

**MINUTES of MEETING of held in the ARDRISHAIG PUBLIC HALL, ARDRISHAIG, ARGYLL
on TUESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2007**

Present:

Daniel Kelly (Chair)

Councillor Gordon Chalmers	Councillor John McAlpine
Councillor Robin Currie	Councillor Roderick McCuish
Councillor Neil Mackay	Councillor Alex McNaughton
Councillor Donald MacMillan	Councillor James McQueen
Councillor Bruce Marshall	Councillor Al Reay

Attending:

Charles Reppke, Head of Democratic Services and Governance
Angus Gilmour, Head of Planning
Richard Kerr, Area Team Leader – Development Management
Frank Park, Npower – Applicant
Stan Phillips, SNH – Consultee
Nigel Buchan, SNH – Consultee
Andy Robinson, RSPB – Consultee
Edward Laughton, Ardrishaig Community Council – Consultee
James Lithgow, Landowner – Supporter
Archie McArthur – Supporter
Alan Stobie – Objector
William Sutherland – Objector
Ron Bowe – Objector
Robert Wakeham - Objector

Apologies:

Councillor Vivien Dance

**1. APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 14 WIND TURBINES AND
ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (ALLT DEARG WINDFARM):
NPOWER RENEWABLES: CRUACH A'PHUBUILL, BY
STRONCHULLIN FARM, INVERNEILL, LOCHGILPHEAD (REF:
06/01158/DET)**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the Committee Members to introduce themselves. He asked Mr Reppke, Head of Democratic Services and Governance, to outline the procedure that would be followed at the meeting with reference to the procedure note, outlined the running order for presentations, and confirmed with those present that they understood the process.

PLANNING SERVICES

Mr Gilmour, Head of Planning, advised that if approved, the application would be subject to referral to Scottish Ministers and an Environmental Impact Assessment would be required. He then spoke regarding material and non-material considerations advising that the application must be judged solely on land use and planning merits.

Mr Kerr presented the Planning report advising that the application before Members was significantly reduced from the applicant's original proposals for

the site which were to have had 40 turbines. He reported that the size of the turbines stood at 115m to the tip of the vertical blade which in context would be twice the size of the Beinn an Turic development and nine times the size of the newly built sports hall in Lochgilphead.

Mr Kerr advised that if the development went ahead approximately half a hectare of land would be developed to construct an adequate access and a further six hectares of blanket bog would also require to be destroyed. He advised that a borrow pit would also require to be constructed which would require a mineral consent application.

Mr Kerr then spoke regarding the adverse visual impact that the proposal would have and showed the Committee photographs of the various views from a number of locations where the impact would be most prominent.

Mr Kerr then summarised the objections to the proposal which were raised by statutory consultees and which are contained within the report by the Head of Planning dated 27 August 2007.

Mr Gilmour advised the Committee of the grounds for refusal contained within his report, highlighting his main concern which was in relation to the adverse visual impact. He considered the development would be an industrial intrusion which would have significant impact for local communities. He stated that while the Planning Service were generally supportive of renewable developments, this should not be to the detriment of the surrounding environment. In support of this statement, Mr Gilmour advised of the Council's newly published renewable energy strategy which highlights three areas of search for development of wind farms over 20 mega watts. It was noted that two of the three sites were in Mid Argyll.

APPLICANTS

Mr Frank Park, on behalf of the applicants, NPower Renewables, spoke to the application advising of the need to reduce Co2 emissions and other such harmful gases significantly. He advised that there would be negligible carbon emissions in terms of transporting equipment onsite to be installed.

He spoke regarding subsidies for renewable companies advising there were no such things. It was the energy companies responsibility to procure and they were required to re-invest monies to encourage further growth.

He discussed potential problems relating to tourism advising that evidence had shown that where an expected adverse impact was expected, when the development became reality the concerns were not realised.

Mr Park advised that following earlier discussions with his company, they were now prepared to offer to reduce the number of proposed turbines on this site from 14 to 12. This would be achieved by removal of the two most prominent turbines from the application site.

With regard to the Inverneill montage shown during the presentation by the Council's Planning Service, he reported that by his estimation the forestry would have grown by approximately 12 feet by the time construction would have taken

place thereby having a minimising effect on the visual impacts. He invited Members to approve the application.

CONSULTEES

Mr Phillips and Mr Buchan (regarding any landscape concerns) appeared on behalf of SNH.

