

TCP/11/16(303)
Planning Application 13/01905/FLL - Erection of two wind turbines on land 1300 metres south east of Tombuie Cottage, Bolfracks, Amulree

REPRESENTATIONS

- Objection from Mr Andrew Vivers, dated 19 October 2013
- Objection from Mr David Dowse, dated 24 October 2013
- Representation from Historic Scotland, dated 30 October 2013
- Representation from Biodiversity Officer, dated 31 October 2013
- Representation from Scottish Water, dated 31 October 2013
- Representation from Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust, dated 5 November 2013
- Representation from Regulatory Services Manager, dated 6 November 2013
- Representation from Ministry of Defence, dated 7 November 2013
- Representation from Transport Planning, dated 7 November 2013
- Representation from NATS, dated 12 December 2013

Mr andrew viviers (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Sat 19 Oct 2013

I write to object to this application.

In August 2013, the United Nations Economic Commission Europe (UNECE) declared that the UK government (NREAP) violates the laws that transpose the Aarhus Convention into the UK legal framework, in that it is not the public have not been given full access to information on the established unacceptable negative impacts that have been given decision-making powers over their approval.

For this reason alone there should be an immediate moratorium on all wind turbine applications and decision

Also, a recent ruling by Lady Clark of Calton has deemed that unless applicants have the relevant OFGEM licence incompetent (unlawful), and planning consent should not be given.

Lady Clark argues that this applies to almost all turbines.

Further to the above, the term 'Wind Farm' is a disingenuous spin on the words 'farm' and 'farming'.

My dictionary describes 'farming' as: 'the husbandry or cultivation of animals, plants, fungi and other life forms in order to sustain human life.'

Wind turbine applications often state that the turbine(s) are required for farming diversification. This is obviously a sterilisation of huge areas of land and sea.

When two or more turbines are gathered together, it should be called a wind factory.

Firstly, wind turbines are certainly not life forms, and therefore it can not be a farm nor farming.

And secondly, there is no conclusive evidence that they sustain human life, or the lives of any other life form killed by the impact of a blade or suffer internal haemorrhaging and death).

In fact the opposite is probably true.

For example, there is mounting evidence that the end result of wind turbine manufacture and use is an increase in evidence that wind turbine use is harmful to humans, livestock, and other life forms.

In the last 12 months approximately 100 million birds and bats were killed world wide by wind turbines. It is evident when their lung capillaries rupture as a result of the pressure changes near turning blades. Only around 10% (Small turbines are also lethal to bats and birds as they are usually sited near buildings that provide roosting

There is also growing concern over the stress, internal haemorrhaging, birth defects and still births, of livestock. The same harmful affects are no doubt occurring to our wild life, and other life forms.

Humans are reported to suffer depression, dizziness and insomnia and I am sure that internal haemorrhaging can go by.

I understand that in recent years there has been an acknowledged and unexplained increase in cases of insomnia. There have been two large wind turbines operating in Dundee since 2006.

The harm is caused by emissions of both ground hugging Infrasound, and Low Frequency Noise. These are the symptoms), have a range of around 10km, and are mostly at vibrations below the human hearing range. It is a military interrogation aid and weapon.

From my own observations, hares, which live and breed on open ground, would appear to be one of the first

haemorrhaging and death out to a distance of at least 5km.

With regard to the effect of off-shore wind factories on marine life, we can be sure that it is considerable. Wal fish have the ability to detect minute pressure changes (0.5%), and in some cases down to less than 1mb (m about 1,013 mb.

Also, I fail to see how the quarrying and transport of huge quantities of granite and other stone in order to sta emmissions.

Recently, the cities of Kolding and S?nderborg in Denmark decided to not erect further wind turbines (in their the health impacts on neighbours is settled.

Mr Mauri Johansson (Specialist in Community and Occupational Medicine) recently stated that: "During the l done the same, in spite of strong pressure from government. They are not satisfied with the noise regulations done concerning the effects of wind turbines on health.

Last year, retired Danish High Court judge Peter Roerdam stated that wind power is ?an industry which has 1 Mauri Johansson has this year added that: ?It is clear the institutional political corruption, and the lack of prof acousticians and public health researchers, who ignore or deny the existence of the sleep and health proble health, is not limited to Denmark.?

