies including relevant Government Departments, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland (SEAI), thus ensuring that a broad range of expertise was considered during policy formulation.
Review E-P-12(2)(c) c) Disturbance displacement To avoid potential permanent disturbance displacement impacts on Special Conservation Interest bird species, Donegal County Council will generally not support wind energy proposals within 1km of Special Protection Areas unless	The Planning Authority appointed AECOM consultants to prepare a Natura Impact Report (NIR) in respect of the Proposed Variation; the main purpose of which is to evaluate (as part of the Appropriate Assessment of the Variation by the planning authority) whether the Proposed Variation may result in likely significant effects or, where relevant,

Issue	Response
<p>clear evidence from the applicant or scheme promoter can demonstrate no adverse effect on site integrity will arise.</p>	<p>adverse effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites, which include Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs).</p> <p>The NIR prepared by AECOM gives detailed consideration to the issue of disturbance displacement and notes (para 6.27) that “available scientific evidence indicates that the area most likely to be at risk from disturbance displacement is approximately 1 km from designated site boundaries”. Following on from this, the consultants advise that the most effective mitigation measure to avoid disturbance effects on birds of special conservation interest is likely to be to set up a 1 km exclusion zone around SPAs where wind energy schemes will not be taken forward; the consultants then specifically recommend the inclusion of the text as set out in Policy E-P-12(2)(c).</p> <p>In light of the analysis undertaken by AECOM and the recommendations contained in the NIR, Policy E-P-12(2)(c) is considered appropriate as drafted, in order to ensure that potential adverse effects on SPAs as a result of wind energy developments are suitably mitigated.</p>
<p>Should be no restrictions on masts (refers to</p> <p>Policy E-P-16 It is a policy of the Council to:</p> <p>(a.) only grant planning permission for new wind measuring masts in areas designated as ‘Acceptable in Principle’ or ‘Open to Consideration’</p>	<p>It is agreed that the restriction on wind measuring masts should be removed.</p> <p>Policy E-P-16 as drafted reflected a provision in the ‘Draft Revised Wind Energy Guidelines 2019’, which stated that it ‘would be inadvisable for the planning authority to grant planning permission for a wind measuring mast in an area where there is a presumption against wind energy development in the development plan’. The Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR) however, has clearly stated in relation to other matters,</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>that the Draft Guidelines have no status. Having regard to this fact, and considering that wind measuring masts may be a useful evidential policy component for the future, it is considered reasonable to allow, in principle, for the consideration of proposals involving wind measuring masts in areas other than those designated as 'Acceptable in Principle' or 'Open to Consideration', and this is reflected in <b>Recommendation 8 in Section 11 below.</b></p>
<p>Premature pending publication of finalised Guidelines.</p>	<p>The Proposed Variation is intended to address a longstanding policy lacuna in the CDP in relation to wind energy following a High Court Order made on 5th November, 2018 which removed critical provisions of the plan with regard to same. This has resulted in the undesirable position of the Council having an incomplete Wind Energy Policy Framework and therefore being unable to properly assess new proposals for wind energy development or give surety to the public and developers with regard to how such proposals will be assessed.</p> <p>In addition, whilst the Council acknowledges the publication of the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines in December 2019 it is noted that there is still no indication on when said guidelines will be published.</p> <p>Consequently, having regard to the above context, it is considered that the early adoption of a Wind Energy Policy Framework is necessary, and this should not await the finalization of the above new Guidelines.</p>
<p>No supporting evidence re comment in draft S.28 Statement:</p> <p>'Extensive public consultation has shown that the ten times tip height setback policy is favoured by the vast majority of</p>	<p>Refer to Section 5.1: Themed Response on Setback Distances</p> <p>Public support for the inclusion of a ten times tip height setback policy was strongly expressed by the elected members during the Members'</p>

Issue	Response
<p>the people of Donegal who would be affected by these turbines.'</p>	<p>Workshops on the formulation of the variation. The statement referred to reflects this position of the Members and was added by the Elected Members by resolution in the Council Chamber.</p> <p>Furthermore, an analysis of the submissions received during the public consultation on the Proposed Variation found that 111 submissions supported the proposed Ten Times tip height setback from residential receptors policies as contained in proposed Policies E-P-23 and E-P-24.</p>
<p>500m buffer around settlements should be deleted.</p>	<p>The 500m buffer around settlements forms part of the 'Not Normally Permissible' layer within Map 8.2.1 of the Proposed Variation.</p> <p>Section 5.6 of the current Wind Energy Guidelines 2006 identifies 500m as a distance threshold beyond which noise is unlikely to be a significant problem.</p> <p>In addition Step 3 of <i>Section 3.6 Step-By-Step Guide To The Analysis Of Suitable Areas For Wind Energy By The Planning Authority</i> of the Draft Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2019 specifically states that: <i>'existing settlements must be identified and these areas should be excluded as they will be subject to the project-level requirement for a minimum of 500m setback from individual properties as set out later in these Guidelines'</i>. In turn SPPR 2 of the Draft Guidelines state that the visual setback therein should be <i>'subject to a mandatory minimum setback of 500 metres'</i>.</p> <p>Settlements constitute the main concentrations of residential population in the county and both the Current Wind Energy Development Guidelines 2006 and the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines 2019 clearly set out to afford reasonable protections to residential amenities.</p>

Issue	Response
	<p>Consequently, whilst it is noted that the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines 2019 have not been finalised, on the basis of the above context it is considered that the proposed 500m buffer around settlements is based on a sound planning rationale, a methodological approach, and is consistent with Proper Planning and Sustainable Development of the area.</p>
<p>Environmental studies should constitute substantial works</p>	<p>The matter of what constitutes ‘substantial works’ in the context of an extension of duration of the appropriate period for a specific Planning Permission is a Development Management matter which lies outside the scope of the Proposed Variation. Nevertheless, it is noted that under S.2 of the Act “works” includes <i>‘any act or operation of construction, excavation, demolition, extension, alteration, repair or renewal’</i>.</p>

## 9.0 Office of the Planning Regulator

Members are reminded of the legal import of the Office of the Planning Regulator's submission. As already noted earlier in this report, the OPR advised in the preliminary comments of its submissions that:

*'Recommendations issued by the Office relate to clear breaches of the relevant legislative provisions, of the national or regional policy framework and/or of the policy of Government, as set out in the Ministerial guidelines under section 28. As such, the planning authority is required to implement or address recommendation(s) made by the Office in order to ensure consistency with the relevant policy and legislative provisions*

These comments must be considered in the context of Sections 31, 31AM and 31AN of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended). In summary, these sections, consequent on a recommendation being made to him or her by the OPR:

~ enable the Minister to, subject to certain procedural matters and for stated reasons, *'direct a planning authority to take such specified measures as he or she may require in relation to that plan'* [Section 31(1)(a) to (d) refers]; and

~ provide that where the Minister issues a direction under this section *'the planning authority, notwithstanding anything contained in Chapter I or II, shall comply with that direction and the chief executive or elected members shall not exercise a power or perform a function conferred on them by this Act in a manner that contravenes the direction so issued.'* [Section 31(2) refers].

## 10.0 Options Available to Members, and Potential Consequences

Section 13(6) of the Planning and Development Act (As Amended) sets out the options available to the Members at this point in the process. These options are that Members may, as they consider appropriate, by resolution:

1. make the variation with further modification;
2. make the variation without further modification; or
3. refuse to make it.

I address these options in detail in the paragraphs below.

With regards to Options 1 and 2, I must again remind Members of the submission of the Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR), the requirements therein, and the potential consequences of not complying with those requirements. Thus, at Recommendation 1 the OPR requires this Planning Authority to:

- (i) indicate, based on relevant and meaningful metrics, how the Plan will contribute to meeting national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation and, in particular, wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource (in megawatts) in the county as required by item (2) of the of the SPPR in the Interim Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Statutory Plans, Renewable Energy and Climate Change (2017); and
- (ii) demonstrate that the Plan is consistent with the delivery of part (i), including through the omission of the setback standard for wind energy development under Policy E-P-23 and Policy E-P-24 of the proposed Variation and ensure that any provision for mandatory setback are consistent with the Wind Energy Development Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2006).

At OPR Recommendation 2 this Planning Authority is required to:

- i) remove the “Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns”;  
and
- ii) remove all “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas from that area defined as “Not Normally Permissible”

**Comment:**

**Members are reminded of the comments of the OPR to the effect that: ‘Recommendations issued by the Office relate to clear breaches of the relevant legislative provisions, of the national or regional policy framework and/or of the policy of Government, as set out in the Ministerial guidelines under section 28. As such, the planning authority is required to implement or address recommendation(s) made by the Office in order to ensure consistency with the relevant policy and legislative provisions.’**

**These comments must be considered in the context of Sections 31, 31AM and 31AN of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended). In summary, these sections, consequent on a recommendation being made to him or her by the OPR:**

- ~ **enable the Minister to, subject to certain procedural matters and for stated reasons, ‘direct a planning authority to take such specified measures as he or she may require in relation to that plan’ [Section 31(1)(a) to (d) refers]; and**
- ~ **provide that where the Minister issues a direction under this section ‘the planning authority, notwithstanding anything contained in Chapter I or II, shall**

**comply with that direction and the chief executive or elected members shall not exercise a power or perform a function conferred on them by this Act in a manner that contravenes the direction so issued.’ [Section 31(2) refers].**

**Thus Members are advised that should they proceed to approve the Variation on the basis of the Proposed Variation that went out to Public Consultation, then given the very clear direction contained in the submission by the OPR, together with advices contained in the submissions of the Department of the Environment, Climate and Communications and the NWRA:**

- 1. it is probable that this Planning Authority will receive a direction from the Minister directing this Authority to take such measures as already specified by the OPR;**
- 2. and the Authority will then be obliged to comply with that Direction in accordance with the provisions of Section 31(1) and (2) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended).**

## **10.1 Procedural Recommendation**

**As Chief Executive, I am strongly recommending that Members do not approve/make the published Proposed Variation.**

**This recommendation is made also in the knowledge that there is what must be considered to be a high risk of a legal challenge by the Wind Energy Sector if the OPR directions and likely subsequent Ministerial directions are not followed.**

**The narrative in the previous sections of this report and the recommendations in Section 11 below both clearly set out how these requirements may be complied with.**

## 11.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that Members:

1. Omit the ten times tip height setback standards for wind energy development as contained in Policy E-P-23 and Policy E-P-24 of the Proposed Variation, as required by the Office of the Planning Regulator, and insert the following policy in their place:

**Policy ???:** It is a policy of the Council to ensure that the assessment of wind energy development proposals will have regard to the following:

- sensitivities of the county’s landscapes;
- visual impact on protected views, prospects, designated landscapes, as well as local visual impacts;
- impacts on nature conservation designations, archaeological areas, county geological sites, historic structures, public rights of way and walking routes;
- local environmental impacts, including those on residential properties, such as noise and shadow flicker;
- visual and environmental impacts of associated development, such as access roads, plant and grid connections from the proposed wind farm to the electricity transmission network;
- scale, size and layout of the project and any cumulative effects due to other projects;
- the impact of the proposed development on protected bird and mammal species;
- The Planning System and Flood Risk Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009);
- The protection of drinking water sources.