Mr Phillips advised that in responding to statutory consultations such as in this case, SNH had supported 77% of the wind farm proposals although in Argyll this figure was slightly lower at 70%. He reported on the main issues of complaint which related to adverse landscape and visual impacts. Other concerns they had were relating to Golden Eagles, Hen Harriers, Black-Throated Divers, blanket bogs and the colour of the wind turbines but he considered these could be resolved by way of suitable conditions.

Mr Buchan advised that the landscape concerns could be summarised in six bullet points:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Increase the dispersal of wind farms
- Considered a poor landscape fit
- Visual effects and prominence
- Cumulative landscape and visual impacts
- Effect on landscape character

Mr Buchan then demonstrated the visual effects of the development on key points within Argyll, emphasising that the visualisations had been increased for ease of viewing and not in an attempt to influence the Committee.

Mr Phillips then spoke regarding the loss of habitat to Golden Eagles advising that there were no breeding pairs on site but that this area was used mainly by single adults and foraging juveniles. He considered that the collision risk impact on adult birds was low, moderate in juveniles. The loss of foraging could be covered by a legal agreement as could the habitat management plan for Hen Harriers.

With regard to blanket bogs, the conditions suggested were:

1. Design plan of drainage infrastructure to be agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with SNH. Mitigation to be carried out should also be detailed.
2. Mitigation measures contained within the peat slide risk assessment are to be implemented in full.

Mr Edward Laughton, Chairman of Ardrishaig Community Council, spoke to the terms of their objection. He advised that while people were generally supportive of wind farm proposals, the majority did not want a wind farm at this particular site as they felt it couldn't have been more visible. The opinion of the Community Council was that this cut across a number of policies and was within a constrained area of sensitive landside. Other issues of concern related to adverse effects of tourism, hazard to birds, particularly Golden Eagles and the distraction this development would have on passing drivers. He asked the Committee to acknowledge the 90 members who were against the proposal and reject the application in line with the Planner's recommendations.

Mr Robinson, RSPB, spoke to the application advising that the RSPB were also supportive of renewable energy projects with an 11% objection rate to wind farm sites. He reported of three ways in which birds could be affected by wind farm developments:

1. Loss of habitat due to construction
2. Disturbance leading to displacement
3. Collision mortality.

He considered that the development proposed, although relatively small scale, would still lead to a barrier for dispersal advising that there had been no young at Beinn an Turic since the development of the wind farm. The RSPB were objecting to the application unless a scheme of mitigation and compensation for habitat loss was agreed before permission was granted. They also considered there should be a pre and post-construction monitoring exercise conducted to establish impacts of development and to assess collision risk for Golden Eagles and Black-Throated Divers and asked that these requests be taken into consideration if the decision of the Committee was to grant planning permission.

SUPPORTERS

Mr Lithgow, Supporter and Landowner, spoke regarding the importance of approval of the application to the whole of Argyll. He referred to the affects of global climate change which he had had witnessed personally at Ormsary where a sea water temperature raise of 1.5 degrees had been detected. He considered that this must be tackled immediately and one way of achieving this would be substituting fossil fuels with renewable projects. While he accepted there were other sources for renewable energy he advised that the most available source in Argyll at present was wind power, the other sources such as wave power were, he considered, further down the line.

He accepted that wind farms had their drawbacks in terms of visibility and requirement to locate on hillside locations but explained that the turbines would only have a 25 year life and in the event that nuclear fusion or viable wave options came to light, the turbines could be removed and we would be none the wiser. He felt that there was a moral obligation to use the wind we have.

In terms of the local economy, he spoke regarding the good position the development was in as there were locally based manufacturers who were well placed to provide the turbines. He advised that the development would have a rateable income to the Council of £200,000 per annum or £5m over the course of the life of the wind farm for which there would be no demands on services ie no additional schools called for or refuse to be collected. He further advised that a Community Trust would benefit financially of between £70,000 to £100,000 and that the development would generate an additional eight full time jobs in the area.

Mr Lithgow understood that visual impact would be at the heart of the application but in his opinion, did not consider that the site was a bad one. Although the Planners had advised that there were three sites identified for wind farm developments over 20 mega watts, he emphasised that these would only be made available on the agreement of landowners and that this permission may not be forthcoming.

He suggested that the scenery at the site was not a “chocolate box” but a living community which was managed carefully at great expense which was evident through matters such as there being no overhead telegraph wires. He considered that trees would largely hide the site from view and corrected the Planners who had stated that the photo montages could be more visible on certain days by commenting on the local weather which he considered would be more likely to obscure visibility of the site.

