

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 January 2015 20:05
To: devplans
Subject: Planning for Onshore Wind Energy
Attachments: Planning_for_Onshore_Wind_Energy__Consultation_Leaflet_and_Form_November_2014.pdf

Submission from:



Planning for Onshore Wind Energy

Comments Form

1) What do you consider to be the minimum scale of onshore wind development that our spatial framework should apply to?

The minimum scale of numbers of wind turbines should be one. The minimum size of wind turbine machine to be included should be in the range 50kW to 100kW.

Because? Because this size is usually near to a domestic size and should often fit into a landscape with little deleterious effect.

2) Apart from the matters identified in Table 1 of SPP, what other considerations do you think we should take into account when identifying where there is strategic capacity for wind farms and areas with the greatest potential for wind development? And what information is available to help us consider those issues?

Why should the Council assess areas with the "greatest potential....."? This is a commercial matter that the industry should bear the cost for.

"Strategic capacity" sound awfully like grid capacity. That is a commercial matter.

Council should assess the result of industry bringing forward proposals. Council should use its criteria to assess whether it is a good idea socially, environmentally, judging transport and health implications and impacts on other sectors which already provide employment and have employment and commercial potential. Eg., industrialising landscape which has potential for attracting tourist spend should be avoided.

3) What criteria do you think we should consider in deciding all applications for wind farms of different scales, including extensions and re-powering? And what information is available to help us set those criteria?

Health considerations should trump all others. Already small-scale single turbines have been built too close to occupied housing. Large-scale developments likely would not be allowed to be built as close. Why is there a difference?

4) Do you think that defining clusters of wind energy developments and important gaps between them is useful to help guide where further development may be most appropriate?

The concept of gaps between these developments is fallacious, unless the gap is many 10s of miles. The notion that these developments' effects are contained within small areas is fallacious. Windfarms have an industrialising effect for 10s of miles in all directions.

5) Given that national policy does not allow us to include the results of the Cumulative Landscape and Visual Assessment of Wind Energy in Caithness (the CLVA) in the spatial framework, in what ways do you think we should take it into account in our plans and guidance?

This is an older and wiser electorate now compared to only a few months ago. The above reads exactly like what we came to know as "NO" - or, Project Fear. "You can't do that". No matter how sensible the research and conclusions may seem. If after your research you are disbarred from using your results, and you know you are disbarred, why ask us what to do.

6) If you have any general comments about the CLVA, please give them here:

If CLVA is a dead duck, reads like a dead duck you can guess the rest. One comment on general policies is that in planning round after planning round the targetting of areas for specific purposes seems not to be effective. One experience here is that after a full planning round expired and the next was consulted on 89% of new houses had been built outwith the target areas. All 89% received planning permission. What was the utility of the planning areas?

If CLVA is disbarred from use why are we being consulted?

Please either send us an email to devplans@highland.gov.uk providing your response to these questions, or complete this form and send to Development Plans Team, Council HQ, Glenurquhart Road, Inverness IV3 5NX.

Responses need to be received by us no later than 7 January 2015.