

Example of Good Practice

Case Study: Good Practice During Wind Farm Construction (4th Edition) (Published Spring 2019)

- 1.1 As advised, this example of good practice was published in the [PPF for 2018/19](#) and the full version is available in pages 15-16 of the published PPF.
- 1.2 The format of PPF case studies is set out in guidance published by the Scottish Government and Heads of Planning Scotland (HoPS). Based on this guidance, the areas of good practice that this case study illustrates are:

Elements of a High Quality Planning Service the Study Relates To:

- Quality of outcomes;
- Quality of service and engagement; and
- Governance.

Scottish Government Key Markers:

- Early collaboration with applicants and consultees (marker 3);
- Continuous improvement (marker 6); and
- Sharing good practice, skills and experience (marker 13)

Key Areas of Work:

- Local Development Plan & Supplementary
- Guidance
- Enforcement
- Interdisciplinary Working
- Collaborative Working
- Skills Sharing

Main Stakeholders Involved:

- Key Agencies (including Scottish Natural Heritage); and
- Renewable Industry Developers

Overview

- 1.3 A collaborative working group led by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) which included industry and other stakeholders already existed to develop [best practice guidance](#) on windfarm construction. The Local Authority liaises with the developer and stakeholder consultees throughout the planning application process and is the conduit through which an overview of the implementation

of this guidance is secured. PKC were invited to join this group due to our 'hands on' approach to monitoring implementation of these developments.

Goals

- 1.4 From PKC's perspective, the delivery of windfarm proposals has greatest impact during construction where there is interaction with the public - on the public road. From our experience, a significant volume of complaints during construction are as a result of impact on the public road. The 3rd edition of the good practice document was light on traffic management and the opportunity to secure a fairer and more robust approach to alleviate the concerns of the public, local businesses and the Council was presented through the working group. The 4th edition sets out a reasonable approach which protects both the developer and the Local Authority and advises on steps to minimise impact on the road network and thereby the public.
- 1.5 Further, we also provided general commentary with photographs on other areas of the document with regard to construction methods, surface water management, archaeology and forestry operations as well as post construction reinstatement. Model informatives relating to the timing of development and further survey information being required where commencement of development is delayed have also been framed.
- 1.6 The lead officer for SNH, on receipt of our comments, stated:
"This is great feedback. Thanks for taking the time to put this together".

Outcomes

- 1.7 The development of good practice documentation is continuous. There are always new methods being developed and generally this is driven by economy or necessity. We have found that industry feedback is a 'cost' analysis where stakeholders and Local Authorities are more driven by necessity. Generally, 'Good Practice' must be a consideration of both and a compromise in relation to each. It must be emphasised to developers that good practice in construction will deliver better outcomes in restoration which could ultimately save money as well as being better for the environment and ecology.