

**Argyll and Bute Council  
Development & Infrastructure**

**Delegated or Committee Planning Application Report and Report of handling as required by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 relative to applications for Planning Permission or Planning Permission in Principle**

---

**Reference No:** 09/01874/PP

**Planning Hierarchy:** Major

**Applicant:** RWE Npower Renewable Ltd

**Proposal:** Application for full planning permission for construction of a 15 turbine (45 megawatt maximum capacity) wind farm and ancillary development.

**Site Address:** Raera Forest, Kilninver, Argyll & Bute

---

## **DECISION ROUTE**

**(i) Local Government Scotland Act 1973**

---

**(A) THE APPLICATION**

**(i) Development Requiring Express Planning Permission**

- Erection of 15 wind turbines (125m to blade tip);
- Formation of hard-standings at the base of each turbine to facilitate installation;
- Temporary construction compound and lay down area;
- A permanent access track onto site and between turbines;
- Erection of electrical sub-station; incorporating site office;
- Three anemometer masts;

**(ii) Other specified operations**

- Clearance of forestry plantation;
  - Five borrow workings to provide the aggregate required during construction (to be subject of separate planning applications);
- 

**(B) RECOMMENDATION:**

This proposal is recommended for REFUSAL for the reasons stated in this report subject to a Discretionary Hearing being held in view of the number of representations which have been received.

---

**(C) HISTORY:**

**01/01263/FDP** - Forest Plan, Raera Forest, Kilmelford, Oban, Argyll – no objections 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2001.

**09/01174/PP** - Erection of a temporary anemometry mast for a period of 36 months, Raera Forest, Loch Melfort, Argyll - Application Approved 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

**(D) CONSULTATIONS:**

**The Scottish Government - Climate Change & Greener Scotland Division (26<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – no comment on the Environmental Statement.

**Health & Safety Executive (21<sup>st</sup> January 2010)** – no comment.

**Historic Scotland (27<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – Historic Scotland have some concerns with some of the criteria employed in the ES to assess the relative significance or sensitivity of historic environment assets of national importance in the vicinity of the development. Despite this, Historic Scotland accepts the conclusions reached in the ES that any impacts on sites of national importance are not as such a level of significance to warrant an objection.

**Forestry Commission Scotland (3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010)** – objects to the proposal as it currently stands. The main reason for their objection is that the proposal seeks to permanently remove some 720 hectares or thereabouts of forest (as well as not replanting a further 100 hectares or so of forest awaiting replanting after routine felling) and therefore does not address the Scottish Government's *'Policy on Control of Woodland Removal'* nor the statutory guidance on woodland removal contained in the National Planning Framework 2. In short, it does not take into account the need to minimise the inappropriate loss of existing woodland or the strong presumption in favour of compensatory planting where woodland is removed in association with development.

**Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) (11<sup>th</sup> August 2010)** – object to the proposed development as it will have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and the qualities of a distinctive and valued coastal landscape whose protection is in the national interest, adversely affecting a large number of its key views, including some located within the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area (NSA). SNH have not identified any mitigation that will change this position.

**Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (26<sup>th</sup> July 2010)** – does not object to this proposal but has concerns regarding the proposal's potential to impact on raptors, namely golden eagle and hen harrier (Annex 1 species of the EC Bird Directive) and has provided advice and suggested mitigation measures to minimise these impacts in the form of planning conditions.

**West of Scotland Archaeology Service (26<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – does not object to this proposal but advises that should planning permission be granted a condition is attached to secure a programme of archaeological works and written scheme of investigation to be agreed by the Council and the West of Scotland Archaeology Service.

**Scottish Water (6<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – no objection.

**Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) (8<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – have no objection to the proposal providing conditions are attached to any grant of planning permission in relation to: impacts on the water environment; private water supplies;

surface water drainage; construction method statement; full site specific environmental management plan; borrow pits; and, watercourse crossings.

**Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) (11<sup>th</sup> August 2010)** – following receipt of additional information from the developer in response to their first consultation letter, SEPA advised that they are of the opinion that it is unlikely that the Private Water Supplies (PWS) for the properties details are at a significant risk from the development given the distance between them.

**Area Roads (3<sup>rd</sup> August 2010)** – No objection subject to conditions relating to: discussions to be entered into with ABC with respect to suitable traffic management arrangement for construction traffic delivering materials to the site and the access is subject to a separate planning application.

**Transport Scotland (14<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – **advise that** overall there will be a minimal increase in traffic on the trunk road during the operation of the facility therefore the proposed development is not likely to have a significant impact on the operation of the trunk road network. However it is likely that as many of the construction loads may be categorised abnormal, authorisation from Scotland Transerv (TS) may be required.

**Local Biodiversity Officer (1<sup>st</sup> February 2010)** –The Local Biodiversity Officer has reservations in terms of the mitigation for protection of a number of species and peat land and freshwater habitats, and recommends a condition to secure an Environmental Management Plan (EMP).

