

Robertson J (Jane)

From: Shirley Gold <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 24 March 2017 18:37
To: Robertson J (Jane); Cliff Green; Calum Reid; Glen Urquhart Community Council
Subject: PPA-270-2155 Cnoc an Eas windfarm final submission
Attachments: 2017-3-24 Immediate Neighbours Cnoc an Eas Appeal final submission.pdf

Categories: Cnoc an Eas

Please find attached the final submission by the immediate neighbours to the Cnoc an Eas Appeal process.
Shirley Gold

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been received from an external party and
has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

PLANNING APPEAL - CNOC AN EAS WINDFARM - PPA-270-2155

CLOSING SUBMISSION.

As the most immediate neighbours to the proposed Cnoc an Eas windfarm [namely: myself and my husband Greigor Gold at Dalich Moire House, Kilmartin; Calum & Susan Reid at Willow Lodge; Edward & Fiona Reid at Cnoc an Raineach; Edward & Jessie Reid at Kintrae House; Ronnie Ferguson at Woodend Cottage and Neil & Elma Lyon at Fallachan, Corrish], we would respectfully ask you consider these final thoughts as you consider your final decision regarding the Cnoc an Eas windfarm appeal.

We believe this is **the wrong development in the wrong place** especially so close to such a scenically important area of Loch Ness and especially when seen in context of the cumulative proposals that are being considered. We believe it will **compromise the USP of our area** with potentially devastating effects in the long run on the area's main business – tourism as it **seriously adversely impairs public views at several very key points** from near Strone next to Urquhart Castle both by road, path and boat, from Strathglass and Aigas, not to mention the wider high lands views including from the Affric Kintail Way and Meall Fuar 'Mhonaidh. As was pointed out during the discussions I believe by the Mountaineering Council of Scotland, the fact that views have already been compromised in certain directions actually makes those as yet still "wild" even more important – to lose one arm does not make it easier to lose the other but actually more vital to preserve it.

We also firmly believe that it will be harmful to the nationally important **Corrimony ancient monument** as it will have a severe detrimental effect on the integrity, coherence and wholeness of the overall site and visitors' experience of the area and sense of place. We also believe that **preservation of the SW-NE aspect of the entrance alignment is essential** ahead of potential future understanding of the overall site of the Cairn. To allow such an intrusion of industrial scale along the potentially vital NE horizon aspect would be very short sighted indeed.

During the recent inquiry discussions about the chambered cairn, argument was made that the wider good should be considered as an exceptional circumstance (to allow developments of windfarms near Schedule 1 monuments) to enable the fulfilment of national imperatives and allow green energy developments such as this to go ahead. We support the example given by a representative of Historic Environmental Scotland that a better example of an exceptional circumstance would be a vital national road link rather than a windfarm development that could easily be located somewhere other than in a position so damaging to our heritage. **Also as a local community, we feel we have already put up with quite substantial contributions to "the greater good"** with several hydro-electric facilities including a new one currently under development and with the controversial Beaully to Denny powerline.

For us personally if the development is given the go ahead, it will significantly impact on the quality of our lives in the homes we love, **changing the whole atmosphere and character of the Glen** from quiet rurality to a huge industrial construction site to be followed by an ongoing blight on the landscape of multiple, huge, metal and glass fibre megaliths, even higher than the dizzying height of the current weather mast, so close to homes for decades to come. For the local visual impacts, what mitigations are proposed are hugely dependent on factors outwith the Appellant's direct control and involve decades of delay before screening is obtained to any substantial degree.

Despite the attempts at mitigation voiced by the Appellant we continue to be very concerned about a plethora of issues from potentially devastating impacts on the local **wildlife** and our domestic **pets** to

pollution of our **drinking water**. We are also very anxious about the proposed changes to our vital **access route** especially during hard winters and by potentially crippling devaluation to our properties. None of us who currently live here “signed up” for living with a view of wind turbines or for listening to their **noises**. Nor putting up with **the mammoth upheaval** that is going to happen if construction goes ahead. We were also very unhappy with the lack of assurance that if the development is given the go ahead that we would be protected from **further expansion** of the site as an access route to areas over the hill previously turned down for windfarm development because of access concerns. Further years of upheaval with dirt, noise and disruption with even more forestry clearing and cement laying is an exceedingly daunting prospect. It was also frightening to hear the evasive answers about setting up at an early stage a protected financial fund for **ultimate decommissioning** of the site should something happen to those who built it in the first place.

We are aware that the national perspective is that planning decisions should be weighted in favour of community backed windfarm developments. Despite some early attempts by the Appellant to cite discussions with the local Soirbheas wind energy project group [who publically declared that they only had involvement as a mitigation step if the development was eventually given the go ahead] as an indication of local support for the development, it is absolutely crystal clear that the contrary is true. Far from being a community backed project, it would be difficult to find a less well locally supported proposal. Apart from those who are financially benefiting, there is **comprehensive opposition by the community** as shown by the widespread opposition given not only by ourselves, the immediate neighbours, and the local STAG group but also from **all the local councils** including Glen Urquhart, Drumnadrochit & Kiltarlity community councils and the regional Highland council itself. Objections have also been strongly voiced by **numerous external, national organizations** such as Historic Environment Scotland, the Mountaineering Council of Scotland and Scotways.

Therefore, in conclusion, we would most strongly request that the appeal is turned down and consent is not given to the proposed development going ahead.

Dr. Shirley Gold, MbChB, MRCP.