

Agenda Item	11
Report No	PLA 26/17

HIGHLAND COUNCIL

Committee: Places

Date: 16 August 2017

Report Title: Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance – Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals

Report By: Director of Development and Infrastructure

1 Purpose/Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report presents for adoption the Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals and associated Strategic Capacity Conclusions for Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast and for Caithness, following consultation on Draft Appraisals published last year.
- 1.2 The Appraisals have been prepared in accordance with the Council's adopted methodology set out in the Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance (SG). The SG's purpose is to provide an effective framework for guiding wind energy development in Highland.
- 1.3 Committee is asked to agree that, upon completion of the necessary procedures, the Appraisals and associated Strategic Capacity conclusions be statutorily adopted as an addition to the already adopted SG.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to:
 - i. consider the comments received on the Draft Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals and agree the Council's responses as set out in **Appendix 1**;
 - ii. agree to adopt the Appraisals and associated Strategic Capacity Conclusions as an addition to the Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance, being statutory Supplementary Guidance to the Highland-wide Local Development Plan (2012), as set out in **Appendix 2**, subject to any feedback from Scottish Ministers during the statutory process for adoption;
 - iii. agree for the Appraisals to be used as a material consideration for planning decisions and advice with immediate effect; and
 - iv. note the progress on further landscape sensitivity and strategic capacity work as set out in **section 6** of this report.

3 Background

- 3.1 The Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance (including Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal and associated Strategic Capacity conclusions for the Loch Ness study area) was statutorily adopted by the Council as part of the Development Plan on 24 November 2016. Upon its adoption we launched public consultation on the next two Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals which, with input from Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), had been drafted for:
- Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast; and
 - Caithness.
- 3.2 The draft Appraisals were produced following our agreed methodology and presented in a manner fundamentally consistent with the guidance for the Loch Ness area. Consultation ran from 25 November 2016 to the extended deadline of 31 January 2017.
- 3.3 A list of respondents, together with a summary of comments received and our recommended Council response by issue is in **Appendix 1**. The resultant Appraisals and associated Strategic Capacity conclusions for Committee's consideration is in **Appendix 2 (online only)**. **Section 6** of the report sets out progress with the ongoing programme of Appraisals. Though not forming part of the consideration of the Appraisals, the opportunity has been taken to also provide Members with an update on the issue of Wild Land Areas, in **Section 7** of the report, and on the progress of renewable energy development in Highland in **Appendix 3**.

4 Highlights of Comments Received on the Draft Appraisals and Recommended Council Response

- 4.1 A number of general issues in comments were previously raised when we consulted on the SG (including Appraisal for Loch Ness study area); these were considered by the Council at that time and our established position is reflected in the responses now provided.
- 4.2 Within our response to comments we are comfortable to defend the draft Appraisals in a number of key respects, providing further explanation of our approach where necessary, particularly bearing in mind the strategic nature and the purpose of the Appraisals. However, we have also identified a number of improvements, for example to provide additional clarity and greater consistency, and these are incorporated within the amended Appraisals.
- 4.3 Concern was raised that not all of the area around Ardross was included within the Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast study area. We have justified the extent of the study area and, as explained in our response, the next Appraisal now being worked on – Sutherland and Ross-shire – will cover the area in question. Concern was similarly raised that the study area had taken in only part of the Dava area. In our response we have acknowledged that it would make sense to extend coverage up to the Cairngorms National Park boundary. However, rather than delay finalisation and adoption of the Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast Appraisal into the SG pending completion of that work, an Appraisal for the extension will be prepared and consulted on alongside the Sutherland and Ross-shire Appraisal and therefore added in to the SG later.

