

Nobel House  
17, Smith Square  
London SW1P 3JR



**Telephone:** 0207 238 4462

**Email:** Barbara.anning@defra.gsi.gov.uk

**Web:** www.defra.gov.uk

**Date:** 08 October 2012

**Aphrodite Smagadi**  
**Secretary to the Aarhus Convention Compliance**  
**Committee**  
**Economic Commission for Europe**  
**Environment, Housing and Land**  
**Management Division**  
**Bureau 348**  
**Palais des Nations**  
**CH-1211 Geneva 10**  
**Switzerland**

Dear Ms Smagadi

**Re: Communication to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee concerning compliance by the European Union and United Kingdom in relation to the implementation of the renewable energy programme in Scotland (Ref. ACCC/C/2012/68)**

Thank you for your letter dated 8 May 2012 inviting us to comment on the complaints raised in Communication ACCC/C/2012/68 and to address the questions annexed to the letter.

The communicant alleges that the authorities at EU, UK and Scottish administrative levels failed to provide information to the public, as required by articles 4 and 5 of the Aarhus Convention ("the Convention"), regarding the implementation of the renewable energy programme in Scotland. The communicant also alleges that the failure of transparency in information impeded effective public participation, as required under articles 6 and 7 of the Convention. The communicant alleges that there are no adequate review procedures, as required by article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention, for members of the public to challenge the occurred failures on access to information and public participation. The communicant also raises concerns regarding two specific projects in Scotland, a wind farm and related access route.

The precise nature of the alleged breaches in many cases is not clear to us. For instance, under the heading "Nature of Alleged Non-Compliance" she states that the public participation exercises were not conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and Article 6 of the Directive. But quite how the requirements of each have not been met is not made clear. We note that the

Committee has invited the communicant to provide relevant information as to the alleged non-compliance with articles 4 and 5 of the Convention. Despite these difficulties we have attempted to respond to the concerns raised.

We do not agree with many of the points raised by the communicant. For example, the communicant states more than once that the "sole justification" for projects such as Carraig Gheal Wind Farm is that they will result in greenhouse gas emission reductions and fossil fuel savings, and questions that this is the case. Modelling and studies have shown definitively that the generation of energy from renewable sources does not generate greenhouse gas emissions to the same extent that generating energy from traditional thermal methods does<sup>1</sup>.

However, it is not the case, as the communicant states, that the deployment of onshore wind farms is justified **solely** on these grounds. As the Committee is already aware, Directive 2009/28/EC ("the 2009 Directive") on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, which amends and largely repeals Directive 2001/77/EC on the promotion of the electricity produced from renewable energy sources in the internal electricity market, **obliges** Member States to increase use of energy from renewable sources and contains a mandatory target of a 20% share of energy overall Community energy consumption to come from renewable sources. The generation of renewable energy from sources such as onshore wind farms is vital for future security of energy supply in a low carbon economy and it also provides jobs and investment in Member States.

In Scotland, the deployment of onshore wind is strategically critical in ensuring that Scotland builds and possesses the skills, supply chain and grid upgrades and infrastructure which will be required to facilitate the development of offshore renewable energy technologies. We note that the communicant has made reference to the Inquiry into the Scottish Government's Renewable Energy Targets. The Inquiry is being conducted by the Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee of the Scottish Parliament. We understand that the Committee is to publish its findings shortly, after which the Scottish Government will formally respond to its recommendations and conclusions.

#### *Article 4 of the Convention: Access to Information*

The communicant refers to Defra as the competent authority for the Aarhus Convention and has attached extracts of email correspondence with Defra at annex 2. This is a misunderstanding over the role of Defra, which was explained to her in an email on 6 December:

"It may help if I clarify that Defra does not have a role in investigating complaints about public authorities' handling of FOI or EIR requests. This is for the regulator, which for UK bodies is the ICO. It is therefore the ICO (rather than the Scottish ICO) that would need to look into any complaints about the FCS's handling of your information request, as the Forestry Commission is a UK public authority rather than a Scottish one. The FCS's internal review response should have given you the appropriate contact details. The only matters that can be considered as part of the internal review are ones relating to access to

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ukerc.ac.uk/support/tiki-index.php?page=0604INtermittencyrelease>

environmental information (e.g. if you are dissatisfied with the amount of information disclosed, or consider that the exceptions or public interest arguments quoted were not correct). Public authorities such as the Forestry Commission will have in place a complaints procedure to deal with other complaints.