Indeed, in 1987 a report, led by N.D.Kelley from the Solar Energy Research Institute in Colorado, found ?imp report has been ignored for 25 years.

Wind electricity is one of the most expensive forms of electricity to be produced. Each turn of a blade adds to abysmal efficiencies. It has been calculated that the average turbine only produces between 15 - 28% of its r electricity produced per square kilometre, or cubic kilometre, of a wind factory is equally abysmal.

The way these huge costs (Renewables Obligation [RO], Feed In Tariffs [FIT], extra pylon and infrastructure added to our electricity bills, and the profits kept by a select few, is worse than the illegal chain letter scam.

I say worse because one has to actually ?opt in? to be scammed by a chain letter. This is not the case with v contact all electricity users and ask them if they wish to pay for wind electricity - and if so, could they tick the electricity could then be proportioned fairly between those willing and able to pay for it.

Even small turbines increase our electricity prices, since turbines up to 6KW can be very easily connected to (through FITs for example).

I understand that thousands of diesel generators are being prepared all over Britain to provide emergency ba National Grid collapsing.

Under this hugely costly scheme, the National Grid is set to pay up to 12 times the normal wholesale market wholesale price for electricity is around ?50 per megawatt hour (MWh) but diesel-generator owners will be pe be paid enormous sums for just having them available to be switched on.

Any suggestions that:

1. ?because there are already turbines or pylons in the area, then it is somehow OK to compound the proble a problem by creating an even bigger problem.
2. ?because there is already a commercial business in the area and therefore it is somehow OK to compoun ludicrous. Why enhance an eye sore with an even larger eye sore?
3. ?if we have to have wind factories, then this is as good a place as any to have one? is again ludicrous. We should have to have anything; particularly when it is against the wish of the majority of the population. There against wind turbines as there are for them. One thing is certain though, those against are growing rapidly as

cost, both financially and environmentally, of wind turbines, be they individual or factory units.

4. the county has somehow missed out on ?tens of millions of pounds worth of investment money? by the rejection again, ludicrous. Very little of that supposed investment would ever benefit the county, as is proven time and probably the fencing contractor!

5. communities would somehow gain from the so-called Community Fund, or ?community bribe? as more an there is an argument that this is merely another disingenuous misleading spin. The value of the ?bribe? is often exemptions a landowner receives for having a wind factory on his land, and therefore the net gain to local communities

6. jobs would be increased by this application is misleading, if not ludicrous. The majority of the workforce in turbines comes from abroad, and if the American example is anything to go by, any UK jobs come at a cost because they are not ?green? jobs anyway, since they cause harm to humans and the environment, and raise CO2 emissions

7. it is somehow ?OK? to empty properties and effectively sterilise huge areas of the Scotland so that wind farms of the Highland Clearances. We have much to be proud of in our history with our determination to fight for, and an energy policy is certainly not something to be proud of.

8. there is a silent majority in favour of wind turbines - that harm their neighbours and cause great financial hardship electricity bills, is yet again, ludicrous. The silent majority are silent because they have not been told about the that wind turbines and wind factories cause. This comment is supported by the UNEC decision mentioned at

Any arrangement which pays millions of pounds to wind factories to NOT produce electricity when the wind is a business, I dread to think where the money would come from to pay for all the surplus production and service

Should Scotland gain its independence, one wonders if the electricity users of the rest of Great Britain will contribute Scottish wind power, even if it is later sold back to them at a ridiculously reduced price. If not, and if these contributions will cause great hardship, financial difficulty, fuel poverty and bankruptcy to many people and businesses in the footsteps of countries like Spain and others who have fallen for the wind power scam. (Spain is a particularly guaranteed subsidies, Spanish electricity users have been saddled with ?126bn of obligations to renewable-energy

In theory would take about 1,500 wind turbines of around 100m tall spread over 20km² to produce the same station ? even then the wind farm could not provide a steady supply. Wind varies considerably, and thus the cover over 100sq km with turbines to possibly provide something near the power from one power station.