5 Strategic Capacity of the Appraisal Areas

- 5.1 The Appraisals contain conclusions on the potential for wind energy development, for each landscape character area. Draft conclusions were contained in the Draft Appraisals and have therefore been subject of public consultation. Officers have used the resultant conclusions in further work, looking to identify any strategic capacity for wind farm development following the methodology set out in the adopted SG (paragraphs 5.24 and 5.25) and used previously for the Loch Ness study area.
- 5.2 For both the Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast study area and the Caithness study area, no areas of strategic capacity were identified. The reasons for this are documented in the respective Strategic Capacity sections of **Appendix 2** to this report.
- 5.3 It is important to note that whilst the conclusions for the Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast study area identify that there is no strategic capacity, there may still be opportunities for some limited further development proposals to be accommodated (and hence to be consented) within it. However, at a strategic level, there are no sufficiently unconstrained and expansive areas to which development may be steered. Interested developers would need to conduct their own site searches and in doing so should take into account the SG and the Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal (which is to become part of the SG).
- 5.4 Similarly it is important to note that whilst the conclusions for the Caithness study area identify that there is no strategic capacity, there may still be some opportunities for further development proposals to be accommodated (and hence to be consented) within it, particularly proposals of a smaller scale or in association with existing schemes. However again, at a strategic level, there are no sufficiently unconstrained and expansive areas to which development may be steered. Interested developers would need to conduct their own site searches and in doing so should take into account the SG and the Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal (which is to become part of the SG).

6 Programme of Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals and Strategic Capacity Assessment

- 6.1 Officers continue to progress the programme of landscape sensitivity appraisals and strategic capacity assessment set out in SG, following the methodologies set in that document and with continuing contribution from SNH in terms of officer time and expertise. We have recently begun working on an appraisal for 'Sutherland and Ross-shire' which includes the following areas we previously named in the adopted SG for appraisal:
- East and Central Sutherland; and
 - North Coast.
- 6.2 We aim to consult on a draft appraisal in the autumn and after that bring the results, including associated conclusions on strategic capacity, to Committee for consideration and adoption. In parallel we intend to prepare, consult and report on an addition to the Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast appraisal to fill the gap between that existing study area and the boundary of the Cairngorms National Park – as explained elsewhere in this report.
- 6.3 After those, the final area for appraisal and assessment referred to in the adopted SG is Skye. The programme for undertaking that is not yet certain but we will be looking to begin work on it in late 2017 or early 2018.

7. Wild Land Areas – Update

7.1 In late January 2017 SNH published a description of each of the 42 Wild Land Areas in Scotland, in final form. At the same time SNH also published for consultation (and for use with immediate effect) a draft document “Assessing impacts on Wild Land Areas - technical guidance”. Together these documents assist the consideration of the wild land issue through the Development Management process. The deadline for comments on the draft guidance was 7 April 2017 and officers provided a response. SNH is considering the results of the consultation and a finalised version of the guidance will follow.

8 Implications

8.1 Resource – We have resources to finalise, adopt and issue the Landscape Appraisals as part of the SG. Our approach to the ongoing programme for the identification of strategic capacity, including undertaking landscape sensitivity appraisals, is taking into account resource pressures.

8.2 Legal – Planning law sets out requirements for development plans and development management. A distinction is made between documents forming part of the development plan (our adopted LDPs, adopted Local Plans as continued in force and adopted SG), and any other material considerations. LDPs and SG are prepared in accordance with legal requirements.

8.3 Community (Equality, Poverty and Rural) – Equalities Screening was undertaken during the evolution of the SG. The SG covers the whole of the Highlands. The main pressures for wind energy development are in rural areas. The SG assists in the identification of opportunities for renewable energy development and assists in the consideration of planning impacts and the documentation now for approval for adoption will be a key part of the SG in that respect.

8.4 Climate Change/Carbon Clever – The SG assists in identification of opportunities for renewable energy development, which will contribute towards Carbon Clever and responding to Climate Change. It helps consideration and balancing of positive and negative effects of development. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) were undertaken during evolution of the SG. The Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals themselves have been scoped out.

8.5 Risk – Each planning application must be considered on its own merits, and there would be a risk of challenge if any part of the Council’s policy and guidance framework were used as a ‘traffic-light’ style indication of the acceptability, or otherwise, of particular developments without reference to the development plan as a whole and material considerations.