Mr Lithgow advised the Committee that tourism was an important part of the income for Ormsary and Stronachullin Estates. However, on the basis that the recent clearing of forestry East of Lochfyne did not seem to have affected tourism levels, he did not consider that this development would be considered off putting. He reminded the Committee of attacks made on fish farm developments which were also predicted to affect tourism levels and which hadn't. He requested that the Committee base their decision on the real benefits of jobs and vibrant economy as against what he considered to be the entirely subjective views expressed and grant the application.

The Committee then heard from Mr Archie McArthur, supporter. Mr McArthur spoke regarding the difficulties experienced by sheep farmers and the development of hill and forestry, advising of the many successful ancillary business which are thriving through forestry enterprises. He considered that diversification was what was now required for ongoing land use and that the natural progression for the estates was to tap into wind power. He spoke of Cruachan and Sloy hydro power stations which were again predicted to affect tourism levels and of the fact that Cruachan had its own very successful tourist centre. He commended the project to the meeting and the community as a whole.

The Chair proposed and the Committee agreed to have a 45 minute adjournment for lunch. The meeting adjourned at 1pm and re-convened at 1.45pm.

OBJECTORS

Dr Stobie, objector, presented a case on behalf of AWF and the 1400 objectors (which he commented was unprecedented in Argyll and Bute). He demonstrated the size of the proposed wind turbines by showing photographs of turbines based within a development in Ayr which were 110m to the tip of the vertical blade. He accepted that this development would go some way to reducing the carbon footprint but considered this to be the wrong location for the development.

Dr Stobie advised the Committee that AWF would work with developers on a good site and highlighted the work they had done with the developers proposing a wind farm at A'Chruach. He accepted that there was no such thing as a perfect site but stressed that there were good sites. He considered the site at Allt Dearg to be a bad site and defined what he considered to be the attributes of a bad site by use of visual aids. He didn't consider that any wind farm site within Argyll and Bute came close in terms of visual impact or being within such a sensitive landscape as the proposed development outlined and for this he congratulated the Planning Authority.

A total of 650 objections came from Argyll based addresses which Dr Stobie asked the Committee take as a material consideration. A ratio of objectors to

supporters for the whole of Argyll (from the figures provided) would work out at 11:1 meaning Argyll was 90% against the development. He referred also to an opinion poll carried out by Npower who had issued residents with pre-paid postcards asking them to return them as a sign of their support. 94% did not return these postcards which indicated to Dr Stobie that 94% were objectors.

Dr Stobie advised the Committee of a few of the comments raised by objectors within their letters to the Planning Authority. While he had great respect for the work that was being done at Ormsary he suggested that if 28% of visitors did not return to this area on the basis of a wind farm being developed (figures from questionnaire conducted by Visitscotland) this would be an economic disaster.

He summarised his presentation advising that this was the right development, in the wrong location and asked that the Committee support AWF, the individual objectors in Argyll (646), the Planning Authority and SNH by refusing the application on a unanimous basis.

Mr Sutherland, objector, cautioned the Committee against approving the application due to the devastating effects on tourism that would be seen as a result of the development going ahead. He advised that tourism was the only source of income in Kilfinan and that this site would be very prominent from this area.

Mr Bowe, objector, spoke regarding the one area which he considered would have a greater impact than the wind farm itself, which he considered would be the access road. He felt this would be ugly, unnatural and a permanent scar. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr Wakeham, objector, acknowledged the work of the Ormsary Estate and thought it was tragic there was no better site within their ownership. He urged caution against granting the application on the basis he felt this would open the floodgates for a huge number of applications for wind farms in Argyll and Bute.

QUESTION TIME

Councillor Reay queried whether the Planners considered that the Country was on track to meet the targets set by Government for renewable energy projects? Mr Gilmour advised that the 2010 target was being met now and that Argyll and Bute was making a big contribution to the 2020 target of 40% renewables. As a follow up Councillor Reay questioned whether Planners were happy that the Government had an appropriate strategy in place? Mr Gilmour advised that in the past this had not been the case although with the introduction of SPP6 which encourages Local Authorities to identify appropriate sites for development of wind farms over 20 mega watts, there was a “chink of light” for the first time. He considered there was big capacity within Argyll and Bute for development of small scale projects.