Another way of looking at it: if we are to achieve this energy policy, nearly 40% of rural Scotland will be covered rural Scotland will be within 2km of a turbine).

In Denmark there are over 6000 turbines for 5.4m people, yet wind power only counts for less than 19% of the closure of any power stations, and they have one of the highest electricity prices in Europe.

Germany has the most expensive electricity in Europe and it is estimated that up to 800,000 German households couldn't pay the country's rising electricity bills.

In the UK there are around 5 million households that are struggling to pay their ever rising electricity bills (many With the potential increase in wind turbines, it has been forecast that by 2017, the rapidly rising UK electricity

German CO2 emissions have been rising for two years in a row as coal is experiencing a renaissance, and that provide power when there is no wind or sun ? usually in the winter when the power is most needed.

CO2 emissions in the EU as a whole are likely to rise because of increased coal burning at power stations. The import of vast amounts of wood, from countries such as America, to power biomass power stations can reduce CO2 emissions, and no doubt will cause further unnecessary price increases for our electricity.

There are very few good wind turbines. By good I mean ones which comply with a few simple, common-sense

- a) where the electricity produced helps to supplement the power requirements of the landowner without taking the country to do so;
- b) where they do not cause continuous harm to humans and other life forms;
- c) where the CO2 emissions caused by the construction, erection and maintenance of the turbines is accurately decreased), is justified;
- d) where the loss of revenue to other local businesses caused by the location of the turbines is justified.

If one applies just these few criteria to wind factories, then there are no good wind factories, either onshore or offshore (as offshore factories are considerably greater than onshore factories), and very few good turbines.

If we are to have renewable energy providers for our national requirements, then we should be considering solar power at more than 30% efficiency, do no harm, and help save the environment. Wind power can never achieve this.

On a more personal level, we run a holiday cottage business, and many of our visitors have stated that, with wind turbines. This will greatly affect our livelihood and many other businesses in the area which rely on tourism. This applies to other areas of the country.

I urge you not to allow the country to be invaded by these turbines.

Let common-sense prevail, reject this application, and help save the country for future generations.

I would like at this stage to add that:

1. The Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) wind farm map for August 2013 <http://www.snh.gov.uk/docs/A105508> has no definition of what it is mapping (ie, what SNH consider a wind farm), and should not be used for any analysis. SNH state that 'we seek to map all developments of more than 1 turbine' but we aren't consulted on all of them, actually within the system. So, a single turbine over 100m high, or even a cluster of 'single turbines' might therefore be a totally useless map as most Councils will verify by a quick comparison with their own maps and data. If SNH use information such as this for their consultations, it suggests that their consultations and recommendations are flawed.

2. Paragraphs 4.15 to 4.21 of: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/07/03153034/7> states that there must be suitable representations.

This is a totally inadequate timescale to allow the public to raise suitable site/application specific representations, family schedules, and it is difficult to find the time to:

- a. find out about turbine applications in the area - especially when the applicants only notify the minimum positions highlighted as being most affected according to their own proposal documentation.
- b. find, read and understand the application documentation.
- c. find, read and understand any planning legislation or regulations for wind turbines.
- d. prepare and submit a suitable site specific representation.

It also does not allow for incidents when people may be away on holiday, or for work or health reasons.

3. Similarly, the 20m boundary notification is totally inadequate since:

- a. a turbine could be built that could potentially topple onto a neighbouring property.
- b. neighbouring property could be at risk of ice or turbine blade throw.
- c. it does not allow for neighbour notification regarding the very real health risks to humans out to at least 2 km.

- d. it does not allow for neighbour notification regarding the known negative effects on property prices.
- e. it does not allow for neighbour notification regarding the known negative effects on local tourist and other t

A much more responsible solution for Councils would surely be to adopt a minimum of 3 to 4 months deadline (post, not newspaper) of all 'Owner, Lessee or Occupier' at the address of the neighbouring land? within a r more in line with the UNECE decision quoted at the beginning of this objection.

One hopes that Councils and Councillors are actively suggesting something along these lines to Scottish Go

Mr David Dowse (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 24 Oct 2013

The level and detail of ecological survey assessment presented in support of the application is utterly inadequate to the protection status of numerous species and legislative requirements. This can give no confidence in the ornithological survey (e.g. flight activity) was conducted and there is no assessment of collision risk. Surely it (including many of the species identified within SNH guidance as being susceptible to threats from wind turbines) assessment should be completed for a development of this nature.