**This is considered to constitute a material alteration.**

2. Amend Map 8.2.1 as follows:

- a. Remove the
  - i) “Lifford -Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns”; and
  - ii) all “Moderately Low” and “Moderately High” landslide susceptibility areas from the Not Normally Permissible designation in Map 8.2.1, as required by the Office of the Planning Regulator, and revert the said Map of these areas to that submitted by the Executive to the November, 2021 Plenary Council meeting;
- b. Move ‘Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchment Areas’ from the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation to the ‘Open to Consideration’ designation;
- c. Move the ‘Gweebarra River Valley designation’ from the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation to the ‘Open to Consideration’ designation;

- d. Retention of the St. John's Point headland in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation;
- e. Inclusion of all existing windfarms; windfarm developments under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed; and sites with an extant planning permission within the 'Acceptable in Principle' designation;
- f. Inclusion in the 'Open to Consideration' designation of sites/projects identified in submission ref. nos. 316 (Mulmasog and Altnapaste); 321 (Upper Illies); 322 (Clare, Redcastle); 336 (Drumskellan/Croackanure); 337 (Carrowglen); and 339 (Garrymore);
- g. Retention in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation of sites/projects identified in submission ref. nos. 305/306 (Altnapaste, Ballybofey); and 320 (Owenerk, Lifford).

(Members are referred to Recommendation 2.a.i) as it affects site/project proposed in submission ref. no. 325 (Meenagolan, Meenreagh, Lismullyduff, Cronalaghy, Corlea, Corradooey, Ballyarren, and Owennagadragh Mountain/Cornashesk).

(Members are also referred to Recommendation 2c as it affects site/project proposed in submission ref. nos. 313 and 324 (Cloghercor, Gweebarra River Valley)

Each individual item referenced above is considered to constitute a material alteration.

**3. Amend proposed Policy E-P-23(1)(ii) as follows (text to be deleted shown in strikethrough):**

Policy E-P-23: It is a policy of the Council that wind farm developments:

(1) (i.) Must not be located within:

(a.) the zone of visual influence of Glenveagh National Park;

(ii.) Must not be located within the following areas, subject to the possible exceptions set out in Policy E-P-12(1)(c)(ii):

~~(b) the Gweebarra River Basin;~~

(c) areas contained within 'Especially High Scenic Amenity' on Map 7.1.2 'Scenic Amenity';

~~(d) Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments; and~~

(e) St. John's Point.

This is considered to constitute a material alteration.

**4a. Include all existing windfarms; windfarm developments under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed, and sites with an extant planning permission within the ‘Acceptable in Principle’ designation in Map 8.2.**

**b. Amend Policy E-P-12(1)(c)(ii) as follows (new text shown in red)**

- (c) Not Normally Permissible
- (i) Windfarm development proposals on previously undeveloped sites, inclusive of sites with a lapsed un-implemented permission (and where substantive works have not been undertaken) will not normally be permissible.
- (ii) The augmentation, upgrade and improvements of: existing windfarms; windfarm developments under construction; developments where permission has lapsed but substantial works have been completed, or on sites with an extant planning permission will be open to consideration where such proposals shall be generally confined to the planning unit of the existing development, **or where a modestly-proportioned projection (relative to the established unit) beyond the established footprint can be demonstrated to be essential and unavoidable for the augmentation project in terms of operational efficiencies, and can demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that all environmental issues can be adequately mitigated.**

**This is considered to constitute a material alteration.**

**5a. Include the sites/projects proposed in Submission Ref. Nos. 321 (Upper Illies); 339 (Garrymore, Milford); 313 and 324 (Cloghercor); 316 (Mulmosog and Altnagapple); 322 (Clare, Redcastle); 325 (Meenagolan, Meenreagh, Lismullyduff, Cronalaghy, Corlea, Corradooey, Ballyarren and Owennagadragh Mountain/Cornashesk); 336 (Drumskellan/Crockanure); and 337 (Carrowglen) within the ‘Open to Consideration’ designation in Map 8.2.1;**

**b. Retain the sites/projects proposed in Submission Ref. Nos. 305 and 306 (Altnapaste, Ballybofey); and 320 (Owenerk) within the ‘Not Normally Permissible’ designation in Map 8.2.1.**

**Each individual item referenced above is considered to constitute a material alteration.**

6. Insert additional narrative in respect of Special Planning Policy Requirement (2) of the Interim Guidelines, and as required by the Office of the Planning Regulator re the requirement of planning authorities to *ie. 'Indicate how the implementation of the relevant development plan or local area plan over its effective period will contribute to realising overall national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation, and in particular wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource (in megawatts)']*. Text to read as follows:

The Planning Authority acknowledges again the national policy drive towards increased renewable energy output. The Authority further acknowledges Special Planning Policy Requirement (2) of the Interim Guidelines, re the requirement of planning authorities to *ie. 'Indicate how the implementation of the relevant development plan or local area plan over its effective period will contribute to realising overall national targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation, and in particular wind energy production and the potential wind energy resource (in megawatts)'*. Following consultation with the Office of the Planning Regulator, the Authority sets out its calculations in this regard as follows:

Map 8.2.1 Designation	Area (KM2)  (total area of County = 4,680 KM2)	Apply Factor of 25% due to scattered rural dwelling pattern	Potential no. of Turbines (Using factor of 5/KM2)	'Provisional' Output (Megawatts) (Using factor of 3 Megawatts/Turbine)	Adjustment Rate for Attrition (ie. lack of success of potential projects)	Final Estimated Output M'watts
Acceptable in Principle	4.33	1	5	15	80%	3
Open to Consideration	2,800	700	3,500	10,500	90%	1,050
<b>Total</b>						<b>1,053</b>

Members are advised that the above-noted calculations have been made on the basis of the policy framework reflecting the recommendations in this Report. Alternative calculations would be required should the aforesaid recommendations not be accepted.

This is considered to constitute a material alteration.
---

7. Insert new policy as below:

**Policy E-P-???**

**It is a policy of the Council to require that proposals for grid connections shall be considered along the national road network only after other potential alternative routes have been reasonably eliminated for reasons of environmental sensitivities.**

**This is considered to constitute a material alteration.**

8. Delete proposed Policy E-P-16 (text shown in ~~strikethrough~~)

**Policy E-P-16**

~~**It is a policy of the Council to:  
(a.) only grant planning permission for new wind measuring masts in areas designated as  
'Acceptable in Principle' or 'Open to Consideration'**~~

**This is considered to constitute a material alteration.**

## **12.0 Strategic Environmental Assessment and Appropriate Assessment**

If, at the July Plenary meeting, Members resolve to modify the Variation, the Chief Executive must consider if one or more of the said modifications is/are material. This matter can be expedited in a short period. Subsequently, under Section 13(6) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (As Amended), the Planning Authority, through the Chief Executive, is: *'required to determine if a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) or an appropriate assessment (AA) or both such assessments, as the case may be, is or are required to be carried out as respects one or more than one proposed modification that would, if made, be a material alteration of the variation of the development plan.'* If the Chief Executive does determine that either the SEA and AA assessments is/are required, then not later than 2 weeks after such a determination, he must specify such period as he or she considers necessary following the determination as being required to facilitate the assessment(s).

## 13.0 Section 28 Statement

Section 28(1B) of the Act requires that the Planning Authority appends a statement to the Plan/Variation setting out how it complies with the policies or guidelines of the Minister or, if it does not so comply, the reasons why it does not. A draft of such a statement was included in the Proposed Variation. This will have to be amended should Members resolve to amend the variation.



**Liam Ward**  
**Deputy Chief Executive**  
**Donegal County Council**  
**23rd June 2022**

## **Appendix A: List of Prescribed Bodies consulted in accordance with section 13(2) of the Planning & Development Act, 2000 (As Amended)**

- Minister for Department of Housing, Local Government & Heritage
- Minister for Department of Culture, Heritage & the Gaeltacht
- An Bord Pleanála
- Minister for Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
- Northern & Western Regional Assembly
- Minister for Department of Defence
- Minister for Department of Education and Skills
- Leitrim County Council
- Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport & Media
- Dublin Airport Authority
- Fáilte Ireland
- National Transport Authority
- An Chomhairle Éalaíon
- The Office of Public Works
- Electricity Supply Board
- Department of Environment, Climate & Communications
- Health Service Executive West
- Heritage Council
- The Health and Safety Authority
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland
- Inland Fisheries Ireland
- An Taisce
- Minister for Department of Enterprise, Trade & Employment
- Irish Aviation Authority
- Minister for Department of Transport
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Loughs Agency
- Local Community Development Committee
- Sligo County Council
- Fermanagh & Omagh District Council
- Irish Water
- Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council
- EirGrid
- Department of Infrastructure
- Office of the Planning Regulator
- Derry City & Strabane District Council