Councillor Currie asked Dr Stobie if the opinion of AWF was that the number of objectors should determine the outcome? Dr Stobie advised that it should not be the sole determining factor but it should be a material consideration. As a follow up, Councillor Currie queried whether they considered the Npower survey as a material consideration as in his opinion a lack of replies could suggest support? Dr Stobie advised that the purpose of the poll was for those who supported the

scheme to respond and in this case, 94% persons failed to respond. Councillor Currie questioned AWF on their position re non-return of tourists in areas where wind farms were to be developed. He asked whether AWF had considered that a number of tourists travelled to areas such as Gigha to look at the turbines. Dr Stobie advised in his opinion Gigha development was on a domestic scale and as there were a number of other countries where larger scale wind farms had already been developed, did not consider that people would come to Lochgilphead to view this site.

Councillor Currie questioned why the RSPB had a different view from SNH with regard to the bird population? Andy Robinson, responded advising that there was no link between the organisations and that the RSPB had simply made a different assessment. Mr Gilmour advised that biodiversity was not grounds for refusal and that the habitat management regime suggested remained unresolved at present.

Councillor Currie spoke regarding the slogan of RSPB “for birds, for people” and queried where the people element came into this development. Mr Robinson advised that they were principally an animal charity but believed the environment was a way to support people and that birds were an important part of this.

Councillor Marshall asked the Planning Officer to speak regarding bird mortality surrounding various wind farms in Argyll and Bute. Mr Kerr advised that there was no sign of any bird strikes at the Tangy or Beinn an Turic site over the course of several years.

Councillor Marshall commented on the fact that there weren't many sites identified in Mid Argyll in terms of SPP6. Mr Gilmour advised that these were developments in excess of 20 mega watts and that there were plenty of opportunities for smaller scale developments.

Councillor Marshall asked Mr Buchan whether he considered a clutter of poles to be more eye-catching than turbines? Mr Buchan advised that in his opinion the poles were a confusing visual image.

Councillor Marshall asked Mr Park to advise the life term of turbines. Mr Park advised this was between 20-25 years and that a fund to meet the costs of removal would be a legal requirement should the application be granted.

Councillor McAlpine asked whether this application had been in the system before the sites referred to in terms of SPP6? Mr Gilmour confirmed that it had although Officers had advised Npower of the controversy this proposal was likely to cause way back when the proposals were first discussed.

Councillor McAlpine questioned the offer to reduce the number of turbines on the site from 14 to 12. He wondered which 2 would be removed? Mr Park advised that the 2 they would propose to remove where the 2 nearest the Knapdale National Scenic Area but that his company had not had sufficient time to produce the relevant work for the meeting today.

Councillor McAlpine asked whether the developers could work with SNH to resolve issues with the bird habitat displacement etc. Mr Park confirmed this would be the case, advising of a management system in place at Beinn an Turic.

Councillor McAlpine questioned the amount of time spent by the RSPB on the hillside monitoring bird activity. Mr Robinson advised he had not spent any time on the hillside, the information provided was from their existing knowledge of the different bird species in the direct vicinity.

Councillor Mackay asked whether the Committee were considering an application for 14 or 12 turbines. Mr Gilmour advised the application before Members was for 14 and they should proceed on this basis. The developers would require to enter into discussions with the Planning Authority in order that a judgement could be made as to whether the proposed amendment was material and possibly require further consultation. Mr Reppke questioned the applicant whether the offer to withdraw 2 turbines was their formal position. Mr Park responded advising the Committee the proposal was for 14, the reduction was an option. When pressed by the Chair he confirmed he was happy for the Committee to consider the application as it stood (ie for 14 turbines)

Councillor MacKay asked Mr Lithgow if there was any further possibility of developing the land for the purpose of additional wind farms. Mr Lithgow responded advising that there was no further opportunity within the site proposed.

Councillor MacKay questioned what the percentage of tourism based income enjoyed by the estate was. Mr Lithgow advised it was in the region of 10%.

Councillor MacKay asked Dr Stobie to advise of the remit of AWF. Dr Stobie advised they were a constituted pressure group with a remit to ensure that they got wind farms in the right locations. As a follow up Councillor MacKay asked Dr Stobie what qualified him to chair the group? Dr Stobie advised he had no formal qualification in this field although felt he knew a considerable amount about it. Councillor MacKay commented that the AWF opinion was therefore just an opinion albeit a knowledgeable one. Dr Stobie conceded this to be the case.