By E-mail

Planning
Perth and Kinross Council
Pullar House
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD
DevelopmentManagement@pkc.gov.uk

Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

Direct Line: 0131 668 8729
Direct Fax: 0131 668 8722
Switchboard: 0131 668 8600
Catherine.Middleton@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Our ref: HGG/A/TC/161
Our Case ID: 201304342
Your ref: 13/01905/FLL

30 October 2013

Dear Sirs

Town And Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Land 1300 Metres South East Of Tombuie Cottage, Bolfracks, Amulree

Thank you for your consultation dated 17 October which we received on 17 October.

We have considered your consultation for the erection of two wind turbines and comment as follows:

The proposed turbines (45m to blade tip) are located just to the south of the Taymouth Castle designed landscape, which is included in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in recognition of its national importance. We are satisfied that the proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact on either the setting of Taymouth Castle (listed at Category A) or the Inventory designed landscape and we do not object.

The turbines will not be visible from the core designed landscape around Taymouth Castle (as illustrated in Viewpoint 5 and the submitted ZTV). Nor will they interfere with the carefully planned visual relationships between built elements of the estate, such as long views from the Castle towards the nearby Kennels Tower, which was designed as an eyecatcher and look-out tower.

We have previously commented on a similar scheme for a single turbine in much closer proximity to the Kennels Tower (your reference 11/01763/FLL) and we are pleased that an alternative, less sensitive location has been identified.

Notwithstanding our comments above, we confirm that your Council should proceed to



determine the application without further reference to us.

If you require any further information, please contact Catherine Middleton.

Yours faithfully

Catherine Middleton

Senior Heritage Management Officer, Strategic Casework

Memorandum

To John Williamson

From David Williamson
Biodiversity Officer

Your ref

Our ref

Date 31 October 2013

Tel No 01738 475278

The Environment Service – Planning & Regeneration

Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth PH1 5GD

John,

13/01905/FLL Erection of two wind turbines Land 1300 Metres South East Of Tombuie Cottage Bolfracks, Amulree

I have considered the information submitted in support of the above application and would like to raise some concerns in relation to the proposal.

The proposal will involve the felling of an area of the existing woodland of around 29.3ha which will have an effect on any species present within the woodland, and there has not been a full ecological survey of the woodland submitted. The chapter on Ecology identifies that Red Squirrels are present but there has been no survey to locate dreys (squirrel homes) within the area to be felled. Without this information it is not possible to assess what impact the proposals will have on Red Squirrels which are European Protected Species. In the Scottish Planning Policy it indicates that if there is evidence to suggest that a protected species is present on site or may be affected by a proposed development, their presence must be established, the requirements of the species factored into the planning and design of the development and any likely impact on the species fully considered prior to the determination of the planning application.

Bearing in mind the number of other wind energy developments in the surrounding area a number of ecological surveys have been carried out, the results of which suggest that there are a number of protected species in the surrounding area, these include Otter, Red Squirrel, Whooper Swan, Kestrel, Hen Harrier, Red Grouse, Short-eared Owl, Black Grouse, Sandpiper, Skylark, Wren, Stonechat and Wheatear.

In paragraph 7.1 of the Environmental report it states that “The turbines would be sited in a young part of the plantation.”, however the accompanying plan shows the turbines in “Mature timber”. The accompanying LVIA Figure 14 shows the area of woodland that will require to be felled which is mature woodland, but not at a stage which I would expect to be ready for harvesting. This conflicting information does not engender any confidence in the quality of the submission for this application.

Before I can make a meaningful response I would require a protected species survey and ornithological survey, both flight and breeding birds surveys for an area covering 500m around the proposed turbines.