## APPENDIX B: Calculation of Potential Contribution to National Renewable Energy Targets

### Scenario 2: Published Proposed Variation

Map 8.2.1 Designation	Area (KM <sub>2</sub> ) (total area of County = 4,680 KM <sub>2</sub> )	Apply Factor of 25% due to scattered rural dwelling pattern	Potential no. of Turbines (Using factor of 5/KM <sub>2</sub> )	'Provisional' Output (Megawatts) (Using factor of 3 Megawatts/Turbine)	Adjustment Rate for Attrition (ie. lack of success of potential projects)	Final Estimated Output M'watts
Acceptable in Principle	4.17	1	5	15	80%	3
Open to Consideration	1395.87	349	1,745	5,235	90%	523
Total						526

### Scenario 2: Published Proposed Variation But With: (1.) Moderately High and Moderately Low Landslide Susceptibility Areas; (2.) 'Lifford - Stranorlar Municipal District Areas at Risk of Landslides and Associated Environmental and Ecological Concerns'; and (3.) Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchment Areas' Moved From 'Not Normally Permissible' to 'Open to Consideration'

Map 8.2.1 Designation	Area (KM <sub>2</sub> ) (total area of County = 4,680 KM <sub>2</sub> )	Apply Factor of 25% due to scattered rural dwelling pattern	Potential no. of Turbines (Using factor of 5/KM <sub>2</sub> )	'Provisional' Output (Megawatts) (Using factor of 3 Megawatts/Turbine)	Adjustment Rate for Attrition (ie. lack of success of potential projects)	Final Estimated Output M'watts
Acceptable in Principle	4.33	1	5	15	80%	3
Open to Consideration	2,800	700	3,500	10,500	90%	1,050
Total						1,053

## APPENDIX C: Public Submissions Generally Opposed To New Windfarm Developments and Generally Supportive of Proposed Variation:

As there were large number of submissions in this category, the following tables identify by way of submission ref. no. all of those who commented on the referenced issue. Please refer to Appendix G containing the names relating to these ref. nos. Finally, it should be noted that many submissions referenced more than one issue.

### Issue 1: General Opposition To Any Further Windfarm Developments on Greenfield Sites, and Broad Support for Policy Approach In Proposed Variation

Table C1

WEPF-01	WEPF-45	WEPF-64	WEPF-93	WEPF-112	WEPF-129	WEPF-146	WEPF-163	WEPF-205	WEPF-222
WEPF-04	WEPF-46	WEPF-65	WEPF-94	WEPF-113	WEPF-130	WEPF-147	WEPF-164	WEPF-206	WEPF-223
WEPF-08	WEPF-48	WEPF-66	WEPF-97	WEPF-114	WEPF-131	WEPF-148	WEPF-165	WEPF-207	WEPF-224
WEPF-10	WEPF-49	WEPF-67	WEPF-98	WEPF-115	WEPF-132	WEPF-149	WEPF-166	WEPF-208	WEPF-225
WEPF-12	WEPF-50	WEPF-68	WEPF-99	WEPF-116	WEPF-133	WEPF-150	WEPF-167	WEPF-209	WEPF-226
WEPF-16	WEPF-52	WEPF-73	WEPF-100	WEPF-117	WEPF-134	WEPF-151	WEPF-168	WEPF-210	WEPF-227
WEPF-18	WEPF-53	WEPF-74	WEPF-101	WEPF-118	WEPF-135	WEPF-152	WEPF-169	WEPF-211	WEPF-228
WEPF-26	WEPF-54	WEPF-75	WEPF-102	WEPF-119	WEPF-136	WEPF-153	WEPF-170	WEPF-212	WEPF-229
WEPF-27	WEPF-55	WEPF-77	WEPF-103	WEPF-120	WEPF-137	WEPF-154	WEPF-171	WEPF-213	WEPF-230
WEPF-28	WEPF-56	WEPF-78	WEPF-104	WEPF-121	WEPF-138	WEPF-155	WEPF-172	WEPF-214	WEPF-231
WEPF-31	WEPF-57	WEPF-79	WEPF-105	WEPF-122	WEPF-139	WEPF-156	WEPF-173	WEPF-215	WEPF-232
WEPF-32	WEPF-58	WEPF-82	WEPF-106	WEPF-123	WEPF-140	WEPF-157	WEPF-174	WEPF-216	WEPF-233
WEPF-39	WEPF-59	WEPF-83	WEPF-107	WEPF-124	WEPF-141	WEPF-158	WEPF-200	WEPF-217	WEPF-234
WEPF-40	WEPF-60	WEPF-84	WEPF-108	WEPF-125	WEPF-142	WEPF-159	WEPF-201	WEPF-218	WEPF-235
WEPF-41	WEPF-61	WEPF-87	WEPF-109	WEPF-126	WEPF-143	WEPF-160	WEPF-202	WEPF-219	WEPF-236
WEPF-42	WEPF-62	WEPF-90	WEPF-110	WEPF-127	WEPF-144	WEPF-161	WEPF-203	WEPF-220	WEPF-237
WEPF-43	WEPF-63	WEPF-92	WEPF-111	WEPF-128	WEPF-145	WEPF-162	WEPF-204	WEPF-221	WEPF-238
WEPF-44									

WEPF-239	WEPF-284	WEPF-301
WEPF-240	WEPF-285	WEPF-309
WEPF-241	WEPF-286	WEPF-327
WEPF-242	WEPF-287	WEPF-329
WEPF-243	WEPF-288	WEPF-330
WEPF-244	WEPF-289	WEPF-331
WEPF-245	WEPF-290	WEPF-332
WEPF-246	WEPF-291	WEPF-333
WEPF-247	WEPF-292	WEPF-335
WEPF-248	WEPF-293	WEPF-341
WEPF-249	WEPF-294	WEPF-342
WEPF-250	WEPF-295	WEPF-
WEPF-251	WEPF-296	WEPF-
WEPF-252	WEPF-297	WEPF-
WEPF-253	WEPF-298	WEPF-
WEPF-282	WEPF-299	WEPF-
WEPF-283	WEPF-300	WEPF-

The reasons given in support of these comments include: the importance of the landscape for the County in terms of tourism; the fact that Donegal has already than played its part' in delivering renewable wind energy for the country; the divisive nature of such developments leading to disharmony in communities; the inherent value of bogs/peatlands in terms of biodiversity and their carbon sink qualities; the risk of siting such developments in peatlands as evidenced at Meenbog; and the risks to the preservation of traditional farm practices.

**Chief Executive's Response:** The balance to be struck between enabling renewable energy in support of the national policy agenda of delivering a more sustainable and secure power supply on the one hand, and the protection of the environmental assets,

residential receptors and tourism attractions on the other hand is central to the consideration of this policy area. In this regard, refer to Sections 4.0, 5.0 and 7.0, 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0 of the Report.

Issue 2: Support for Policy Approach (Policy E-P-23, and Map 8.2.1) re Prohibition of Windfarm Developments In: Glenveagh National Park; the Gweebarra River Basin; Areas contained within ‘Especially High Scenic Amenity’ on Map 7.1.2 ‘Scenic Amenity’; Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments; and St. John’s Point.

Table C2

WEPF-4	WEPF-60	WEPF-92	WEPF-119	WEPF-143	WEPF-167	WEPF-191	WEPF-215	WEPF-239	WEPF-291
WEPF-11	WEPF-61	WEPF-93	WEPF-120	WEPF-144	WEPF-168	WEPF-192	WEPF-216	WEPF-240	WEPF-292
WEPF-19	WEPF-62	WEPF-97	WEPF-121	WEPF-145	WEPF-169	WEPF-193	WEPF-217	WEPF-241	WEPF-293
WEPF-20	WEPF-63	WEPF-98	WEPF-122	WEPF-146	WEPF-170	WEPF-194	WEPF-218	WEPF-242	WEPF-294
WEPF-28	WEPF-64	WEPF-99	WEPF-123	WEPF-147	WEPF-171	WEPF-195	WEPF-219	WEPF-243	WEPF-295
WEPF-31	WEPF-65	WEPF-100	WEPF-124	WEPF-148	WEPF-172	WEPF-196	WEPF-220	WEPF-244	WEPF-296
WEPF-32	WEPF-66	WEPF-101	WEPF-125	WEPF-149	WEPF-173	WEPF-197	WEPF-221	WEPF-245	WEPF-297
WEPF-36	WEPF-67	WEPF-102	WEPF-126	WEPF-150	WEPF-174	WEPF-198	WEPF-222	WEPF-246	WEPF-298
WEPF-37	WEPF-68	WEPF-103	WEPF-127	WEPF-151	WEPF-175	WEPF-199	WEPF-223	WEPF-247	WEPF-299
WEPF-40	WEPF-70	WEPF-104	WEPF-128	WEPF-152	WEPF-176	WEPF-200	WEPF-224	WEPF-248	WEPF-300
WEPF-41	WEPF-71	WEPF-105	WEPF-129	WEPF-153	WEPF-177	WEPF-201	WEPF-225	WEPF-249	WEPF-301
WEPF-44	WEPF-72	WEPF-106	WEPF-130	WEPF-154	WEPF-178	WEPF-202	WEPF-226	WEPF-250	WEPF-304
WEPF-45	WEPF-73	WEPF-107	WEPF-131	WEPF-155	WEPF-179	WEPF-203	WEPF-227	WEPF-251	WEPF-327
WEPF-46	WEPF-74	WEPF-108	WEPF-132	WEPF-156	WEPF-180	WEPF-204	WEPF-228	WEPF-252	WEPF-329
WEPF-48	WEPF-75	WEPF-109	WEPF-133	WEPF-157	WEPF-181	WEPF-205	WEPF-229	WEPF-253	WEPF-333
WEPF-49	WEPF-77	WEPF-110	WEPF-134	WEPF-158	WEPF-182	WEPF-206	WEPF-230	WEPF-282	WEPF-335
WEPF-50	WEPF-78	WEPF-111	WEPF-135	WEPF-159	WEPF-183	WEPF-207	WEPF-231	WEPF-283	WEPF-341
WEPF-53	WEPF-79	WEPF-112	WEPF-136	WEPF-160	WEPF-184	WEPF-208	WEPF-232	WEPF-284	WEPF-342
WEPF-54	WEPF-81	WEPF-113	WEPF-137	WEPF-161	WEPF-185	WEPF-209	WEPF-233	WEPF-285	
WEPF-55	WEPF-82	WEPF-114	WEPF-138	WEPF-162	WEPF-186	WEPF-210	WEPF-234	WEPF-286	
WEPF-56	WEPF-83	WEPF-115	WEPF-139	WEPF-163	WEPF-187	WEPF-211	WEPF-235	WEPF-287	

WEPF-57	WEPF-84	WEPF-116	WEPF-140	WEPF-164	WEPF-188	WEPF-212	WEPF-236	WEPF-288	
WEPF-58	WEPF-87	WEPF-117	WEPF-141	WEPF-165	WEPF-189	WEPF-213	WEPF-237	WEPF-289	
WEPF-59	WEPF-90	WEPF-118	WEPF-142	WEPF-166	WEPF-190	WEPF-214	WEPF-238	WEPF-290	

The reasons given are broadly similar to those identified at C1 above.