8.6 Gaelic – We will ensure that the documentation complies with the Council’s requirements for publications.

Designation: Director of Development and Infrastructure

Date: 3 August 2017

Authors: David Cowie (Principal Planner) 01463 702827 and Craig Baxter
(Planner) 01463 702276

Background Papers:

On the Council's development planning consultation portal at <http://consult.highland.gov.uk>:

- Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals for Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast and for Caithness (draft, November 2016)
- Responses received to the Draft Appraisals

On the Council's website www.highland.gov.uk:

- Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance (adopted, November 2016) www.highland.gov.uk/onshorewind
- Online interactive map of Wind Turbines: www.highland.gov.uk/windmap
- Storymap of Hydro energy developments: www.highland.gov.uk/hydromap

On SNH's website www.snh.gov.uk:

- Wild Land Areas – descriptions; and draft document “Assessing impacts on Wild Land Areas - technical guidance”; both available at: <http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/looking-after-landscapes/landscape-policy-and-guidance/wild-land/>

Appendix 1: Summary of comments and recommended Council response

List of Respondents

Customer Type	Organisation
Charity/ Club/ Third Sector Organisation	John Muir Trust
Community Council	Grantown-on-Spey & Vicinity Community Council
Community Council	Ardross Community Council
Community Council	Ferintosh Community Council
Community Council	Tarbat Community Council
Government/ Statutory Body/ Other Public Organisation	Historic Environment Scotland
Campaign Groups	Save Our Dava
Industry	Muirden Energy LLP
Industry	Coriolis Energy
Industry	Limekiln Wind Ltd
Industry	Wind 2 Limited
Members of Public & Other Individuals	5

[Black Isle, Surrounding Hills and Moray Firth Coast](#)

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Community Council & Campaign Group	There is a gap in coverage of the study area in the Dava Moor between the National Park boundary and southern-most LCAs. This area is important and requires safeguarding and is under consideration for inclusion as part of the Cairngorms National Park.	The suggestion for the additional area to be included has been considered and it will be appraised. The results will be consulted on alongside the next study area for Sutherland and Ross-shire, for subsequent inclusion in the Supplementary Guidance.
Industry	Object to the principle of the document because it contradicts SPP by creating additional constraints to the Spatial Framework; ignores previous comments about these concerns and applies development management considerations (e.g. cumulative effects) to policy.	The Landscape Sensitivity Appraisals do not create a sequential approach to decision making, nor do they include additional constraints in the Spatial Framework. Rather, in line with Policy 67 of HwLDP, the appraisals <i>ensure that developers are aware of the key constraints to ... development</i> . Policy 67 requires the consideration of landscape and visual effects, including cumulative effects. No change required.
Public	The references to different scales of wind turbines should be defined with height values.	References to different scales of turbines are relative to those in a particular area. Any assessment should take account of what scales of development are consented, under construction, constructed and operational at the time of assessment. No change required.
Government or Statutory Body	Welcome the appraisal and consideration given to the historic environment.	Noted. No change required.

Public	No views listed from Ben Wyvis, Views from Tarbat Ness and Portmahomack out of the study area are included as 'views from', why not include views north from Ben Wyvis and Cnoc Fyrish? Views to the study area from Dornoch coast and central Inverness are included in 'views to' but not others like Carn Chuinneag or other hilltops. The LCA appraisal tables describe several views to Sutherland, why not more views out of the study area?	The role of Ben Wyvis to the study area is now described in the introduction to the appraisal and an additional key view from Ben Wyvis has been included. This is sufficient in response to the points raised, and maintains an appropriate coverage of views for this strategic-level appraisal.
Public	Support the purpose of the study, but suggest the whole area ban turbine developments. 'Routes through' the area should be prioritised over 'key viewpoints' to recognise the effects on local residents.	Scottish Planning Policy 2014 is clear at Paragraph 166 that <i>Moratoria on onshore wind developments are not appropriate</i> . Key Routes are listed for the study area, were part of the draft for consultation and taken into account in the appraisal; the Key Views listed refer to the broad views experienced within an area that are representative of the visual attributes of the landscape. No change required.
Community Council	Ardross needs to be covered in its entirety, it is only partially covered by this study and should be completely included in this study. It must not be omitted from the Sutherland study. A range of inaccuracies and inconsistencies about where the current wind energy developments are require to be addressed as well as confirming the extent of the study area boundary, which appears for the north west part (BL12 & BL40) to be arbitrary. Wild Land Areas are suggested as alternative features to use to define the study area extent.	Concerns regarding coverage of the landscape sensitivity appraisal in relation to Ardross are noted. The boundary at this location was drawn to provide an approximation of the horizon as seen from the main routes and areas of population i.e. the locations of most visual receptors. The rest of the Ardross area will be appraised as part of the next study for Sutherland and Ross-shire. Specific issues that have been raised about mapping inaccuracies have been reviewed and addressed where appropriate.
Community Council	The Wyvis range should have a special category like Loch Ness, but not as extensive. Recommend the Community Council liaise with the Council to achieve a special designation for the Wyvis range.	The Ben Wyvis Massif is already designated as a Special Landscape Area and this landscape appraisal provides an additional consideration in respect of wind energy development. No change required.