David Williamson
Biodiversity Officer

31/10/2013



Perth & Kinross Council
Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

SCOTTISH WATER

Customer Connections
The Bridge
Buchanan Gate Business Park
Cumbernauld Road
Stepps
Glasgow
G33 6FB

Dear Sir Madam

Customer Support Team
T: 0141 414 7660
W: www.scottishwater.co.uk
E: individualconnections@scottishwater.co.uk

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: 13/01905/FLL
DEVELOPMENT: Amulree
OUR REFERENCE: 635107
PROPOSAL: Erection of two wind turbines

Please quote our reference in all future correspondence

Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application. Since the introduction of the Water Services (Scotland) Act 2005 in April 2008 the water industry in Scotland has opened up to market competition for non-domestic customers. Non-domestic Household customers now require a Licensed Provider to act on their behalf for new water and waste water connections. Further details can be obtained at www.scotlandontap.gov.uk.

In some circumstances it may be necessary for the Developer to fund works on existing infrastructure to enable their development to connect. Should we become aware of any issues such as flooding, low pressure, etc the Developer will be required to fund works to mitigate the effect of the development on existing customers. Scottish Water can make a contribution to these costs through Reasonable Cost funding rules.

A totally separate drainage system will be required with the surface water discharging to a suitable outlet. Scottish Water requires a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) as detailed in Sewers for Scotland 2 if the system is to be considered for adoption.

If the connection to public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s). This should be done through a deed of servitude.

Should the developer require information regarding the location of Scottish Water infrastructure they should contact our Property Searches Department, Bullion House, Dundee, DD2 5BB. Tel – 0845 601 8855.

If the developer requires any further assistance or information on our response, please contact me on the above number or alternatively additional information is available on our website: www.scottishwater.co.uk.

Yours faithfully,

Lynsey Horn
Customer Connections Administrator

To:	Development Management
From:	David Strachan, Area Archaeologist
Tel:	01738 477081
Email:	dlstrachan@pkc.gov.uk

Tuesday, 05 November 2013

13/01905/FLL: Erection of two wind turbines, Land 1300 Metres South East Of Tombuie Cottage Bolfracks Amulree for Bolfracks Estate

Thank you for consulting PKHT on this application.

The location of the proposed turbines is in an area considered to have potential for the recovery of archaeological remains given the density of prehistoric archaeology in the locality, for example the spread of cup marked rocks to the north east and north west of the development site. As the development is within forestry, this area has not been subject to archaeological survey however this does not preclude the survival of significant sites. Further, there are a number of archaeological sites situated in close proximity to proposed access tracks through the Bolfracks Estate that may be accidentally impacted upon by construction traffic if not mapped and afforded protection.

It is recommended, therefore, that an archaeological survey by a professional archaeological organisation is carried out prior to the commencement of construction works. This archaeological work – to consist of a desk based assessment and walk over survey – will inform any further mitigation measures required, for example: fencing-off of upstanding remains; micro-siting of the scheme; the need for recording archaeological sites and / or maintaining a watching brief in archaeologically sensitive areas; and / or the reinstatement of historic landscape features. The archaeological survey should include areas to be impacted on by associated infrastructure (e.g. lay-down areas, hard-standing, borrow pits, compounds, cabling routes and access routes) as well as the footprint of the turbines themselves.

In terms of the indirect impact of the development upon the settings of designated and non-designated archaeological sites, PKHT does not consider this application to unduly impact on the historic environment. However it is recommended that Historic Scotland's opinion is sought in regard to the impact of the development on the setting of Scheduled Monuments.

Recommendation:

In line with Scottish Planning Policy historic environment sections 110-11 and 122-4, if planning permission is granted, it is recommended that the following condition for a programme of archaeological works is attached to consent:

No development shall take place within the development site as outlined in red on the approved plan until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant, agreed by Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust, and approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter the developer shall ensure that the programme of archaeological works is fully implemented and that all recording and recovery of archaeological resources within the development site is undertaken to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in agreement with Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust.

Notes:

- 1. Should consent be given, it is important that the developer, or his agent, contact me as soon as possible. I can then explain the procedure of works required and prepared for them written Terms of Reference.**
2. This advice is based on information held on the Perth and Kinross Historic Environment Record. This database of archaeological sites and historic buildings is regularly updated.