**Chief Executive’s Response:** Please refer to Section 5.2 of the Report where the Gweebarra River Basin; ‘Especially High Scenic Amenity’ areas on Map 7.1.2 ‘Scenic Amenity’; Freshwater Pearl Mussel Catchments; and St. John’s Point issues are all considered in detail. With regards to the Glenveagh National Park, this is a vital tourism, landscape and ecological asset of the County and therefore it is proposed to maintain the status quo in this regard.

Issue 3: Specific Support for Policy [Policy E-P-23(1)(ii)(e); and Map 8.2.1] Prohibiting Windfarm Development in St. John’s Point

**(Please note that these submissions specifically referenced St. John’s Point, and should be considered along with the submissions identified at Table C2 above, all of which also expressed support for the St. John’s Point policy).**

Table C3

WEPF-11	WEPF-14	WEPF-21	WEPF-25	WEPF-33	WEPF-46	WEPF-51	WEPF-81	WEPF-91	WEPF-308
WEPF-13	WEPF-15	WEPF-22	WEPF-30	WEPF-38	WEPF-47	WEPF-76	WEPF-85	WEPF-307	WEPF-334

The reasons given in support of these comments include that windfarms would: devastate the local community; damage heritage sites, scenery, health; would lower property values; reference is also made to narrowness of the headland and the Special Area of Conservation around the shoreline and at the southern end of the headland; and the Especially High Scenic Amenity designation at the southern end of the headland.

**Chief Executive’s Response:** Please refer to Section 5.2 of the Report where the St. John’s Point issue is considered in detail.

Issue 4: Gweebarra River Valley

4a. Specific Support for Policy [Policy E-P-23(1)(ii)(b); and Map 8.2.1] Prohibiting Windfarm Development in the Gweebarra River Basin

**(Please note that these submissions specifically referenced the Gweebarra River Valley, and should be considered along with the submissions identified at Table C2 above, all of which also expressed support for the Gweebarra River Valley policy).**

Table 4a

WEPF-32	WEPF-304
---------	----------

The reasons given in support of these comments include the area being described as ‘stunning’; and that the Gweebarra River is a SAC and no industrial development should occur on this river; and ‘the entire valley area and wilderness it contains must be preserved for environmental and tourism purposes, and for the mental health of the farming population’.

4b. Specific Opposition to Policy [Policy E-P-23(1)(ii)(b); and Map 8.2.1] Prohibiting Windfarm Development in the Gweebarra River Basin

Table 4b

WEPF-313	WEPF-324
----------	----------

These two industry submissions make the following observations in support of the area being placed back into ‘Open to Consideration’. They state that it is ambiguous why sensitive and visually vulnerable parts of the County, including the Gweebarra Estuary and coastline are within areas Open to Consideration, whilst the site of the Gweebarra River is proposed to be within areas designated as ‘Not Normally Permissible’. They also suggest there is no scientific basis for this proposed policy, and that excluding this area from consideration for wind energy development should only take place where there is a supporting statement and scientific basis from an appropriate expert.

**Chief Executive’s Response:** The balance to be struck between enabling renewable energy in support of the national policy agenda of delivering a more sustainable and secure power supply on the one hand, and the protection of the environmental assets, residential receptors and tourism attractions on the other hand is central to the consideration of this policy area. In this regard, refer to Sections 4.0, 5.0 and 7.0 of the Report. In this context, please refer to Section 5.2 of the Report where the Gweebarra River Valley issue is considered in detail. In addition, it is noted and acknowledged that the Gweebarra River is included within the West of Ardara/Maas Road SAC. An Appropriate Assessment Natura Impact Report for the variation was prepared for all 101 Natura sites in Donegal by AECOM consultants. The NIR concluded that there would be no adverse effects on any Natura site but did recommend the inclusion of a policy in the Variation to provide additional policy ‘security’ for all types of Natura sites, including water-based sites such as the Gweebarra River. Thus, Policy E-P-12(2)(d) provides that:

*‘Any wind energy developments within 1 km of sensitive SPAs / SACs shall ensure that potential adverse impacts on the European sites due to water quality impacts are assessed and, where required, mitigated. Possible assessments and mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, water quality and ecological baseline studies, run-off / leachate modelling, delivery of Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) and Water Management Plans (WMPs) and compliance with industry good practice.’*

Issue 5: Specific Support for Policies E-P-23(2)(b) and E-P-24 Requiring Mandatory Setback of Ten Times Tip Height From Residential Receptors

Table 5

WEPF-4	WEPF-62	WEPF-97	WEPF-117	WEPF-137	WEPF-157	WEPF-202	WEPF-222	WEPF-242	WEPF-291
WEPF-18	WEPF-63	WEPF-98	WEPF-118	WEPF-138	WEPF-158	WEPF-203	WEPF-223	WEPF-243	WEPF-292
WEPF-28	WEPF-64	WEPF-99	WEPF-119	WEPF-139	WEPF-159	WEPF-204	WEPF-224	WEPF-245	WEPF-293
WEPF-31	WEPF-65	WEPF-100	WEPF-120	WEPF-140	WEPF-160	WEPF-205	WEPF-225	WEPF-246	WEPF-294
WEPF-32	WEPF-66	WEPF-101	WEPF-121	WEPF-141	WEPF-161	WEPF-206	WEPF-226	WEPF-247	WEPF-295
WEPF-40	WEPF-67	WEPF-102	WEPF-122	WEPF-142	WEPF-162	WEPF-207	WEPF-227	WEPF-248	WEPF-296
WEPF-41	WEPF-68	WEPF-103	WEPF-123	WEPF-143	WEPF-163	WEPF-208	WEPF-228	WEPF-249	WEPF-297
WEPF-44	WEPF-73	WEPF-104	WEPF-124	WEPF-144	WEPF-164	WEPF-209	WEPF-229	WEPF-250	WEPF-298
WEPF-45	WEPF-74	WEPF-105	WEPF-125	WEPF-145	WEPF-165	WEPF-210	WEPF-230	WEPF-251	WEPF-299
WEPF-48	WEPF-75	WEPF-106	WEPF-126	WEPF-146	WEPF-166	WEPF-211	WEPF-231	WEPF-252	WEPF-300
WEPF-49	WEPF-77	WEPF-107	WEPF-127	WEPF-147	WEPF-167	WEPF-212	WEPF-232	WEPF-253	WEPF-301
WEPF-50	WEPF-78	WEPF-108	WEPF-128	WEPF-148	WEPF-168	WEPF-213	WEPF-233	WEPF-282	WEPF-302
WEPF-53	WEPF-79	WEPF-109	WEPF-129	WEPF-149	WEPF-169	WEPF-214	WEPF-234	WEPF-283	WEPF-327
WEPF-54	WEPF-80	WEPF-110	WEPF-130	WEPF-150	WEPF-170	WEPF-215	WEPF-235	WEPF-284	WEPF-330
WEPF-55	WEPF-82	WEPF-111	WEPF-131	WEPF-151	WEPF-171	WEPF-216	WEPF-236	WEPF-285	WEPF-331
WEPF-56	WEPF-83	WEPF-112	WEPF-132	WEPF-152	WEPF-172	WEPF-217	WEPF-237	WEPF-286	WEPF-332
WEPF-57	WEPF-84	WEPF-113	WEPF-133	WEPF-153	WEPF-173	WEPF-218	WEPF-238	WEPF-287	WEPF-333
WEPF-58	WEPF-90	WEPF-114	WEPF-134	WEPF-154	WEPF-174	WEPF-219	WEPF-239	WEPF-288	WEPF-335
WEPF-59	WEPF-92	WEPF-115	WEPF-135	WEPF-155	WEPF-200	WEPF-220	WEPF-240	WEPF-289	
WEPF-60	WEPF-93	WEPF-116	WEPF-136	WEPF-156	WEPF-201	WEPF-221	WEPF-241	WEPF-290	
WEPF-61									

The reasons given in support of these comments include: ‘the resultant reduction in noise, ill-health and annoyance; and ‘protecting homeowners from negative health factors including noise pollution, shadow flicker and electro-magnetic frequencies’.