Key Routes

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	The description of the B9176 fails to appreciate the Ardross Castle designed landscape that is prominent along the key route- the map on page 15 does not mention this route but	The B9176 Key Route is included because of the access it enables over the Struie and the views and gateways it provides. The route skirts the edge of the Ardross Castle Designed Landscape and views across it are limited and

	should.	restricted. However, this designed landscape is recognised within BL13 & 14 as described below.
--	---------	---

Key Views

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	Highland Council argues at Glenmorie PLI for Cnoc Fyrish to be used as the key viewpoint rather than the monument, this should be rectified in the study and views north into Sutherland included in the appraisal.	The key view from Fyrish Monument is listed because it captures the 'iconic postcard views' across the study area. The views are described in the wider, more general sense, rather a description of a specific viewpoint being used to consider the particular impacts of a specific development proposal. No change required.

BL7

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Campaign Group	The B9007 is missing from the list of Key Routes for the LCA but is listed in the study area's list of Key Routes. There is a gateway on the B9007 that should be included in the study area's list of Gateways where the route adjoins LCA BL10 where there is an abrupt transition from an enclosed landscape to that of an open one. In the Sensitive Visual Receptors section an additional sentence should be added that reads "The community hub for the LCA, Ferness village lies immediately adjacent to the A939 gateway at the "milestone"".	The B9007 Key Route has been added to the list for BL7. The study is a strategic level appraisal and gateways are identified to illustrate those landscape changes of wider or strategic significance, rather than describing every change. The sensitivity of visual receptors (residents and visitors to Ferness Village) is described in the Sensitive Visual Receptors in the references to 'residents of immediate locality' and 'visitors/tourists including cyclists and walkers'. It is not considered appropriate or consistent with the appraisal method that any place could be described as the 'hub' for an LCA as such.

BL10

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Campaign Group	An addition should be made to the Key Views that acknowledges the key view looking north from the A939 approximately 1km north of Aitnoch down to the "milestone". The panorama here captures the entire study area. The list of Gateways for the study area should include the sentence: "Ferness village lies immediately adjacent to the A939 gateway at the "milestone" as described for BL7". Further guidance should be added to the Potential for Wind Energy Development section to state no development located adjacent to Gateways or Key Views or to neighbouring LCAs where there is greater sensitivity to development.	The study is a strategic level appraisal and the key views identified capture the essence of an area's particular qualities rather than a specific location. The list is not exhaustive and particular viewpoints may be identified for assessment of specific development proposals as part of the development management process. The landscape and visual criteria listed in section 4 of the Onshore Wind Energy SG address issues about sensitivity of gateway locations and landscape character. No change required.
Campaign Group	The conclusion for the LCA contradicts planning case history which has	The LCA is a varied landscape and whether a particular development is considered

	consensus that the area is sensitive to larger scale development.	appropriate will be considered on a case by case basis. The Landscape Sensitivity section reflects the LCA's higher sensitivity. No change required.
--	---	--

BL13 & BL14

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	Disagree that the area is shielded by the landform as described in the appraisal. Novar wind farms are not mentioned but are dominating across the area. Ardross Castle designed landscape is not mentioned. Supportive of the conclusions of the appraisal.	The statement made in the Key Views about views being shielded by landform has been qualified with additional text, and recognition that on ridges the area may be more visible. Reference to Ardross Castle Designed Landscape has been added for these LCAs for clarity over issues raised. Novar Wind Farm is not considered to be dominating across the LCAs but the visibility from upper straths in the north and west of Ardross Castle is noted. However, the appraisal does not seek to identify all visibility of existing developments. Impacts of such visibility on features like key routes and Designed Landscapes are assessed on a case by case basis in respect of specific development proposals; visibility of existing developments will be part of any cumulative assessment undertaken as part of that.