I have been informed by colleagues in Defra that, as far as the Aarhus Convention is concerned, Defra does not act as arbiters. Once you have exhausted all domestic avenues of complaint about your information request, you could go to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee in Geneva, which would then contact the relevant UK authorities."

The complaint appears to relate to requests for information from the Forestry Commission relating to the original routing of the timber haul route. More detail on this can be found below in our response to the third question posed by the Committee.

#### *Article 5 of the Convention: Collection and Dissemination of Environmental Information*

The concern appears to relate to the belief of the communicant that the evidence does not justify proposals for wind farms and thus any authority that authorises such a project cannot possess adequate environmental information on which to base such a decision. This is a matter on which we simply disagree on the substance, as we have explained above.

The Scottish Government, and the Forestry Commission Scotland, have received a substantial quantity of correspondence from the communicant over the years. A large amount of information has been made available in response in a manner that was transparent and effectively accessible. It is voluminous so we have not provided this to the Committee, but are happy to do so on request. The annexes to this response give an indication of some of this correspondence.

We believe it is clear from the public participation exercises referred to in this communication further demonstrate that the authority was in possession of the relevant environmental information in coming to its decisions.

#### *Article 6 of the Convention: Public Participation in Specific Decisions*

Whilst the application for Carraig Gheal Wind Farm was made to Scottish Ministers on 24 December 2004, which was before the UK ratified the Aarhus Convention, it is our belief that the information given in response to the questions posed to us, demonstrate compliance with article 6.



*Article 7 of the Convention: Public Participation concerning plans, programmes etc*

We accept that Article 7 applies to the NREAP but again believe that the information provided in the response to the questions posed to us demonstrates compliance with the article.

*Article 9 of the Convention: Access to justice*

The applicant claims that the remedies to courts in this case were prohibitively expensive. The Committee is considering these issues elsewhere so we do not propose to respond in the context of this case.

We have been asked to respond to the following:

*1) Were any public consultations conducted in relation to the adoption of the National Renewable Energy Action Plan in the United Kingdom? If public consultations were conducted, please provide the committee with relevant information.*

(Please see annex A)

The National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP) in the UK – a requirement under European Directive 2009/28/EC (the Directive) – brings together the objectives and implementation mechanism set out in the renewable action plans in the different parts of the UK, including in the devolved administrations such as Scotland.

The NREAP sets out the various measures that the UK is taking to meet the renewables targets set by the Directive. These measures include a National Policy Statement (NPS) for renewable energy, which provides a basis for determining significant renewables planning applications in England & Wales, and which has undergone an SEA. The UK NREAP does not set the framework for the determination of consent applications for renewable energy projects. Therefore an SEA was not required.

The drafting of the NREAP used the content and analytical work contained within the Renewable Energy Strategy published by the UK Government in July 2009. In developing that Strategy the Government published a consultation in June 2008, together with Impact Assessments of proposals for renewable electricity, renewable heat and transport. A total of 748 responses were received to that consultation, in addition to which Government officials attended conferences and seminars, where a variety of individuals, organisations and businesses gave their views on the consultation. A summary of responses was published on the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform's website. The summary showed that the majority of respondents agreed with the assessments and proposals set out in the consultation on most issues.

In Scotland, the Scottish Government set out objectives in respect of renewable energy in its Renewables Action Plan published in July 2009, and again in the Scottish Renewables Routemap published in July 2011. Both these plans have been subject to public consultation, including Strategic Environmental Assessment. Individual Environmental Reports were included as supporting material for the Plan and the Routemap public consultations. This included relevant environmental information for known issues and an

assessment of the likely environmental effects and impacts across all the environmental issues identified by EU Directive 2001/42/EC.

The latest formal public consultation on renewable targets, which centred upon the draft Electricity Generation Policy Statement and a Strategic Environmental Assessment, opened in March 2012 and closed on 4 June 2012. The Scottish Government is currently preparing a report on the consultation responses. However, it is clear at this stage that a number of responses to this consultation, including on the Environmental Report have been received and will now be taken into account.