**Chief Executive’s Response:** Refer Section 5.1 of Report.

## Issue 6: Broad Support for Augmentation/Re-powering of Existing Turbines and Policy Approach in Proposed Variation

**Table 6**

WEPF-4	WEPF-62	WEPF-97	WEPF-117	WEPF-137	WEPF-157	WEPF-202	WEPF-222	WEPF-242	WEPF-291
WEPF-18	WEPF-63	WEPF-98	WEPF-118	WEPF-138	WEPF-158	WEPF-203	WEPF-223	WEPF-243	WEPF-292
WEPF-28	WEPF-64	WEPF-99	WEPF-119	WEPF-139	WEPF-159	WEPF-204	WEPF-224	WEPF-245	WEPF-293
WEPF-31	WEPF-65	WEPF-100	WEPF-120	WEPF-140	WEPF-160	WEPF-205	WEPF-225	WEPF-246	WEPF-294
WEPF-32	WEPF-66	WEPF-101	WEPF-121	WEPF-141	WEPF-161	WEPF-206	WEPF-226	WEPF-247	WEPF-295
WEPF-40	WEPF-67	WEPF-102	WEPF-122	WEPF-142	WEPF-162	WEPF-207	WEPF-227	WEPF-248	WEPF-296
WEPF-41	WEPF-68	WEPF-103	WEPF-123	WEPF-143	WEPF-163	WEPF-208	WEPF-228	WEPF-249	WEPF-297
WEPF-44	WEPF-73	WEPF-104	WEPF-124	WEPF-144	WEPF-164	WEPF-209	WEPF-229	WEPF-250	WEPF-298
WEPF-45	WEPF-74	WEPF-105	WEPF-125	WEPF-145	WEPF-165	WEPF-210	WEPF-230	WEPF-251	WEPF-299
WEPF-48	WEPF-75	WEPF-106	WEPF-126	WEPF-146	WEPF-166	WEPF-211	WEPF-231	WEPF-252	WEPF-300
WEPF-49	WEPF-77	WEPF-107	WEPF-127	WEPF-147	WEPF-167	WEPF-212	WEPF-232	WEPF-253	WEPF-301
WEPF-50	WEPF-78	WEPF-108	WEPF-128	WEPF-148	WEPF-168	WEPF-213	WEPF-233	WEPF-282	WEPF-302
WEPF-53	WEPF-79	WEPF-109	WEPF-129	WEPF-149	WEPF-169	WEPF-214	WEPF-234	WEPF-283	WEPF-327
WEPF-54		WEPF-110	WEPF-130	WEPF-150	WEPF-170	WEPF-215	WEPF-235	WEPF-284	WEPF-329
WEPF-55	WEPF-82	WEPF-111	WEPF-131	WEPF-151	WEPF-171	WEPF-216	WEPF-236	WEPF-285	WEPF-330
WEPF-56	WEPF-83	WEPF-112	WEPF-132	WEPF-152	WEPF-172	WEPF-217	WEPF-237	WEPF-286	WEPF-331
WEPF-57	WEPF-84	WEPF-113	WEPF-133	WEPF-153	WEPF-173	WEPF-218	WEPF-238	WEPF-287	WEPF-332
WEPF-58	WEPF-90	WEPF-114	WEPF-134	WEPF-154	WEPF-174	WEPF-219	WEPF-239	WEPF-288	WEPF-333
WEPF-59	WEPF-92	WEPF-115	WEPF-135	WEPF-155	WEPF-200	WEPF-220	WEPF-240	WEPF-289	WEPF-335
WEPF-60	WEPF-93	WEPF-116	WEPF-136	WEPF-156	WEPF-201	WEPF-221	WEPF-241	WEPF-290	WEPF-341
WEPF-61									WEPF-342

The reasons given in support of these comments generally reference a lack of capacity of the County to absorb any more greenfield windfarm developments, and that there is a logic to augmentation projects as this will minimise impacts.

**Chief Executive’s Response.** Refer to Section 5.3 in Report.

Issue 7: Broad Support For Approach To Landslide Susceptibility/Expressions of Concern Re Development of Windfarms in Lands at Risk OF Landslide/Raising the Carbon Sink Qualities of Peat Bog

Table 7:

WEPF-09								
WEPF-19	WEPF-62	WEPF-97	WEPF-117	WEPF-137	WEPF-157	WEPF-177	WEPF-197	WEPF-299
WEPF-20	WEPF-63	WEPF-98	WEPF-118	WEPF-138	WEPF-158	WEPF-178	WEPF-198	WEPF-300
WEPF-28	WEPF-64	WEPF-99	WEPF-119	WEPF-139	WEPF-159	WEPF-179	WEPF-199	WEPF-301
WEPF-31	WEPF-65	WEPF-100	WEPF-120	WEPF-140	WEPF-160	WEPF-180	WEPF-282	WEPF-302
WEPF-32	WEPF-66	WEPF-101	WEPF-121	WEPF-141	WEPF-161	WEPF-181	WEPF-283	WEPF-304
WEPF-36	WEPF-67	WEPF-102	WEPF-122	WEPF-142	WEPF-162	WEPF-182	WEPF-284	WEPF-326
WEPF-37	WEPF-68	WEPF-103	WEPF-123	WEPF-143	WEPF-163	WEPF-183	WEPF-285	WEPF-329
WEPF-40	WEPF-70	WEPF-104	WEPF-124	WEPF-144	WEPF-164	WEPF-184	WEPF-286	WEPF-330
WEPF-41	WEPF-71	WEPF-105	WEPF-125	WEPF-145	WEPF-165	WEPF-185	WEPF-287	WEPF-331
WEPF-44	WEPF-72	WEPF-106	WEPF-126	WEPF-146	WEPF-166	WEPF-186	WEPF-288	WEPF-332
WEPF-45	WEPF-73	WEPF-107	WEPF-127	WEPF-147	WEPF-167	WEPF-187	WEPF-289	WEPF-333
WEPF-46	WEPF-74	WEPF-108	WEPF-128	WEPF-148	WEPF-168	WEPF-188	WEPF-290	WEPF-341
WEPF-48	WEPF-75	WEPF-109	WEPF-129	WEPF-149	WEPF-169	WEPF-189	WEPF-291	WEPF-342
WEPF-49	WEPF-77	WEPF-110	WEPF-130	WEPF-150	WEPF-170	WEPF-190	WEPF-292	
WEPF-50	WEPF-78	WEPF-111	WEPF-131	WEPF-151	WEPF-171	WEPF-191	WEPF-293	
WEPF-53	WEPF-79	WEPF-112	WEPF-132	WEPF-152	WEPF-172	WEPF-192	WEPF-294	
WEPF-54	WEPF-80	WEPF-113	WEPF-133	WEPF-153	WEPF-173	WEPF-193	WEPF-295	
WEPF-55	WEPF-82	WEPF-114	WEPF-134	WEPF-154	WEPF-174	WEPF-194	WEPF-296	
WEPF-56	WEPF-83	WEPF-115	WEPF-135	WEPF-155	WEPF-175	WEPF-195	WEPF-297	
WEPF-57	WEPF-84	WEPF-116	WEPF-136	WEPF-156	WEPF-176	WEPF-196	WEPF-298	
WEPF-58	WEPF-87							
WEPF-59	WEPF-90							
WEPF-60	WEPF-92							
WEPF-61	WEPF-93							

**Chief Executive's Response:** Please refer to Section 5.2. In addition, it should be noted that the County's most precious bogs are all identified within designated Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), and all SAC's are included in the 'Not Normally Permissible' designation in Map 8.2.1. All remaining bogs are identified within the 'Open to Consideration' areas in Map 8.2.1 on the basis of advice from environmental agencies that these remaining bogs do contain discreet sub-areas of more valuable bog. Their inclusion in the 'Open to Consideration' area is designed to alert all stakeholders regarding the potential presence of such areas. Consideration of detailed planning applications should, where necessary, include assessment of the balance between the environmental benefits of renewable energy versus potential environmental loss due to the loss of the carbon sink qualities of peat bog. This approach is consistent with text contained in the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines, 2019 (Appendix 4: Best Practice for Wind Energy Development In Peatlands), notwithstanding the advice from the OPR that this document does not have any legal status.

The specific case referenced is the subject of ongoing investigations and action by the Council and other agencies.

## APPENDIX D: General Public Submissions Generally Opposed To/Concerned Re Proposed Variation:

Table D1: Submissions Of General Opposition To Any Further Windfarm Developments on Greenfield Sites, and Broad Support for Policy Approach In Proposed Variation

Table D1

WEPF-23	WEPF-24	WEPF-254	WEPF-314	WEPF-315	WEPF-326	WEPF-328	WEPF-163	WEPF-205	WEPF-222
---------	---------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

The reasons given in support of these comments include: the need for greater energy security in light of global warning concerns, the domestic policy direction of banning fossil fuels, hopes for offshore energy are overly-optimistic, and the geopolitical situation and concerns around energy security; much of the County's land is suitable for 'marginal farming' only; the proposed ten times tip height setback policy combined with the Proposed Map 8.2.1 would render windfarm development 'impossible'; the landslide risk is over-stated and events that have happened have been due to 'reckless engineering mistakes', and such development can be properly managed; missed opportunities will cause further emigration and result in a loss of rates to the local authority; and the policy regime will not deter 'private' developers but will negatively impact on potential community projects. A further submission suggested that the process should be suspended until the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines were finalized.

**Chief Executive's Response:** The national policy drive towards greater renewable energy and security of energy was strongly referenced also by key statutory bodies and the windfarm industry. These concerns are documented in detail at Section 4.2 of the Report, and reflected in the requirements of the Office of the Planning Regulator and the recommendations made at Sections 10.1 and 11. Please refer to Section 5.1 of Report re setback distances, and Section 5.2 re landslide risk. Potential income from rates is not a planning consideration. Also refer to Section 8.2 re suspending the variation pending finalisation of the Guidelines.

## APPENDIX E: Windfarm/Electricity Industry, Agents or Owners of Prospective Developments

### E1: Submissions Of Windfarm/Electricity Industry, Agents or Owners of Prospective Developments

Table E1

WEPF-88	<b>WEPF-305</b>	WEPF-310	<b>WEPF-313</b>	<b>WEPF-316</b>	<b>WEPF-318</b>	<b>WEPF-320</b>	<b>WEPF-322</b>	WEPF-324	<b>WEPF-336</b>	<b>WEPF-338</b>
WEPF-95	<b>WEPF-306</b> (*)		<b>WEPF 324(*)</b>	<b>WEPF-317</b>	WEPF-319	<b>WEPF-321</b>	WEPF-323	<b>WEPF-325</b>	<b>WEPF-337</b>	<b>WEPF-339</b>

(\*) both submissions refer to same project.

#### (submissions in bold contain project-specific proposals)

These submissions contained either: a critique of the general approach that informed the content of the Proposed Variation in the context of national energy policy and planning guidelines; the case for a particular project; or both the aforementioned.

With regards to the general approach that informed the content of the Proposed Variation, a summary of these concerns is set out in Section 4.2 of the Report. The key issues raised are then addressed in Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 (Recommendations) as appropriate.

Project-specific proposals are addressed as follows:

- a) Existing and Permitted Windfarms (subm. refs. 317, 318, 336, 337 and 338) - Section 5.3,;
- b) Sites with Previous Planning History But Now Expired (subm. refs. 321 and 339) – Section 6.1; and
- c) No Previous Planning History/Projects Being Prepared For Planning Application (subm. refs. 305/306; 313/324; 316; 320; 322; 2325; 336; and 337)

## Broad Proposals

Termon; Termon/Kilmacrennan: The undernoted submissions contained one line requesting that there would be no restrictions in the said areas. In the absence of any supporting evidence or details, these proposals were not considered in any detail.