BL20

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	Further safeguarding of the Tarbat Ness Headland is required by restricting development only to limited scope for micro turbines. The conclusions for the LCA are too relaxed and threaten the area which is an important tourist asset.	The text for this LCA has been amended to recognise the Tarbat Ness Headland.

BL39

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	No focus on views to the north and north west that reflects the study is Inner Moray Firth-focused and not objective. Supportive of the conclusions for the appraisal.	Where appropriate, key views to the north are referenced in the study, but the broad focus of the study is 'towards the Inner Moray Firth'. The emerging study for the Sutherland and Ross-shire area will address views 'to the north.'

BL40

Type	Issue	How issue has been addressed
Community Council	Dispute the boundary and descriptions of the landscape character types (LCT) described for the LCA. Suggest area should be divided to distinguish between LCTs. Reference to Ardross Castle and Novar wind farms are missing. Disagree with the inclusion of the Balnagowan designed landscape that is outwith	The starting point for this appraisal was to look at SNH's recent revision of its Landscape Character Assessment. The strategic nature of the appraisal means it would not be appropriate to sub-divide the LCA. Issues about dividing the LCA into different parts have been addressed by clarifying the boundaries on the map. Land outwith the study area in this vicinity

	<p>the LCA. Disagree with the conclusions of the appraisal and question the meaning of ‘bases of turbines are on the far side of the horizon to maintain a containment of space’.</p>	<p>will be addressed in the next study for Sutherland and Ross-shire. Reference to Ardross Castle Designed Landscape has been included in this LCA but Novar Wind Farm is not considered to have significant visibility from the key routes in the LCA. The description of ‘turbine bases on the far side of the horizon’ refers to being able to see turbines, but not their bases as they are hidden by the landform. Therefore whilst there may be visibility of parts of the turbines, they are perceived as being located in a different space from the receptor.</p>
--	---	--

Caithness Landscape Sensitivity

Caithness Landscape Sensitivity		
Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Public	There should be a moratorium on windfarms because the cumulative and visual impacts are already unacceptable.	Scottish Planning Policy 2014 is clear at Paragraph 166 that <i>Moratoria on onshore wind developments are not appropriate</i> . No change required.
Industry	The references to different scales of wind turbines should be defined with height values.	The terms larger, medium and smaller refer to relative scales within the area being considered, taking into account existing turbines and the scale of the landscape. Therefore there is not one fixed definition for a whole study area or for the whole of Highland since landscape and development patterns vary. Any assessment should take account of what scales of development are already consented, under construction, constructed or operational at the time of assessment in or near that area. No change required.
Industry	Welcome caveats about the study not introducing additional constraints to those set out in the Spatial Framework. The strength of some conclusions for the appraisals contradict this and SPP (e.g. CT06).	Support for the explanation of the role of the appraisal is noted, which is clear that the studies <i>do not introduce additional constraints to those set out in the Spatial Framework for Onshore Wind Energy [or form] part of a sequential approach to wind farm planning</i> . The study only discusses landscape and visual sensitivities; the study’s conclusions are intended to give a clear steer on what those sensitivities suggest for development potential, but there are other factors set out in the Supplementary Guidance to be considered. Assessment of specific schemes will take account of site and proposal-specific factors that will be weighed in the planning balance. No change required.
Government/ Statutory Body	Welcome the appraisal and consideration given to the historic environment.	Noted. No change required.

Industry	Should be greater encouragement for the consideration of appropriately located schemes.	Noted. No change required.
----------	---	----------------------------

CT3

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Charity/ Third Sector	Disagree that large scale wind farms should be scored less sensitive than smaller individual turbines.	The landscape character type in this area is capable of accommodating larger scale development, hence the lower sensitivity rating applied. In the <i>Potential for Wind Energy Development</i> section only limited scope is identified for larger scale development where it <i>aim[s] to consolidate and improve the existing layout of Stroupster</i> [Wind Farm]. The landscape is scored as being most susceptible to change in respect of smaller individual turbines because these would be unlikely to reflect the current pattern of development in the area and would therefore cause visual confusion between the simple moorland and coastal settlement landscapes. No change required.
Public	Disagree with conclusions of appraisal because development in the LCA would have far-reaching impacts across the wider study area. A Key Route is missing from the LCA that is part of National Cycle Network Route 1.	The conclusions, that there is limited scope for development in this LCA, are considered to be appropriate. NCN 1 is not listed as a key route because it shares similar attributes to the A836 which is listed as a key route and is, for the purposes of this strategic-level appraisal, sufficiently representative of receptor experience. However at a proposal-specific level NCN1 may be relevant in its own right and it will be for such proposals to assess the relevance of NCN 1 and any potential impacts upon it. No change required.
Industry	Supportive of the approach to cluster further development with existing.	Noted. No change required.