*2) Were any public consultations conducted in issuing the planning permission for the Carraig Gheal wind farm? If public consultations were conducted, please provide the Committee with relevant information.*

Carraig Gheal was consented under section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989, and consent was granted by Scottish Ministers. Public consultation ran in accordance with the Act, where the public and interested organisations can make representations to Ministers before decisions are taken. Please see the timeline in annex B.

The consultation on applications for generating stations under the Electricity Act forms an integral part of the determination process. Scottish Ministers ensure that consultations comply with the requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations and that consultative bodies and the public are afforded the appropriate time to comment on applications before them.

As we have already noted, the correspondent has stated that the public participation exercises in relation to the two developments were not conducted in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and Article 6 of the Convention. However, we do not understand why she says that. The Scottish Government ran a total of four consultations, one for the original applications and 3 addendums. These were:

- ☐ Application – 7 January 2005 – 10 February 2005
- ☐ Addendum 1 – 1 November 2005- 29 November 2005
- ☐ Addendum 2 (an erratum) – 28 February 2006 – 28 March 2006
- ☐ Addendum 3 – 18 October 2007 – 23 November 2007

The Scottish Government received 440 representations during the various consultation periods for Carraig Gheal. Of these, 351 were objections including 3 written objections from Avich and Kilchrenan Community Council and 1 from Ms Christine Metcalfe personally. The 3 written objections are dated 6 May 2006, 24 July 2006 and 22 November 2007. We have recorded an objection from Ms Metcalfe on 8 February 2005. There were also 89 statements of support for the application.

When determining an application under The Electricity Act 1989, Scottish Ministers balance a wide range of material considerations. These include any written representations from members of the public alongside consultation responses, legal and planning obligations and the compliance of the proposal with current Scottish Government policy. Consent is only granted by Ministers after thorough consideration of these



elements, and when Ministers are satisfied that any environmental or other impacts are either of a temporary nature, or can be the subject of mitigation.

The representations by Ms Metcalfe and Avich and Kilchrenan Community Council were received and considered by Ministers during the determination process for the Carraig Gheal proposal. Ministers considered that the benefits of the scheme outweighed any potential impacts.

Since the time of the Carraig Gheal wind farm application, the Scottish Government has made several changes to the section 36 consent process. In the main, these changes are to ensure greater streamlining of the process whilst ensuring that all relevant stakeholders are able to participate fully in the decision making process. In particular, the Energy Consents and Deployment Unit, who administer section 36 Applications on behalf of Scottish Ministers, now encourage members of the public to submit representations electronically, and attempt to make details of live projects available on their website in order to improve the access which the public has to details of proposals.

*3) Please provide the Committee with relevant information that indicates how the access road to the Carraig Gheal wind farm comes within the purview of the Convention. Were the decisions regarding the access road subject to public consultations in accordance with national law?*

(Please see annex C)

The access road referred to in the Communication by the correspondent functions as an access route to Carraig Gheal wind farm and a timber access route. As such, it most likely falls under the purview of article 6(1)(a) of the Convention as the access road is a development which may have significant effect on the environment. The Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS) and the communicant have been in lengthy correspondence regarding a number of matters relating to the access route, a note of this is contained in annex C.

As the principal function of the access route, West Loch Awe Timber Haul Route (WLATHR), is to serve as a timber haul route, FCS were the body responsible for making the determination. The decision was subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under the EIA (Forestry) (Scotland) Regulations 1999, instead of being considered as part of the application for the wind farm. This was agreed at the time with the Local Planning Authority, Argyll and Bute Council. However, a public consultation was run in accordance with the EIA Regulation.

Nine responses were received, with no outstanding objections from statutory agencies. The communicant responded to the consultation. There was a full EIA conducted on the WLATHR, and the correspondent was made fully aware of the Environmental Statement documents. These were available online as part of the Forestry Commission's EIA public register, and were advertised in the local press. Following the EIA decision objectors had up to 6 weeks to challenge the consent in the Court of Session (as detailed in the EIA regulation). No challenges were made.

The communicant also alleges that alternative routes were not fully considered. This is not the case. By way of background, in 2001, FCS submitted a funding bid to the European Regional Development Fund. The bid was unsuccessful, and the documents later destroyed in accordance with FCS's document management policy, which complies with Freedom of Information legislation and Environmental Information Regulations. The proposed route in the funding bid was indicative only, and had not been fully surveyed on the ground. When the FCS considered the routing for the eventual WLATHR, it became apparent that the route that had been proposed in the funding bid was not viable, due to difficult gradients and abutting infrastructure for the Scottish and Southern Energy Hydro scheme, and that a different route would have to be taken.

