

## Mckay, Chrissy

---

**From:** House, Syd  
**Sent:** 04 May 2009 13:23  
**To:** Mckay, Chrissy  
**Cc:** Mainprize, Nick; Miller, Keith; McEwan, Colin  
**Subject:** FW: Re. error in WLATHR letter.....  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Chrissy,

Can you file all the various documentation on the above with the WLA EIA file.

Nick/Keith/Colin - for info.


Syd



Syd House  
Conservator  
Perth & Argyll Conservancy  
Tel: 01738-442830

---

**From:** House, Syd  
**Sent:** 04 May 2009 13:19  
**To:** 'Christine Metcalfe'  
**Subject:** RE: Re. error in WLATHR letter.....



Dear Christine,

Many thanks for your letter of 1 May. I have deleted the first version and will respond to your second, corrected version.

Firstly, can I thank you and Marilyn and Graham Henderson for attending the meeting at short notice. Your constructive contributions to the discussions were much appreciated. In reviewing progress on the West Loch Awe Timber Haul Route and the Carraig Ghael Windfarm Access EIA I felt that a face to face meeting of the key contributors and stakeholders would help clarify the way forward in coming to a decision on the Project. The constructive debate and discussion, whilst not necessarily reaching consensus on all aspects of the Project, did, I feel, chart the way forward.

As we discussed at the meeting, the Project is principally one concerning a timber haul route and the associated road building and upgrading to build that route. There is the added, and important, factor of the potential use of the road as an access route to the Carraig Ghael Windfarm. Whilst the latter clearly has an impact on the timing of the proposed building of this road, and may thus be perceived currently as the main driving factor of the EIA, I would reiterate again that the principal purpose of this road is as a timber haul route. This has been accepted and agreed by the principal statutory consultees, including Argyll & Bute Council, SEPA and SNH. Thus the Project is being considered under the EIA (Forestry) (Scotland) Regulations 1999.

I would not agree with you that Forestry Commission Scotland has decided to consent the Project. In fact, the

06/05/2009

words that Nick Mainprize used were that FCS were 'minded to grant consent' to the Project. This was based on the comments and submissions received to date from the key contributors ie Argyll & Bute Council, SEPA, SNH and, of course, AVCC. These comments principally stated that there was a substantial amount of further information and clarification required from the applicants before any decision on the Project could and should be reached. We concurred with that assessment but from our reading and understanding of these aspects we believed that they were resolvable and that once this was done to our satisfaction (in the course of which we would obviously take into account the views of the various contributors) we were likely to grant consent provided no unresolved or unforeseen matters were to remain outstanding. Past experience of other forestry EIA's has shown that a clear steer from ourselves at various stages of a Project does help resolve outstanding matters and focus on key topics.

I believe the course and content of the discussion at the meeting on 29 April vindicated this approach and charted a way forward for the outstanding issues to be resolved. Should they remain unresolved however it would of course influence our view as to whether or not consent should be granted.

I am also mindful of the fact that the project does seek to have an environmental and social benefit insofar as removing a significant amount of timber traffic from the B845. I think it is reasonable to say that this was probably understated at last week's meeting.

I hope this further clarifies our position in considering the Project. AVCC will now have the opportunity to see and comment on the various actions being asked of the applicants prior to our finalising any decision on consent.

Yours sincerely

Syd

Syd House  
Conservator  
Perth & Argyll Conservancy  
Tel: 01738-442830

---

**From:** Christine Metcalfe [mailto:luanam@btinternet.com]

**Sent:** 01 May 2009 20:38

**To:** syd.house@forestry.gsi.gov.uk

**Subject:** Re. error in WLATHR letter.....

Dear Mr. House,

You may have spotted the error in the following sentence which should of course have read as indicated.

'Rather to point out that if the necessity for it to be able to accommodate the delivery of turbines was removed, a less damaging, and almost certainly lower route, removing the major effects on the Loch Avich environs and probably other sensitive areas, could be avoided (read 'provided').'

I have attached the corrected letter to avoid any confusion.

Apologies.

Sincerely,  
Christine Metcalfe.

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

06/05/2009

Taigh a Luana,  
Loch Avich,  
Taynuilt,  
Argyll. PA35 1HJ.

1.05.09.

Dear Mr. House,

It seems appropriate, now that enough time has passed for reflection, to pass on some thoughts in respect of Wednesday's meeting.

Despite assurances given to the contrary, your opening statement that the Forestry Commission had indeed decided to consent the application was completely unexpected and surprising. Only good manners prevented a C.C. member's discussion about the point of staying.

It has become abundantly clear that the prime reason for this decision, is to ensure that the consent will enhance the ability of Green Power to raise necessary funds to proceed with their plans. In essence - the Forestry Commission do not much mind who develops the site - as long as the bill for the WLATHR is picked up by someone/anyone! As stated - such a consent will last for five years which further underlines the background intentions.

Our Community Council's prime objective was not to object to there being a Timber Haul Route - that is clearly very desirable. Rather to point out that if the necessity for it to be able to accommodate the delivery of turbines was removed, a less damaging, and almost certainly lower route, removing the major effects on the Loch Avich environs and probably other sensitive areas, could be provided. Nothing that was said at this meeting has altered that view, rather it has served to confirm it. We are left with the impression that this was a 'going through the motions' exercise and feel great sorrow that the chance to put the interests of the area first, above the obvious attraction of financial considerations, has been lost.

We have certainly learned from the experience however and would hope that the decision not to insist that F.C. engineers oversee operations will at least be reversed.

As it is now in the public domain, please find attached for your interest, a document which may serve to further explain some of the reasons for our general concerns.

Please be assured that this is the combined view of the C.C. members present and should not be taken as criticism of the chairing of the meeting. The views expressed are directed at Forestry Commission policy in this instance.

Yours sincerely,

Christine Metcalfe.