Memorandum

To	Development Quality Manager	From	Regulatory Services Manager
Your ref	13/01905/FLL	Our ref	JC/SAL
Date	6 November 2013	Tel No	(01738) 476 464

The Environment Service

Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth PH1 5GD

Consultation on an application for Planning Permission PK13/01905/FLL RE: Erection of two wind turbines Land 1300 Metres South East of Tombuie Cottage Bolfracks Amulree for Boltracks Estate

I refer to your letter dated 17 October 2013 in connection with the above application and have the following comments to make:

Recommendation

I have no objection in principle to the application but recommend the undernoted condition be included on any given consent.

This application for 2 x 250kW wind turbines with 30 metre free standing tower is located around 900 metres to the North West from the closest noise sensitive receptor at Tombuie Cottage. As such there is a potential for loss of amenity here due to increased noise levels arising from this proposal.

The applicant has submitted a Supporting Environmental report with this application and this includes a short chapter on noise. The noise chapter is fairly basic without any background measurements and wind shear calculations but this is acceptable as the predicted noise levels at the closest noise sensitive property is L_{A90} 24.75dB.

Noise from wind farms is assessed in line with ETSU and this sets a lower limit of L_{A90} 35-40dB at noise sensitive properties. Since the noise levels predicted for this development are lower than the lowest level set by ETSU, there is no need for baseline surveys, and I am in a position to support this application however I recommend that the undernoted conditions be attached to any consent.

Conditions

1. Noise arising from the wind turbine shall not exceed an L_{A90} , 10 min of 35 dB at any noise sensitive premises at wind speeds not exceeding 10m/s, and measured at a height of 10m above ground at the wind turbine site, all to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority. In the event of that audible tones are generated by the wind turbine, a 5dB(A) penalty for tonal noise shall be added to the measured noise levels.
2. On a formal written request by the Council as Planning Authority, appropriate measurements and assessment of the noise arising from the wind turbine (carried out in accordance with ETSU report for the DTI - The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (ETSU-R-97) shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the Council as Planning Authority

Water (assessment date – 29 October 13)

Recommendation

I have no objections to the application but recommend the undernoted condition and informative be included in any given consent.

Comments

The development is in a rural area with private water supplies believed to serve properties in the vicinity. To maintain water quality and supply in the interests of residential amenity and ensure the private water supply or septic drainage systems of neighbours of the development remain accessible for future maintenance please note the following condition and informative. No public objections relating to the water supply were noted at the date above.

Condition

Prior to commencement of site works, details of the location and measures proposed for the safeguarding and continued operation, or replacement, of any septic tanks and soakaways / private water sources, private water supply storage facilities and/or private water supply pipes serving properties in the vicinity, sited within and running through the application site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council as Planning Authority. The approved protective or replacement measures shall be put in place before the site works commence and shall be so maintained throughout the period of construction.

Informative 1

The applicant should ensure that any existing wayleaves for maintenance or repair to existing private water supply or septic drainage infrastructure in the development area are honoured throughout and after completion of the development.





Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Debi Parker
Safeguarding Assistant
Ministry of Defence
Safeguarding – Wind Energy
Kingston Road
Sutton Coldfield
West Midlands B75 7RL
United Kingdom

Your Reference: 13/01905/FLL

Telephone [MOD]: +44 (0)121 311 3847

Facsimile [MOD]: +44 (0)121 311 2218

Our Reference: DIO/SUT/43/10/1/ 19295

E-mail: DIOOpsNorth-LMS7a1a1@mod.uk

Perth & Kinross Council
Pullar House
35 Kinoull Street
PERTH PH1 5GD

7th November
2013

Dear Mr Brian

Please quote in any correspondence: 19295

Site Name: Land 1300m SE of Tombuie Cottage

Proposal: Erection of 2 Wind Turbines

Planning Application Number: 13/01905/FLL

Site Address: Bolfracks Amulree

Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above Planning Application in your communication dated 17th October 2013.

I am writing to tell you that the MOD has no objection to the proposal.

The application is for 2 turbines at 45.00 metres to blade tip. This has been assessed using the grid references below as submitted in the planning application or in the developers' or your pro-forma.