We would like to emphasise to the Committee that not only was a public consultation ran on the proposed WLATHR, but Scottish Natural Heritage, who advise both FCS and Scottish Ministers on matters relating to wildlife and habitats, and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, did not object to the proposed route.

The communicant also states that there were documents that were originally stated to have been destroyed and were later produced by the FCS. This is the case, and as we have already stated, this was done in accordance with FCS's document management policy. The communicant had requested information about the alternative route, and, despite some of the information being destroyed in compliance with the FCS's document management policy, some relevant files were later found and supplied to the communicant. The FCS and the communicant were in lengthy correspondence regarding this matter, and details of this are provided in annex C. We note that the Communicant has supplied the Committee with a copy of correspondence she has had with the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). The ICO advised the Communicant on 9 November 2011 that her request falls out with the remit of the ICO. When the FCS responded to a specific request dated 5 November 2011 from the Communicant for information in relation to the Environmental Impact Assessment conducted for alternative routes, they advised her to approach the Information Commissioner should the matter not be resolved to her satisfaction. As far as the FCS are aware, no further complaint was made to the ICO. The letter from the FCS was dated 2 December 2011 and is contained in the attachment to this letter.

We note that the communicant states that she does not think that it is good administrative practice that the EIA was conducted jointly by the developer of Carraig Gheal Wind Farm and Forestry Enterprise Scotland, because Forestry Enterprise Scotland is associated with Forestry Commission Scotland. We feel that it would be helpful to for the Committee for us to provide an explanation of the relationship between Forestry Commission Scotland and Forestry Enterprise Scotland. Forest Enterprise Scotland is an executive agency of Forestry Commission Scotland and operates at arms length. The internal Governance of Forest Enterprise Scotland is structured so that it is separate from the rest of FCS. This includes a separate Chief Executive and Management Board for FES.

Forest Enterprise Scotland is assigned the role as managing agency for the national forest estate in Scotland. Forest Enterprise Scotland play no part in the evaluation or determination of EIA either on the national forest estate or elsewhere. In this respect their status is equivalent to that of a private individual or organisation who may bring forward projects for screening against the EIA (forestry) regulations. The national forest estate in Scotland is held in the ownership of the Scottish Ministers.

FCS's Conservancy Office staff are, amongst other things, tasked with discharging the Scottish Minister's responsibilities under the Environmental Impact Regulations which apply to forestry projects. They do this across Scotland regardless of the project under consideration being situated on public or private land or a combination of the two. This approach is designed to place the focus of EIA on the potential environmental impacts of a project not on the ownership. In this way we strive to achieve a consistent approach across Scotland when it comes to the evaluation of forestry projects.

Yours sincerely



**Barbara Anning**



List of hyperlinks to public consultation documents and Strategic Environmental Assessments.

United Kingdom

UK National Renewable Energy Action Plan, published 1 July 2010

[http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting\\_energy/renewable\\_ener/uk\\_action\\_plan/uk\\_action\\_plan.aspx](http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting_energy/renewable_ener/uk_action_plan/uk_action_plan.aspx)

Renewable Energy Strategy, July 2009

[http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/what%20we%20do/uk%20energy%20supply/energy%20mix/renewable%20energy/renewable%20energy%20strategy/1\\_20090717120647\\_e\\_@\\_theukrenewableenergystrategy2009.pdf](http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/what%20we%20do/uk%20energy%20supply/energy%20mix/renewable%20energy/renewable%20energy%20strategy/1_20090717120647_e_@_theukrenewableenergystrategy2009.pdf)

Consultation, opened 26 June 2008

[http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/consultations/cons\\_res/cons\\_res.aspx](http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/consultations/cons_res/cons_res.aspx)

National Policy Statement, published 19 July 2009 :

[http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting\\_energy/consents\\_planning/nps\\_en\\_infra/nps\\_en\\_infra.aspx](http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting_energy/consents_planning/nps_en_infra/nps_en_infra.aspx)

Consultation, 15 July 2010 :

[http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/news/pn10\\_083/pn10\\_083.aspx](http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/news/pn10_083/pn10_083.aspx)