CT4

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Charity/ Third Sector	Disagree that large scale wind farms should be scored as level 3 because it is likely to be highly sensitive to any large scale development, particularly looking west to Wild Land Area 39.	The landscape character type in this area is capable of accommodating larger scale development. The scoring reflects this, but the potential identified is limited to that which can concentrate and consolidate existing development. Conversely the landscape is scored as being more susceptible to change from smaller individual turbines because they will be unlikely to reflect the existing pattern of development and could cause visual confusion. No change required.
Industry	Supports the draft appraisal's assertion that the LCA has low susceptibility to change to large scale wind farms. Highlight that the conclusions align with	Support noted. Clear reference is already made in the study to what potential for wind energy development there is. This study does not seek to assess individual proposals but to guide

	previous LUC study for Caithness. It should be more explicit that the LCA has capacity for development. A range of specific references to the proposed Limekiln Wind Farm are made in the comments.	development at a strategic level. No change required.
Industry	Support the indication that there is potential for development in the LCA and assert that this aligns with previous landscape capacity work undertaken by LUC.	Noted. No change required.

CT6

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Industry	Sensitivity and degree of wildness over emphasised. The LCA is not integral to the key sensitivities of the area. The conclusions are overly restrictive for this LCA and are contradictory, initially stating there is very limited potential, then stating the area should remain undeveloped.	Noted. The final appraisal has been amended to clarify that this area should remain undeveloped. This is because the area is limited in extent and contributes to continuity of this landscape character across the east of the study area.
Industry	Disagree that the open horizontal form of the LCA is small in scale due to its broad expanse.	The appraisal describes that “whilst small in scale the open horizontal form of the landscape allows wide 360 degree panoramas from any number of locations...” so, although the LCA is itself small within the other character types that surround it, the views are expansive from this area. Therefore, development in this area could affect the way the existing clusters of development are read in the landscape, especially over different LCAs which have different sensitivities. Text has been added to clarify meaning. No change required.

CT9

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Public	The visual impacts of Dounreay and HMS Vulcan should be more accurately described. The LCA is already impacted by tall structures including wind farms.	Noted, minor amendments have been made to this section to reflect the issues raised.
Industry	The conclusions for the LCA appraisal are overly constraining and, subject to further detailed site considerations and assessments, development could be accommodated. The conclusion should be amended accordingly to provide flexibility for proposals to be considered on their merits.	The use of the term ‘limited scope’ is intentional because there are likely to be considerable siting and design challenges to accommodating larger scale development within the LCA. The introductory guidance provided within the Highland Strategic Capacity section of the Supplementary Guidance provides sufficient guidance about how the appraisal will be applied on a case by case basis. If a developer nevertheless wishes to pursue a larger scale proposal in this LCA they may seek to demonstrate through good siting and design that it can be accommodated, taking into account all

		relevant considerations including the issues identified in the appraisal. No change required.
--	--	---

CT10

Type	Summary of Comment	How issue has been addressed
Public	No turbine present at Golval, concerns about cumulative associated infrastructure.	Noted. The section has been amended to reflect the turbine present at Kirkton Farm.