Turbine	100km Square Letter	Easting	Northing
1	NN	80003	43802
2	NN	79843	43970

The principal safeguarding concern of the MOD with respect to the development of wind turbines relates to their potential to create a physical obstruction to air traffic movements and cause interference to Air Traffic Control and Air Defence radar installations.

Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding wishes to be consulted and notified of the progression of planning applications and submissions relating to this proposal to verify that it will not adversely affect defence interests.

If planning permission is granted we would like to be advised of the following;

- the date construction starts and ends;
- the maximum height of construction equipment;
- the latitude and longitude of every turbine.

This information is vital as it will be plotted on flying charts to make sure that military aircraft avoid this area.

If the application is altered in any way we must be consulted again as even the slightest change could unacceptably affect us.

I hope this adequately explains our position on the matter. If you require further information or would like to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Further information about the effects of wind turbines on MOD interests can be obtained from the following websites:

MOD: <http://www.mod.uk/DefenceInternet/MicroSite/DIO/WhatWeDo/Operations/ModSafeguarding.htm>

Yours sincerely

Debi Parker
Safeguarding Assistant – Wind Energy
Defence Infrastructure Organisation

SAFEGUARDING SOLUTIONS TO DEFENCE NEEDS



MEMORANDUM

To	John Williamson Planning Officer	From	Niall Moran Transport Planning Technician Transport Planning
Our ref:	NM	Tel No.	Ext 76512
Your ref:	13/01905/FLL	Date	7 November 2013

Pullar House, 35 Kinnoull Street, Perth, PH1 5GD

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997, - ROADS (SCOTLAND) ACT 1984

With reference to the application 13/01905/FLL for planning consent for:- **Erection of two wind turbines Land 1300 Metres South East Of Tombuie Cottage Bolfracks Amulree for Bolfracks Estate**

Insofar as the Roads matters are concerned I do not object to the proposed development provided the conditions indicated below are applied, in the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety.

- Roads and associated works shall be constructed in conformity with the Council's specifications and to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.
- Prior to the commencement of works on the development, the applicant shall submit for the written approval of the Planning Authority a Construction Traffic Management Scheme (TMS) which shall include the following:
 - (a) restriction of construction traffic to approved routes and the measures to be put in place to avoid other routes being used;
 - (b) timing of construction traffic to minimise impact on local communities particularly at school start and finishing times, on days when refuse collection is undertaken, on Sundays and during local events;
 - (c) a code of conduct for HGV drivers to allow for queuing traffic to pass;
 - (d) arrangements for liaison with the Roads Authority regarding winter maintenance;
 - (e) emergency arrangements detailing communication and contingency arrangements in the event of vehicle breakdown;
 - (f) arrangements for the cleaning of wheels and chassis of vehicles to prevent material from construction sites associated with the development being deposited on the road;
 - (g) arrangements for cleaning of roads affected by material deposited from construction sites associated with the development;
 - (h) arrangements for signage at site accesses and crossovers and on roads to be used by construction traffic in order to provide safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians;
 - (i) details of information signs to inform other road users of construction traffic;
 - (j) arrangements to ensure that access for emergency service vehicles are not impeded;
 - (k) co-ordination with other major commercial users known to use roads affected by construction traffic;
 - (l) traffic arrangements in the immediate vicinity of temporary construction compounds;
 - (m) monitoring, reporting and implementation arrangements; and
 - (n) arrangements for dealing with non-compliance.

The TMS as approved shall be strictly adhered to during the entire site construction programme all to the satisfaction of the Council as Planning Authority.

The applicant should be advised that in terms of Section 56 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 he must obtain from the Council as Roads Authority consent to open an existing road or footway prior to the commencement of works. Advice on the disposal of surface water must be sought at the initial stages of design from Scottish Water and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency.

I trust these comments are of assistance.

Audrey Brown - CHX

From: ALLEN, Sarah J <Sarah.ALLEN@nats.co.uk> on behalf of NATS Safeguarding <NATSSafeguarding@nats.co.uk>
Sent: 12 December 2013 08:22
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Your Ref: 13/01905/FLL (Our Ref: W(F)18346)

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NERL (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.

If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NERL in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.

Yours faithfully,

Sarah Allen
Technical Administrator
On behalf of NERL Safeguarding Office

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.