Scotland

Renewables Action Plan, published 6 July 2009

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/07/06095830/18>

Renewables Action Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment: Environmental Report, published 1 July 2009

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/07/01093638/0>

2020 Routemap for Renewable Energy in Scotland, published June 2011

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/08/04110353/0>

Electricity Generation Policy Statement, 17 November 2010

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/11/17094217/0>

Draft Electricity Generation Policy Statement, 6 March 2012

<http://scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Business-Industry/Energy/EGPS2012/DraftEPGS2012>

SEA on Scotland's Renewable Energy Routemap and Electricity Generation Policy  
Statement, 5 March 2012  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/03/2294/0>

**Carraig Gheal Wind Farm section 36 application Timeline**

24/12/2004	Application officially received and consultation letters issued
06/01/2005	Public notice is published in The Oban Times (week one)
07/01/2005	Public notice is published in Glasgow Herald and Edinburgh Gazette
13/01/2005	Public notice is published in The Oban Times (week two)
10/02/2005	End of 28 day consultation period (public and statutory/non-statutory consultees)
24/04/2005	End of consultation period for Argyll and Bute Council
09/05/2005	How to Proceed Letter to developer at end of consultation
20/10/2005	Developer submits addendum to application
??/??/????	Press Notices in Edinburgh Gazette, Glasgow Herald and Oban Times (referred to on file but no dates)
01/11/2005	Consultation letters issued for addendum
29/11/2005	Addendum consultation closes
20/01/2006	Extension period to consultation for Argyll and Bute Council agreed and response received.
20/01/2006 – 27/02/2006	Developer submits Erratum correcting several errors from addendum
28/02/2006	Consultation letters issue for Erratum
??/??/????	Press Notices in Edinburgh Gazette, Glasgow Herald and Oban Times (referred to on file but no dates)
28/03/2006	Erratum consultation period closes
24/05/2007	How to Proceed Letter to developer at end of addendum/erratum consultation.
18/10/2007	Developer submits Addendum # 3 – Press Notice appears in The Oban Times (week one) and consultation letters issued
25/10/2007	Press Notice appears in The Oban Times (week two)
23/11/2007	Consultation period for Addendum # 3 ends
26/11/2007	How to Proceed letter issued to developer (with exception of SNH who have extension to 3 November 2007)
08/04/2008	Confirmation that access track will be considered by Forestry Commission
06/06/2008	Submission sent to Scottish Ministers for determination
11/06/2008	Scottish Ministers consent development
12/06/2008	Decision announced





**WLATHR and Carraig Ghael Windfarm Access EIA****Time-Line of Key Casework Developments**

NB: In this document FCS refers to Perth & Argyll Conservancy staff acting as the authority in dealing with the relevant EIA Forestry Regs. FES refers to the West Loch Awe Forest District, also part of Forestry Commission Scotland but in this situation treated as a developer by FCS staff in the same way as any non-public body would be.

Key documents and milestones are highlighted in yellow

November 2004	Carrick Gael Windfarm application submitted the Scottish Government
October 2005	Amendment to take account of issues raised primarily by SNH & RSPB (removed 4 turbines)
2006	Application approved by Oban and Lorne Area Planning Committee against advice of Councils head of Planning.
July 2007	Following discussion with the Argyll Timber Transport Group, the Windfarm developers agree to develop, in partnership with FES, an alternative route to both access the windfarm and facilitate long-term timber transport around the West Loch Awe area on the shared route to be known as the West Loch Awe Long Haul Timber Routes
Oct 2007	After discussion with key statutory consultees, including Argyll & Bute Council planning officials, there was a consensus that the principal purpose of the road was to be timber transport. Accordingly, FCS (Perth & Argyll Conservancy staff) indicated to the proposed developers (Greenpower and FES) that the road required EIA consent under the 1999 EIA (Forestry) (Scotland) regs
11 June 2008	Full Windfarm Consent granted by Scottish Ministers
December 2008	Road haulage route consultation issued and advert placed in local newspaper (Oban Times)
March 2009	Draft ES for the WLAHTR received by FCS. Letter issued to Greenpower from NM outlining significant issues with the Environmental Statement
April 2009	Letter received from Greenpower address points raised within March letter referred to above
April 2009	Report produced outlining consultee and advert responses and comments
April 2009	Borrow Pit Method Statement produced
April 2009	Meeting held in Oban with the developers, statutory agencies, and local community interests (including Christine Metcalfe acting as a local community council representative) to clarify progress on the ES and outline who was responsible for which aspects of the ES process
May 2009	Email/letter received from C Metcalf following meeting