Councillor McCuish asked the landowner why the development had to be on this site on the basis of the information given to them by the Planning Authority. Mr Lithgow advised they entered into negotiations approximately 6 years ago with developers who advised this to be the preferred site as it would give more power per year than the national average. He felt then, and continues to feel that this was the right thing to do although accepted that 2 of the turbines would be too intrusive and was supportive of the proposal to withdraw these.

Councillor Marshall asked Mr McArthur his opinion on what the issue was with locals/tourists. Mr McArthur stated that nobody had raised any objection directly to him and that generally they wanted to see a new development which would bring in new occupants, accepting these new occupants would require to make a living from somewhere.

Councillor Chalmers referred to the percentage of the Ormsary Estates tourism business as being 10% and asked whether there were growth in other areas. Mr Lithgow explained that the other parts of the business were performing better than they have previously advising that the 10% figure related mainly to the fact that the seasons seemed to be shortening with people preferring long weekend breaks rather than fortnights as was the case previously.

Councillor McQueen asked Mr Lithgow if he considered the Planners were wrong on this occasion? Mr Lithgow stated they may be correct in terms of the planning legislation but that they had failed to take on board other aspects such as the economy.

Councillor McNaughton asked what the reduction in efficiency of the turbines would be if they were reduced in height. Mr Park advised that any height reduction would be dramatic and explained the tender process that required to be undertaken. To ensure fairness of competition, they could not ask for prices to be based on supply of 115m turbines but had submitted an application on the basis that this would be the maximum height to be installed on the site. Mr Gilmour advised that if there were changes in the height they may require a fresh application or non material amendment. He asked the Committee to consider the application on the height of 115m which was as submitted.

Councillor McAlpine queried whether Vestas would be an option for manufacture of the turbines. Mr Park advised it would be their intention to ask them to tender if the application was granted and hoped that they would be in a position to offer a competitive price due to their location to the site.

SUMMING UP

Mr Gilmour advised that the Planning Authority were objecting for strong landscape and visibility reasons. He considered this an inappropriately sited development advising of their good track record in working with sustainable developers. He stated that renewal energy was important but not at the detriment of the environment and that there were sufficient identified sites to meet Government targets for renewables. He considered the Planning Authority had a duty to protect the Community from such inappropriate developments and asked the Committee to refuse the application for the reasons specified within his report.

Mr Park advised the Committee that it boiled down to one objection based on landscape/visual impact. While SNH had one view, their company specialists had another. He stated that the landowners of the three identified sites may not sign up to the cause. His opinion was that the land would be developed to the best of their ability and was well thought out.

Mr Phillips advised that SNH saw the project as being unacceptable visually. There were no shortage of wind farm applications in the planning system and that it would be disappointing to approve this application before all other opportunities were exhausted.

Mr Laughton stated that the removal of 2 turbines would make no difference to the residents of Ardrishaig.

Mr Robinson advised he remained concerned about impacts on Golden Eagles and Black-Throated Divers and should only proceed on the basis of studies being undertaken.

Mr Lithgow spoke regarding Mr Sutherland's presentation and the breakdown of Kilfinan community. He did not want the same situation for Ormsary and

Stronachullin or the wider Argyll community. He felt that the concerns raised were of the unknown but still believed this was the right thing to do.

Mr McArthur advised he had nothing further to add.

Dr Stobie advised that the landowners of the three identified sites were the Forestry Commission who have a pro-active approach to wind farms so did not anticipate any problems. He advised he was pleased that Ormsary Estates had made a profit last year of £1m. At this point in proceedings Mr Reppke, on the basis that this comment was the introduction of new material but had been raised nevertheless, allowed Mr Lithgow for comment (in addition the Chair suggested Dr Stobie should apologise to Mr Lithgow for this inappropriate comment). Mr Lithgow was sorry that Dr Stobie had felt the need to try and personalise the matter. He assured the Committee that the profit ability of Ormsary had been marginal at best during the last few years and that to suggest this was some vast money making scheme was incorrect on the basis that the business struggles to make money. He stated that the profit figures had as yet not been published and that the figure was not one he recognised and that he did not know where Dr Stobie had obtained this.

Dr Stobie retracted his comment and rephrased to say he was delighted they run a successful local business and it was unfortunate there were no alternative sites on Ormsary. He stated the Committee would be taking a great risk with the economy if they approved the application.

Mr Sutherland advised that in his opinion this was a case of selling the unspoilt nature of the Country.

Mr Bowe confirmed he had nothing further to add.