WEPF-255	WEPF-258	WEPF-261	WEPF-264	WEPF-267	WEPF-270	WEPF-273	WEPF-276	WEPF-279
WEPF-256	WEPF-259	WEPF-262	WEPF-265	WEPF-268	WEPF-271	WEPF-274	WEPF-277	WEPF-280
WEPF-257	WEPF-260	WEPF-263	WEPF-266	WEPF-269	WEPF-272	WEPF-275	WEPF-278	WEPF-281

Meenlecknalore Mountain: The submission WEPF-05 contained one line requesting that this area be considered as it was close to a 110Kv line. In the absence of any supporting evidence or details, this proposal was not considered in any detail.

## APPENDIX F: Statutory Bodies Submission

Ref	Name	Summary	CE Response
WEPF-02	Dept. of Agric., Food and Marine	Refers to tree felling licenses.	This is a development management issue.
WEPF-03	Environmental Protection Agency	<p><b>1</b> Would appear to be a generic document that makes recommendations mainly regarding the Environmental Report including, for example, that: its guidance document '<i>SEA of Local Authority Land Use Plans-EPA Recommendations and Resources</i>' (or as amended) and its State of the Environment Report, 2020 be considered when finalising and implementing the Variation; how mitigation and monitoring should be addressed in the ER.</p> <p><b>2</b> States that Variation should align with higher level plans, programmes and be consistent with NPF and RSES.</p> <p><b>3</b> States that SEA statement should be prepared after the Variation is adopted, what should be contained within, and that it should be sent to relevant environmental authorities.</p>	<p><b>1</b> The Planning Authority has had regard to all current guidance documents prepared by the EPA, including that specified.</p> <p><b>2</b> Noted. The OPR has raised concerns in this regard and these issues are addressed at Sections 4, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11 of the Report.</p> <p><b>3</b> Noted and agreed.</p>
WEPF-06	Department of Education	No comment on.	Noted.
WEPF-17	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	<b>1</b> Concerned that grid connection for windfarm developments, and their potential impacts on the national road network, were not considered in the Proposed Variation. Refers to the requirement of the NPF, National Strategic Outcome no.2 'Enhanced Regional Accessibility', to maintain strategic capacity and safety of the National Road network; this is also reflected in the NDP, NIF, S28 National roads guidelines for PAs and TEN-T EU	Refer to Section 8.2 of Report.

	<p>regulations. States there is a critical requirement to ensure the strategic capacity and safety of the NR network and safeguard the significant government investment already made.</p> <p><b>2</b> States that grid connections predominantly utilise the public road network for routing transmission lines presenting a number of significant implications for TII and roads authorities in the management and maintenance of the roads network. Lists a number of practical and cost issues (not all) arising from such development.</p> <p><b>3</b> Suggest that grid connection proposals should safeguard the strategic function of the NR network to the provisions of official policy and recommends this be considered for incorporation into the Proposed Variation before Adoption.</p> <p>TII would welcome and objective in the Proposed Variation in relation to renewable energy and safeguarding the national roads network indicating that grid connection routing options should be developed to safeguard the strategic function of the national roads network in accordance with Government Policy by utilising available alternative routes.</p>	
<p><b>WEPF-29</b> <b>Derry City &amp; Strabane District Council</b></p>	<p><b>1</b> Details previous consultation and liaison between DCC and DCSDC including the NWRSES, Metropolitan City Region Spatial Planning and a NW Energy Strategy. Acknowledges information sharing meetings that took place in September 2021 and formal environmental screening in December 2021.</p> <p><b>2</b> Refers DCC to DSCDCs recent Local Development Plan Strategy that reference regional focus, emerging wind energy policies and environmental designations.</p> <p><b>3</b> States their broad agreement with the consultation documents and accepting of findings.</p>	<p><b>1, 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5</b> Noted. It is agreed that both future proposed policies and individual applications with a potential transboundary impact should involve consultation and liaison.</p>

	<p><b>4</b> Note the new policy map but state it is difficult to predict potential impacts on their district, either strategically or site specifically, and that any potential impacts continue to be considered and appropriate consultations carried out (including their council) at individual planning application stage.</p>	
<p><b>WEPF-34</b> <b>Dept. of Agriculture, Environment &amp; Rural Affairs (NI)</b></p>	<p><b>1. <u>Natural Environment Division</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) State there are significant areas of ‘open to Consideration’ lands along the NI border and any proposals shall require cross border engagement on transboundary impacts including possible environmental assessment.</li> <li>b) Welcome proposed monitoring and mitigation of environmental effects and are supportive of this provided it is applied transboundary and engagement with NI.</li> <li>c) Welcome that NIS has considered NI sites stating that further AA may be required at project level.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. <u>Marine and Fisheries Division Response</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Notes that variation refers to terrestrial wind energy only. Suggests that land-based windfarms in proximity to the Lough Foyle coast have potential to adversely impact on the marine environment through impacts such as pollution from sedimentation and hydrocarbon spillages (S 7.3.4 of NIR) and noise disturbance.</li> <li>b) Suggest that WE developments have the potential risk of flooding including increased surface water runoff from access roads and hardstands, which in close proximity to the marine could lead to marine pollution.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>1 Natural Environment Division</u></b> Noted and agreed.</p> <p><b><u>2 Marine &amp; Fisheries Division</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The referred recommendation (S7.3.4 of NIR) has been included in Proposed Variation. (Amendment No. 10) as a new Policy E-P-12(2).</li> <li>b) Any application submitted for windfarm development must be assessed in accordance with both the Ministerial Flood Risk Guidelines, and the Wind Energy Development Guidelines and will be subject to environmental assessment at a macro scale.</li> <li>c) Such a buffer was included in the map construction exercise following agreement with the City of Derry Airport officials.</li> <li>d) Noted. The extent of Natura 2000 sites and buffers within NI are mapped in Section 9 of the NIR.</li> </ul> <p>e, f, g Noted. Whilst the retained Natura consultant did not identify such need, these suggestions can be considered should the project proceed to Material Alterations stage.</p> <p><b>4, 5 &amp; 6</b> Noted.</p> <p><b><u>7 Historic Environment Division</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Suggest that Derry City airport buffer extension if extended into the marine area they would have no further comment.</li> <li>d) Welcome that Natura site buffers, cumulative effects and consideration of coastal sites are being used.</li> <li>e) Welcomes consideration of protected marine areas (Table 3 of NIR) and their buffers and suggests the inclusion of the following also: North Antrim Coast SAC; 9 ASSIs; Lough Foyle Ramsar site; all SACs within 100km for grey seals; all SACs within 50km for Common Seals; all SACs within 100km for Harbour porpoise.</li> <li>f) State that figures 3.1 and 3.2 of ER do not show NIs Natura 2000 sites as suggested in the text.</li> <li>g) Section 3.9 of the ER should also consider potential impacts on the Lough Foyle Regional SCA, and the North coast Strands and Dunes Regional SCA.</li> <li><b>3.</b> Makes reference to the following NI/UK legislation and guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</li> <li>b) Marine Strategy Regulation (UK).</li> <li>c) Marine Policy Statement 2011 (UK).</li> <li>d) the draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland (consultation 2018). When adopted all public authorities will be responsible for implementing the Plan through existing regulatory and decision-making processes.</li> <li>e) Wildlife NI Order 1985.</li> <li>f) Conservation (Natural Habitats ETC.) Regulations (NI) 1995.</li> <li>g) Strategic Planning Policy Statement for NI 2015.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Consideration of localised setting of windfarms and the visual asset that is cultural heritage shall be more appropriately assessed at project/ application stage.</li> <li>c) Any application submitted for wind energy shall be subject to detailed consideration and assessment including in depth analysis of transboundary effects.</li> <li>d) Noted.</li> <li>e) Noted.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>h) An integrated Coastal Zone Management Strategy for NI 2006-2026.</li> <li>i) Marine Act (NI) 2013.</li> <li>j) NI Regional Seascape Character Assessment 2014.</li> </ul> <p>4. Agrees with findings of ER.</p> <p>5. Agrees with findings of NIR.</p> <p>6. <u>Historic Environment Division</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Welcome articulation of transboundary impacts in respect of the setting of cultural heritage in section 7.3.8 of the ER.</li> <li>b) Advise that they consider the focus on setting, as a visual asset in relation to heritage asset is narrow and should be broadened to consider the contextual setting.</li> <li>c) Consideration of transboundary issues is particularly merited given the distribution of areas 'Open to Consideration' for WE along the border.</li> <li>d) Advise that NI's historic environment digital datasets can be used for future assessments or at project level. Datasets specific to Nis Marine Historic environment, including wrecks can be obtained through a suggested contact.</li> <li>e) Suggest that Strategic Planning Policy Ireland (and datasets) may aid interpretation of their datasets.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>WEPF-35</b> <b>Office of Public Works</b></p>	<p>Submission refers specifically to flooding.</p> <p>1. Highlight that ER (Section 7.3.7) states <i>"...Wind energy development guidelines specifically recommend that such developments demonstrate compliance with the Ministerial Flood Risk Guidelines and are accompanied</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Noted and agreed. Refer Sections 8.1 and Recommendation 1 in Section 11.</li> <li>2 Noted. Such considerations are most appropriately made at the detailed project level stage.</li> </ul>