	outlining concerns and Syd House Response
June	Email/letter received from C Metcalf outlining concerns and Syd House Response
June 2009	Clarification report produced regarding rock aggregate
June 2009	Letter received from GreenPower regarding consultee response issues from SEPA
July 2009	Letter received from C Metcalfe outlining issues relating to Burrow Pits

August 2009	Avich & Kilchrenan Community Council (AKCC) objection to planning application for a public road crossing (an essential part of the forest road project)
September 2009	Avich & Kilchrenan Community Council objections to both the public road aspects and aspects of the ES related to the WLAHTR submitted to Argyll&Bute Council
September 2009	Email from Greenpower outlining a proposed way forward taking into account consultee and applicants responses.
September 2009	Email correspondence regarding the proposed and agreed approach to "withdraw the current ES and to re-advertise and consult" taking into account that mentioned in the email above
September 2009	Revised/new EIA submitted by Greenpower and FES to FCS (with Non Technical report)
October 2009	Consultation issued and received
January 2010	Golden Eagle Meeting Notes
25 January 2010	Consent, including conditions relating to the impact on eagles, for the forest road issued by FCS to the developers
25 January 2010	Complaint made by Avich & Kilchrenan Community Council to the EU regarding the granting of forest road consent as breaching European Protected Species legislation for golden eagles. Copied to Bob McIntosh, Director, FCS NB Objectors had up to 6 weeks after the consent was issued to challenge the consent in the Court of Session (as outlined under the EIA regs). No such challenge was made by any objector
March 2010	Letter from AKCC to Bruce Inglis, copy sent to the Minister of Environment and "contact in Europe"
April 2010	Nick Purdy response/input regarding content of email/letter above
April 2010	Official response to letter received from AKCC in March
May 2010	Internal email dialogue relating to reply from Jane Organ April 2010
May 2010	Bruce Inglis response to email received from Jane Organ April 2010
May 2010	Reference made to a received letter of 15 <sup>th</sup> April regarding Timer Haulage



June 2010	Email confirmation of telephone conversation sent to C Metcalfe
July 2010	Email dialogue pertaining to complaint submitted to "UK Authorities" by AKCC
April 2009	Notes from WLTHR meeting April 2009
August 2010	Correspondence regarding possible EC Complaint re: forest operations and the birds directive
October 2010	Query and response regarding re: EU request for information regarding traffic movements
November 2010	(C Metcalfe) Email to Bob McIntosh relating to EU complaint CHAP (2010) 02125. Incomplete feedback from EU via Mrs Metcalfe of AVCC does not challenge approach by FCS

November 2010	Further dialogue connected to CHAP (2010) 02125 – Email from EU says that 'the conditions (in the consent) appear to me to be reasonable in the circumstances... The conditions themselves as drafted do not appear to represent such a breach' (in the EU Habitat Directives)
March 2011	Update provided from Greenpower to AKCC
April 2011	Email received from AKCC regarding timber haulage
April 2011	Email update provided to AKCC from Greenpower
April 2011	Email received from AKCC regarding STTF
May 2011	Copy of AKCC email to First Minister
June 2011	Cameron Maxwell correspondence regarding AKCC/First Minister –
June 2011	Greenpower update regarding Borrow Pits
July 2011	Sunday Herald letters page
July 2011	Newspaper article regarding AKCC and WLAHR
August 2011	C Metcalfe to SNH re: Timber Haulage
September 2011	Letter to C Metcalfe from Nicky Whitiker referring to letters and emails received 28 July, 16,18 and 31 August and 1,5 and 11 September
November 2011	FOI received from C Metcalfe
December 2011	FCS response to FOI as above
January 2012	Golden Eagle update from Greenpower
January 2012	Golden Eagle update from Greenpower
January 2012	Greenpower WLATHR and Conditions correspondence
January 2012	Greenpower WLATHR and Conditions correspondence – document 52 and copy of conditions letter sent 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2010
March 2012	Loch Avich Bridge Update