Mr Wakeham suggested that Ormsary use their links with Jura to identify opportunities.

Following the summing up, the Chair confirmed with all parties that they had received a fair hearing. They confirmed they had with exception of Mr Lithgow who only took issue with the comment made regarding the estates profit margin for the last financial year.

DEBATE

Members then commented on certain aspects of the presentations heard and Councillor Currie asked for some procedural advice from Mr Reppke as to whether it would be competent to adjourn the meeting to consider a proposal for 12 turbines? Mr Reppke advised that in this case there appeared to be three options open, the first to refuse, the second to approve and the third to continue consideration to allow the technical aspects of a 12 turbine option which may require submission of new plans etc and investigation into the mitigation options to be undertaken.

MOTION

That the application be refused on the basis that the development proposed would be inappropriately located on elevated land immediately overlooking Loch Fyne,

where its visual impact at close quarters on the skyline would assert a commanding presence upon the coast, which in turn, would have adverse consequences for the maintenance of landscape character. The coastline of the loch does not have the capacity to absorb such magnitude of change given that it is the focus of settlement in the area, the conduit for people travelling around the area using established land and sea transport routes, and in view of the scenic sensitivity it derives from the role it performs in the inter-relationship between seascape and landscape. The prominence of this location is such that the presence of turbines of the scale proposed would exert an all round influence, extending into Mid Argyll to the north, Cowal to the east, Knapdale to the west and north Kintyre to the south.

The proposed site fails to reinforce the established distribution of the other consented wind farm sites in Mid Argyll and Kintyre, and would not share the advantageous locational characteristics of those developments. These have been largely confined to upland locations removed from coastal areas where the shielding effect of topography and forestry, and the moderating effect of distance from sensitive viewpoints, conspire to reduce the visual and landscape significance of such large scale developments within areas of open countryside; thereby enabling the exploitation of the wind resource without unnecessarily compromising the landscape and scenic qualities of the area. This site, by virtue of its positioning and prominence, beyond those established locations above the head of Loch Fyne and the upland spine of Kintyre, would extend the influence of wind farm development throughout the length of Loch Fyne, thereby giving rise to particularly damaging consequences in terms of sequential impacts, to the detriment of the landscape qualities and the visual amenity of the area.

In addition to the immediate adverse impacts the presence this wind farm would have upon Loch Gilp, west Loch Fyne, and the coastal margins of these lochs, it would also be significant in longer distance views, exerting an adverse influence upon isolated and sensitive locations along the west coast of Cowal, and upon scenic vantage points within the Knapdale National Scenic Area. The development by reason of its siting and scale would therefore give rise to adverse visual and landscape impacts, not only in terms of its immediate surroundings and its wider landscape setting, but also in terms of the disproportionate contribution it would make to the overall cumulative impact of wind power development in Argyll.

The foregoing considerations are of such magnitude that they cannot be reasonably offset by the projected benefits which a development of this scale would make to the achievement of climate change related commitments. The proposal would be contrary to Policies SI 1 and DC 8 of the 'Argyll and Bute Structure Plan' 2002; and the Policies RUR 1 and RUR 2 of the 'Mid Argyll Local Plan', which in particular, affords special protection to the Knapdale Scenic Area, and the Loch Fyne – West Loch Tarbert area of local landscape significance. In view of its adverse consequences for views from west Cowal, it would also conflict with Policy RUR 1 of the Cowal Local Plan (1995). In view of the foregoing, it would also be contrary to Policy ENV 10 of the 'Argyll and Bute Local Plan' Finalised Draft 2005, and would conflict with Policy WF 1 of the Council's non-statutory 'Wind Farm Policy' 1995, and with governance guidance given in SPP 6 (2007) and PAN 45 (2002).

Moved by Councillor Kelly, seconded by Councillor Reay

The Committee adjourned for 10 minutes in to allow time for Councillors McAlpine and Currie to prepare a competent amendment.

AMENDMENT

That the application be continued to allow;

- (a) the submission of details of the proposal reducing from 14 to 12 turbines and the process of revised Zones of Visual Introduction Mitigation; and
- (b) full details of the proposed mitigation schemes required to fulfil the requirements set out by Scottish Natural Heritage.

Moved by Councillor Currie, seconded by Councillor Marshall

DECISION

The motion was carried by 6 votes to 4 and the Committee resolved accordingly.

(Ref: Report by Head of Planning dated 27 August 2007, submitted)