Appendix 3 – Progress of Renewable Energy Development in Highland

1. Earlier this year we published an updated version of our map of wind energy developments, available via the link www.highland.gov.uk/windmap . It now contains information on wind energy schemes that are "Constructed", "Constructed - Removed" or "Under Construction", "Approved", "In Planning", "Refused" and "Withdrawn". We also published a new storymap of hydro energy developments, available at www.highland.gov.uk/hydromap .
2. The following table (based on that data, with some corrections) summarises the progress of renewable energy development in Highland as at 1 January 2017:

Renewable Energy Progress, 1 January 2017					
Technology	Capacity (MW)				
	HRES-derived targets for 2017	Constructed & Under Construction	Consented	Total of: Constructed & Under Construction + Consented	In Planning
TOTAL⁴	2908	2435	3543	5979	873
Export Hydro	440	¹ 1078	² 629	1708	3
Export Onshore Wind	1280	1261	798	2059	859
Export Biomass	140	(Updated figures awaited)			
Export Offshore Wind	520	10	³ 2116	2126	12
Export Wave	0	0	0	0	0
Export Tide	220	86	0	86	0
Local	250	(All Hydro and Wind included in figures above, including non-export; updated figures for other technologies awaited)			
Micro	58				

Notes:

- 1 Includes 'old' hydro schemes, whereas the HRES-derived target is exclusive of many 'old' schemes pre-dating HRES.
 - 2 Includes Coire Glas pump storage scheme – capacity of up to 600 MW.
 - 3 Includes the maximum consented capacity for Beatrice Offshore Wind Ltd of 1000MW; however, we understand that it is the developer's intention to construct a lower figure of 588MW.
 - 4 Figures may not total exactly, due to rounding of figures.
3. Our installed capacity of renewable energy, including all consented schemes, significantly exceeds the Highland Renewable Energy Strategy (HRES) target with respect to overall renewable energy capacity, although it may be noted that the implementation of consented schemes will depend also upon developers' commercial decisions to proceed (influenced by

funding) and connection to the grid.

4. The following further commentary in this section of the report focuses on generally larger scale onshore wind energy development, a sub-sector on which Scotland's Draft Energy Strategy continues to rely for a substantial contribution with further development going forward – including new and repowered windfarm sites. This is in the context of growing pressure for onshore wind energy to be less dependent upon subsidies or similar assistance, which means greater emphasis on projects that are efficient in terms of costs and rewarding in terms of energy generation and income. Taken in isolation such increase in efficiency and contribution to meeting energy needs may be broadly welcomed; however we may experience growing interest in the development of sites which could be efficient and productive but some of which could raise significant planning issues.
5. From 1 January 2016 to 1 January 2017, in Highland: Creag Rhiabach received consent (now subject of a judicial review); Achlachan 2 received consent on appeal; Corriemoillie (increasing the capacity of the previously permitted scheme) received consent; Tom Nan Clach (alternative scheme to that previously consented) received consent on appeal. However, the 'dip' in additional onshore wind energy consents noted in our report to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee in August 2016 largely continued. There was not much additional capacity consented for other types of renewables during that period, there generally not having been much additional capacity the subject of applications for consent. Like last year, there remained a considerable potential capacity for onshore wind energy 'In Planning'.
6. It may be noted that since 1 January 2017: Lychrobbie received consent on appeal; Millennium South received consent; Aberarder received consent on appeal; Cnoc An Eas appeal against refusal was dismissed.
7. There are still a significant number of schemes 'In Planning', some of which have been so for a considerable length of time, and a number of schemes are subject of appeals – together creating a significant element of uncertainty about the future pattern of wind energy development in parts of Highland and making it more complex to assess cumulative effects. Decisions are awaited on the following Section 36 applications that are or have been with the Scottish Government's Directorate for Planning and Environmental Appeals: Strathy South (report issued); Braemore (report issued); Cairn Duhie (report issued); West Garty; Caplich; Limekiln (resubmission). Decisions are awaited on the following appeals: Druim Ba (second proposal – appeal against non-determination); Culachy; Cogle Moss. Decisions are awaited on the following other Section 36 applications which are with Scottish Government's Energy Consents Unit: Golticlay; Gordonbush Extension; Strathy Wood; Drum Hollistan. Decisions are still to be made on the following Planning Applications: Dell; Achlachan (application to increase tip height from that already permitted).
8. Members are reminded that a report is taken to each Planning Applications Committee as a standing agenda item, providing an update on progress of all cases within the 'Major' development category currently with the Planning and Development Service for determination and identifies those proposed applications subject of Proposal of Application Notices. That report also details progress on proposals submitted under S36 or S37 of the Electricity Act 1989 on which the Council is consulted.