

Question 1(a)

Please provide specific information on the comments you submitted to the decision-making for (a) the Carraig Gheal wind farm....and show how your comments were not considered in the decisions taken.

The Communicant submitted its comments on the application for the Carraig Gheal wind farm (CGWF) in a single document dated in November 2005. There are twelve chapters. A follow up letter was sent on 6 May 2006. These are attached.

The local planning authority's response (Argyll and Bute Council) was first to be found in reports to its Public Service and Licensing Committee dated 8 March and 5 April 2006.

The decision of Scottish Ministers is to be found in their decision letter dated 13 June 2008, and an accompanying Consent dated the same day.

Having regard to the following issues, this table sets out the issues on which submissions were made, and shows the decision maker's response.

	ISSUE	COMMENT/CONCERN expressed by AKCC	HOW RESPONDED TO/NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT
1	Visual amenity	Very large scale, dominant and uncharacteristic feature radically changing landscape character of Loch Awe and environs.	No landscape analysis in the decision – no idea what was taken into account. A quote from PAN 45 says, without any reference to local conditions, that it sets out good practice including siting in the landscape; society <u>must accept</u> turbines as a feature of many areas of Scotland for the foreseeable future; but nothing further.
2	Effects on people	Effects in Inverinan; noise; possible water supply pollution; social division and conflict; and use of "lifeline road."	para. 12-14 simply refers to SEPA's work; survey to be carried out and if mitigation required details should be submitted

			and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No analysis of the severity of the concern or the adequacy of possible mitigation.
3	Environment and ecology	Otter spraint; fish spawning grounds; lack of supervision and enforcement by SEPA; destruction of peatlands; possible peatslides	para 21; addressed by licencing process (SNH); nothing on fish or spawning; regulated by conditions. Ornithological impacts dealt with bird monitoring i.e. after construction. No preventative measure considered.
4	Noise	Reservations about methodology adopted which relies on a calculated contour map; noise power output not yet known as no turbines selected; failure to assess LFN; history of noise impacts at other locations causing distress despite developer's reassurances	Minimise disturbance to community by conditions 6.6 and 6.50 to 6.54; no conditions on LFN. No independent noise analysis, simply a set of conditions providing a complaints mechanism.
5	Tourism	Important to Argyll as major industry and employer; 26% of repeat visitors will avoid WF; effect on Bed and Breakfast businesses	PAN 45 notes important contribution of tourism and suggests it should be reconciled with need to promote RE generation. There is no analysis. Without analysis , how can these two factors be reconciled?
6	Effects on local water supply	PWS is located 1.5km from closest turbine; developer denies any	SEE POINT 3; no solution suggested

		effect; potential problem that drainage is adequate.	
7	Effect on setting of Scheduled Ancient Monument	Not adequately assessed in ES	STRAT DC 9 - castle and HGDL; no suggestion that any further assessment be carried out.
8	Impact on birds	Long list of birds impacted; ornithological survey superficial; raised concerns with regard to Golden Eagle	Policy WF9; RSPB objected as information inadequate; withdrew in event of a developer's proposal for a programme and mitigation; para 23 monitoring sensitive breeding sites. No attempt at all to assess the actual effect on <i>aquila chrysaetos</i> {Golden Eagle}
9	Impact on Historic Garden and Designed Landscape	Ignored Ardnaiseig which is a HGDL; impact of visibility.	Impact not sufficiently significant; see section 7.
10	Proposal to use the "lifeline road" (B845) for site access	Road closure will be needed and will cause severe disruption as only access road. A 'Roads Liaison' group was promised but did not materialise.	No assessment of the effect on community of road closure.
11	Cumulative impact	Cumulative impact with other Windfarms 6 proposed or operational; inadequate photomontages.	PAN 45; STRAT DC8; RE1; WF Policy 1995 - list of policies only – no assessment.
12	Site selection and other matters	Submit contrary to AB Structure Plan; adherence to principles; landscape character; "limited opp for WF" and "very sensitive for WG"; CO2 savings wildly	STRAT S1 para 25; valuable contribution to targets;

		overstated; roadstone for tracks and roads	