	<p><i>by detailed flood risk assessments...” and that amendment No.13 (Policy E-P-13) of the Variation reflects this, and pointing out that no such policy exists within the Variation.</i></p> <p><b>2.</b> Should any changes to zoning designations in flood risk areas be made, that a flood risk assessment, at appropriate level of detail, be carried out.</p>	
<p><b>WEPF-303</b> <b>Failte Ireland</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to 2012 &amp; 2018 studies looking at visitor attitudes to windfarms and lists the findings.</li> <li>2. Discusses objectives and policies relating to the current CDP in relation to tourism.</li> <li>3. Welcome statement in Section 1.2.3 of the ER that it is considered beyond reasonable doubt that windfarm applications will require an EIAR and AA at development consent stage.</li> <li>4. Recommend that baseline data include tourism-related assets as illustrated on Map 9.1 of the current CDP.</li> <li>5. Recommends that ER consider the Regional Seascape Character Assessment.</li> <li>6. Recommend that EPOs in Table 7.1 be updated to include tourism assets as an environmental component.</li> <li>7. Recommends that summary assessment matrix, table 7.2 be updated to include Chapter 9 of the CDP.</li> <li>8. Refer to Section 7 of the ER ‘Assessment of likely effects on the Environment’, and that many issues listed would be of interest and importance to tourism. The impact on tourism is not however specifically stated, and they recommend that impact on tourism be considered specifically in the contents of the ER.</li> </ol>	<p><b>1, 2, 3</b> Noted.</p> <p><b>4-11</b> Noted. Landscape is very strongly referenced and considered in the Environmental Report. However, the advice of Failte Ireland in relation to the broader tourism offering in the County is acknowledged and this will be considered should environmental assessment of Material Alterations, should they transpire, be required.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Supports sustainable development of renewable energy at appropriate locations and in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.</li> <li>10. Supportive of the ER approach.</li> <li>11. Suggest that omission of Tourism and identified tourism assets may lead to a perception that windfarms are open to consideration within tourist areas particularly around the coast. Recommend that these assets are identified and incorporated into the mapping and assessment process to ensure tourism is protected as an essential part of the tourism economy.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>WEPF-311</b> <b>Irish Water</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Principal issue is around wind energy developments having ensuring that existing or planned Irish Water assets and drinking water sources are protected and access is maintained at all times. A key concern is impacts on contributing water source catchments and maintaining security of supply.</li> <li>2. Observed that the catchment for the Illies water treatment plant sources is open to consideration, this is a major water source supplying the regional growth centre of Letterkenny. The catchment of the source is categorised by peaty soils that may be susceptible to landslides.</li> <li>3. State that WE developments should also have regard to ongoing and planned IW projects, and to the potential impacts of assimilative capacity.</li> <li>4. State that new/temporary connections require a connections charge and any proposals that would require diversion or alteration as a result of proposed development, a diversion agreement</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is considered that there is sufficient protection at this strategic level. Proposed Policy E-P-12 (Ref 9 of the Proposed Variation) 2(c) makes specific reference to water quality. Chapter 5.2 of the existing CDP contains overarching objectives and policies pertaining to Water within which any application for windfarms must also be assessed. In addition, Section 7.3.4 of the ER that was published alongside the Variation assessed the potential impact on the water resource as a result of the implementation of the Variation.</li> <li>2, 3) At the project level, it is agreed that the concerns of IW must be fully recognised and relevant environmental impact assessment reports should ensure such issues are addressed with sufficient robustness.</li> <li>4) This shall be an implementation issue at application stage.</li> </ol>

	shall be required. This shall be an implementation issue at application stage.	
<p><b>WEPF-312 Northern and Western Regional Assembly;</b></p> <p><b>WEPF-340 OPR;</b></p> <p><b>WEPF-69 Department of the Environment, Climate Action and Communications (DECC) Planning Advisory Division</b></p>	<p>The comments of these bodies all express serious concerns around the general policy direction contained in the Proposed Variation. They advise that it is inconsistent with/contrary to national policy and legislation as the combined effect of the ten times tip height setback combined with Map 8.2.1 will be very prohibitive for new windfarm development.</p> <p>In this context, the following key specific ‘failings’ are referenced:</p> <p><u>Incorrect Application of Guidelines</u> It is advised that the Wind Energy Guidelines, 2006 and Interim Guidelines, 2017 are the operable guidelines, and thus that the Draft Wind Energy Guidelines 2019 and the SPPRs contained therein (as referenced in the Proposed Variation) have been incorrectly applied.</p> <p><u>Setback Distances</u> Given that there is no mandatory setback distance in the operative Guidelines, the Authority is strongly urged/recommended/advised to omit the ten times tip height policy contained in the Proposed Variation.</p> <p><u>Map 8.2.1</u> Concerns expressed regarding the extent of areas designated as Not Normally Permissible. The OPR references the Lifford-Stranorlar area and Moderately High and Moderately Low landslide susceptibility areas in this regard.</p>	<p>These comments are central to the decisions now facing the Authority. The Report references these concerns in some detail and makes strong recommendations on foot of same.</p> <p>These concerns were previously expressed by the GSI. The Authority did attempt to allay the concerns with the statement in the Introduction document to the effect only that ‘GSI officials were consulted during the preparation of the Proposed Variation’ (Row 10, table 2 refers). This statement can be reviewed further to add further clarity if necessary.</p>

Calculation of Potential Renewable Energy Output As A Contribution To The National Renewable Energy Target

Failure of the Variation to outline how its implementation will contribute to realising the overall targets on renewable energy and climate change mitigation, in particular WE production and potential WE resource expressed in MW is contrary to the requirements of a (mandatory) Special Planning Policy Requirement.

**Arising from these concerns the OPR makes strong recommendations as follows:**

- (i) Indicate how Proposed Variation will contribute to meeting national renewable energy targets and climate change mitigation, in particular WE production and potential WE resource in MW.**
- (ii) Omit set-back distance under policy E-P-23 and E-P-24.**
  
- (i) Omit the Lifford-Stranorlar MD area at risk of landslides; and**
- (ii) Omit Moderately High and Moderately Low landslide susceptibility areas from the Not Normally Permissible designation in Map 8.2.1.**

Geological Survey of Ireland Reference

States that text in Table 1 of the Introduction document makes it appear GSI were consulted on the inclusion of

<p>landslide susceptibility mapping in 'not normally permissible areas' and refers to their letter dated 06/01/22 in which GSI state they did not advise nor perform the analysis and within the Variation it appears as though this was made by the resolution by members. A list of points of clarification are made regarding GSIs landslide susceptibility mapping.</p> <p>GSI submission to the council dated 06/01/22 is appended to the submission.</p>	
--	--

## APPENDIX G: Register of Submissions

The table below catalogues the names of all parties that made submissions and allocates a ref. no. against each. These ref. nos. are used throughout the report, particularly in Appendices C-F.

Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name
WEPF-01	Margo Goman	WEPF-21	James Osborne and Caitríona Ní Shúilleabháin Osborne	WEPF-41	Danny O'Dwyer
WEPF-02	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	WEPF-22	Mary Shovlin	WEPF-42	Kurt Lohse
WEPF-03	EPA	WEPF-23	Michael Ward	WEPF-43	Gabriele Lohse
WEPF-04	Susan Ajmi	WEPF-24	Michael Ward	WEPF-44	Ben Austin
WEPF-05	Edward Gallagher	WEPF-25	Scott Duncan	WEPF-45	Mark Cannon
WEPF-06	Department of Education	WEPF-26	Eithne Ní Ghallchobhair	WEPF-46	Dr Christopher P. Fowler and Ms Elizabeth McDonagh
WEPF-07	Joseph McCole	WEPF-27	Scarlet Fahy	WEPF-47	Anne Alvey
WEPF-08	Chris Povey	WEPF28	Brendan Gallagher-	WEP-48	Finn Valley Wind Action
WEPF-09	Tara Burstall	WEPF-29	Derry City & Strabane District Council	WEPF-49	Louise Howard
WEPF-10	Sandra Miller	WEPF-30	Dunkineely Community Ltd	WEPF-50	Seamus McMenamin
WEPF-11	Janet Deane	WEPF-31	Charlene McClintock	WEPF-51	Mary Cunningham
WEPF-12	Georgina Boyd	WEPF-32	Bettina Bartmann	WEPF-52	Neil Mc Cormick
WEPF-13	Dean Newton and Scott Duncan	WEPF-33	Olive Mc Govern	WEPF-53	Laura McMenamin
WEPF-14	Anne McSharry	WEPF-34	DAERA	WEPF-54	Bernadette O'Brien
WEPF-15	Malcolm Morrow	WEPF-35	OPW	WEPF-55	Bríd O'Brien
WEPF-16	Agnes Doolan	WEPF-36	Louis and Joan Hanlon	WEPF-56	P. J. O'Brien
WEPF-17	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	WEPF-37	Gerd and Helga Albers	WEPF-57	Patricia O'Brien
WEPF-18	Mary Crumlish	WEPF-38	Elaine Steel	WEPF-58	Patrick O'Brien
WEPF-19	Carolyn Robinson	WEPF-39	Richard Tobin	WEPF-59	Brendan O'Brien
WEPF-20	W J Robinson	WEPF-40	Caoilin O'Dwyer	WEPF-60	Karen O'Brien

Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name
WEPF-61	Bella Gallen	WEPF-90	Patricia Bradley	WEPF-119	Michael Melley
WEPF-62	Áoife Gallen	WEPF-91	Bláthnaid Deeny	WEPF-120	Louise Melley
WEPF-63	Patrick Gallen	WEPF-92	Eithne and Des Turley	WEPF-121	Katie Melley
WEPF-64	Óisín Gallagher	WEPF-93	Niall Gallen	WEPF-122	Ciaran Mc Devitt
WEPF-65	Marcella Gallagher	WEPF-94	Mervyn Norris	WEPF-123	Hannah Mc Devitt
WEPF-66	Conor Gallagher	WEPF-95	Jim Harley	WEPF-124	Mary Mc Devitt
WEPF-67	John McKelvey	WEPF-96	Kathleen Harron	WEPF-125	Francis Mc Devitt
WEPF-68	Mary McKelvey	WEPF-97	Mary Mc Loone	WEPF-126	Sandra Johnston
WEPF-69	Dept of the Environment, Climate and Communications (DECC)	WEPF-98	Patrick Mc Loone	WEPF-127	Séamus Ó Gallchoir
WEPF-70	Karen McCready	WEPF-99	Francis Mc Loone	WEPF-128	Gráinne Mc Polin
WEPF-71	Daniel Elliott	WEPF-100	Anne Mc Loone	WEPF-129	Luke Mc Polin
WEPF-72	Craig Andrews	WEPF-101	Roisin Mc Loone	WEPF-130	Michael Mc Polin
WEPF-73	Annie Quinn	WEPF-102	Lorraine Mc Loone	WEPF-131	Sean Mc Polin
WEPF-74	Andrew Ellard	WEPF-103	Keith Boileau	WEPF-132	Ruth Mc Polin
WEPF-75	Stephen and Patricia Bradley	WEPF-104	Charlotte Mc Loone O'Connor	WEPF-133	Cormac Mc Polin
WEPF-76	Derek Vial	WEPF-105	Paul O'Connor	WEPF-134	John P Mc Loone
WEPF-77	Eileen Hynes	WEPF-106	Seamus O'Connor	WEPF-135	Catherine Mc Loone
WEPF-78	Martin O'Brien	WEPF-107	Mary Gallagher	WEPF-136	Isabell Boileau
WEPF-79	Ruth O'Brien	WEPF-108	James Gallagher	WEPF-137	Charlotte Boileau
WEPF-80	Michael McGeehan	WEPF-109	Bridget Melley	WEPF-138	Jack Boileau
WEPF-81	Enya Alvey	WEPF-110	Breege Melley	WEPF-139	Pat Mc Loone
WEPF-82	Colleen Quigley	WEPF-111	Shaun Melley	WEPF-140	Mairead Mc loone
WEPF-83	Andrea Quigley	WEPF-112	John Melley	WEPF-141	Jamesey Ward
WEPF-84	Darren Howard	WEPF-113	Ethna Mc Loone	WEPF-142	Bernie Donoghue
WEPF-85	Cyndi Graham	WEPF-114	Patrick J. Mc Loone	WEPF-143	Aileen Boyle
WEPF-86	Thomas McLaughlin	WEPF-115	Ethna Mc Loone	WEPF-144	Philomena Boyle
WEPF-87	Joseph Brennan	WEPF-116	John Mc Loone	WEPF-145	Dermot O'Donnell
WEPF-88	ESB	WEPF-117	Maria Mc Loone	WEPF-146	Felix Jackson
WEPF-89	John Kalf	WEPF-118	Danny Melley	WEPF-147	Darren Whelan

Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name
WEPF-148	Patricia O'Donnell	WEPF-178	Les Winters	WEPF-208	Mairéad Mac Loone
WEPF-149	Lisa Coughlan	WEPF-179	Martin Bonner	WEPF-209	John J Mac Loone
WEPF-150	Colette Gallagher	WEPF-180	Suzanne Bonner	WEPF-210	Rónán Galvin
WEPF-151	Conell Gallagher	WEPF-181	Catherine Campbell	WEPF-211	Deborah Ricklin
WEPF-152	Janet Mc Gill	WEPF-182	Patricia Sharkey	WEPF-212	E. A. O'Connor
WEPF-153	Patrick Mc Gill	WEPF-183	Kieran Weir	WEPF-213	T. M. Ellard
WEPF-154	Siobhan Browne	WEPF-184	Peter Campbell	WEPF-214	John J. Mc Nelis
WEPF-155	Rosaleen McElhinney	WEPF-185	Brid Moy	WEPF-215	Rosaleen Mc Nelis
WEPF-156	Damien McElhinney	WEPF186	Cliona Boyle	WEPF-216	Condy Campbell
WEPF-157	C R Nethercoat	WEPF-187	Sandra Andrews	WEPF-217	Anne Mulhern
WEPF-158	Pat McGrath	WEPF-188	Vincent Carroll	WEPF-218	Dr R. J. Cooke
WEPF-159	Catherine Boyle	WEPF-189	Sandra Andrews	WEPF-219	Sheila Coyle
WEPF-160	Hayley Coughlan	WEPF-190	Sharon Browne	WEPF-220	Eunan O'Donnell
WEPF-161	Ciaran O'Connor	WEPF-191	Anne Marie Maguire	WEPF-221	Annie Gallagher
WEPF-162	Brenda McElhinney	WEPF-192	John Maguire	WEPF-222	John J Higgins
WEPF-163	Kevin McLaughlin	WEPF-193	Dona Hanlon	WEPF-223	Mary Higgins
WEPF-164	Caolan Mc Clintock	WEPF-194	Siobhan Sharkey	WEPF-224	Frankie Quinn
WEPF-165	William Mc Clintock	WEPF-195	Michael Devine	WEPF-225	Stephen Coughlan
WEPF-166	Bernard McLaughlin	WEPF-196	Rose B. McCready	WEPF-226	Sean Coughlan
WEPF-167	Patrick Gallinagh	WEPF-197	Francise McGeehan	WEPF-227	Emily Browne
WEPF-168	Mary Gallinagh	WEPF-198	Margaret McGeehan	WEPF-228	Joseph Browne
WEPF-169	Teresa Muldoon	WEPF-199	Grainne Sharkey	WEPF-229	Malinda Jackson
WEPF-170	Michael Muldoon	WEPF-200	Jonathan Craig	WEPF-230	Alex Jackson
WEPF-171	James Muldoon	WEPF-201	Frankie Devine	WEPF-231	Olivia Bowman
WEPF-172	James E Muldoon	WEPF-202	Pat Gallagher	WEPF-232	Pat Bowman
WEPF-173	Chris Mc Laughlin	WEPF-203	John Quinn	WEPF-233	Jillian Furey
WEPF-174	Kathleen O'Dwyer	WEPF-204	Caroline Quinn	WEPF-234	Donna Furey
WEPF-175	Daniel Sharkey	WEPF-205	T. Devine	WEPF-235	Debbie Furey
WEPF-176	Patrick Carroll	WEPF-206	Hughie Quinn	WEPF-236	Mary Furey
WEPF-177	Moira Miller	WEPF-207	Risteárd Mac Loone	WEPF-237	Cheryl Quinn

Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name
WEPF-238	Michael Quinn	WEPF-265	Kelly Donaghue	WEPF-291	Pat Harrold
WEPF-239	Fonda Boyle	WEPF-266	Noreen Trearty	WEPF-292	Carl Scanlon
WEPF-240	Maria Boyle	WEPF-267	Hugo Trearty	WEPF-293	E Scanlon
WEPF-241	Mary Maume	WEPF-268	Eugene Trearty	WEPF-294	Kathleen Byrne
WEPF-242	Kevin Maume	WEPF-269	Myra Trearty	WEPF-295	Martin Byrne
WEPF-243	Chris Boughtow	WEPF-270	Margaret Duffy	WEPF-296	Marie Scanlon
WEPF-244	Maureen Keeney	WEPF-271	Treasa Mc Laughlin	WEPF-297	Damien Scanlon
WEPF-245	Mary Keeney	WEPF-272	Deirdre Trearty	WEPF-298	M & F Scanlon
WEPF-246	Anne Marie O'Donnell	WEPF-273	Orla Trearty	WEPF-299	Edward Byrne
WEPF-247	Charles Nethercoat	WEPF-274	Christina Kelly	WEPF-300	John Conaghan
WEPF-248	Jennier Furey	WEPF-275	John Duffy	WEPF-301	Michael McGlinchey
WEPF-249	Elaine Boyle	WEPF-276	James Trearty	WEPF-302	John Brennan
WEPF-250	Cathy Browne	WEPF-277	Benny Trearty	WEPF-303	Fáilte Ireland
WEPF-251	Catriona Mc Elhinney	WEPF-278	Dec Mc Hugh	WEPF-304	Gweebarra Conservation Group
WEPF-252	Aodhan Browne	WEPF-279	Nicole Rankin	WEPF-305	Gildea Family
WEPF-253	Patrick Browne	WEPF-280	Clohie Bradley	WEPF-306	The Altnapaste Landowners Committee submitted by Conall Newman
WEPF-254	Conal Shovlin	WEPF-281	Dan Mc Laughlin	WEPF-307	Michael Kennealy
WEPF-255	Michael Trearty	WEPF-282	Christine Soames	WEPF-308	Alan Cunningham
WEPF-256	Mattie Trearty	WEPF-283	Richard Soames	WEPF-309	Joyce Norris
WEPF-257	Sarah Trearty	WEPF-284	April Soames	WEPF-310	Canavan Associates
WEPF-258	Marty Donaghue	WEPF-285	Paul Soames	WEPF-311	Irish Water
WEPF-259	Finnola Bradley	WEPF-286	James R. Osborne and Caitríona Osborne	WEPF-312	Northern & Western Regional Assembly
WEPF-260	Shaun Bradley	WEPF-287	Ava Harrold	WEPF-313	Cloghercor Wind Farm Ltd. submitted by Tobin Consulting Engineers
WEPF-261	Hugh Trearty	WEPF-288	Ryan Harrold	WEPF-314	Martin Ferry
		WEPF-289	Caroline Soames Harrold	WEPF-315	Martin Ferry
WEPF-263	Hugh Kelly	WEPF-290	Jonathan Soames	WEPF-316	Mulmosog Wind Ltd submitted by Conall Newman
WEPF-264	Paul Mc Laughlin				

Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name	Ref No.	Name
WEPF-317	Gineadoir Gaoithe Teroranta submitted by Conall Newman	WEPF-326	James McCarron	WEPF-335	Clr Micheál Choilm Mac Giolla Easbuig
WEPF-318	ProVENTO Ireland submitted by Canavan Associates	WEPF-327	Graffy Environmental Group	WEPF-336	Aught Wind Ltd submitted by Canavan Associates
WEPF-319	Statkraft Ireland Ltd	WEPF-328	Barbara Bradby	WEPF-337	Inishgaoth Ltd submitted by Canavan Associates
WEPF-320	Wind Park Systems Ltd	WEPF-329	Colm Shovlin and Anne Shovlin	WEPF-338	Inishgaoth Ltd submitted by Canavan Associates
WEPF-321	Fahan Wind submitted by Canavan Associates	WEPF-330	George Sproule	WEPF-339	Garrymore Wind Ltd Inishgaoth Ltd submitted by Canavan Associates
WEPF-322	TCR Wind submitted by Canavan Associates	WEPF-331	Esther Heekin Gallen	WEPF-340	Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR)
WEPF-323	Wind Energy Ireland	WEPF-332	Francie Gallen	WEPF-341	Jonathan Soames
WEPF-324	Future Energy Ireland	WEPF-333	Patrick Gallen	WEPF-342	Claire Soames
WEPF-325	Planree Ltd submitted by MKO	WEPF-334	Patricia Moloney		