**Salmon Fishery Board (6<sup>th</sup> April 2010)** – Overall have considerable concerns about the Raera wind farm development given the amount of potential disruption to watercourses within the site and the scale of the development itself. The main areas of potential impact on 'in river' species, including fish are: silting due to road building and forestry clearance; chemical (including concrete) pollution to water courses; and inappropriate bridges and culverts preventing fish access. It is recommended that these matters are controlled by relevant planning conditions.

**Access Officer (13<sup>th</sup> August 2010)** – no objections to the proposal, however, note that from their records there and from Ordnance Survey data it appears that a number of paths cross the site. These paths could be valuable and should be protected ensuring access is maintained and improved. Conditions are recommended to protect these paths should planning permission be granted.

**Environmental Health Officer (9<sup>th</sup> August 2010)** – no objection.

**Ministry Of Defence (MOD) (22<sup>nd</sup> January 2010)** - advise that the MOD has no objection. However, in the interests of air safety, they recommend that the turbines are fitted aviation lighting at the highest practical point.

**National Air Traffic Services (NATS) NERL Safeguarding (25<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – no safeguarding objection to this proposal.

**BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding (5<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – no objection - the proposal has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria as it is out with the area of concern for Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen Airports.

**Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) (5<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – do not object to the proposal but advise that consultation is undertaken with the Airport licensee/operators, MoD, NATS, BAA and Local Emergency Services to establish their viewpoints. Several

conditions are also recommended should permission be granted for the scheme, relating to: aviation lighting, paint colour and the proposal being charted on civil aviation maps.

**Scottish Ambulance, South West Division & National Air Wing (26<sup>th</sup> July 2010)** – have confirmed that the wind farm would have no impact on air ambulance operations.

**Oban Airport Manager (20<sup>th</sup> July 2010)** – has looked at the ES for the development and advised the agent that Oban Airport will not be raising objections or conditions against the proposal. However, they have advised the agent that they are not in receipt of the ‘scoping request’ in order to make a formal safeguarding response to the Planning Department. Oban Airport were formally consulted by Development & Infrastructure at the same time as all other consultees and were sent a copy of the ES.

**Joint Radio Company (4<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and data provided.

**Ofcom (6<sup>th</sup> January 2010)** – have found that within the assessed fixed link frequency bands, there are currently no fixed link ends within or fixed link path(s) that cross a 500 m radius coordination area for the stated turbine location as provided.

**Kilninver & Kilmelford Community Council (10<sup>th</sup> February 2010)** – at their bi monthly meeting to consider the proposal the vast majority of those in attendance certainly over 80% were against the project and wished their collective objections to be registered . These objections relate to: land allocation; constrained areas; area of panoramic quality; forest and ancient woodland removal; originally told turbines would be ‘keyholed’; no replanting proposals, contrary to Scottish Government Policy; PAN 45 - dwellings should be out with 2km radius of wind farms; height of wind turbines (biggest in Europe); Vague semantics of the application; grid connection and pier at Loch Melfort – difficult to consider all implications of the wind farm without considering these too; Noise implications; Sheer size of turbines and Visual Implications; Community Benefit; Economic impact; tourism impact; Traffic impact, and, unanswered questions and uncertainties

**Seil & Easdale Community Council (26<sup>th</sup> July 2010)** – consider that the proposal is located for the most part in Kilmelford Parish, but impacting primarily on Seil. Their objection to the proposal relates to: towers would be tallest on mainland Scotland; danger of setting a precedent for further developments; viewpoints; significant visual impact on Seil; lesser visual impact on Kilmelford; possible health hazards arising from low frequency noise; would be considerable pressure to grant permission for the Jetty & power lines should the wind farm receive permission; applicants have focused on Kilmelford; greatest long term impact will be on Seil; Community Benefit; Seil highly dependent on natural environment – attracts tourists in large numbers; very large scale of proposed towers, and the disproportionate impact that they would have on Seil; and, Consideration should be given to reducing the height of the towers.

**Seil & Easdale Community Council (29<sup>th</sup> August 2010)** – raised additional concern in relation to: private water supplies; and, the very large scale of the proposed towers, and the disproportionate impact that they would have on the environment of Seil and Easdale Community Council area.

**(E) PUBLICITY:**

- Environmental Assessment Regulations Advert – Expired 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010
- Regulation 20 Advert, Major Applications – Expired 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010

---

**(F) REPRESENTATIONS:**

At time of writing a total of 276 representations have been received - 32 in support, 237 against and 7 general. Full details of representees are shown at Appendix C.

Due to the large amount of written correspondence received, the key issues raised are summarised below and are addressed in the assessment at Appendix B

**IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSAL****Location, Siting, Design & Layout**

- *The site is located on land that benefits from good wind speeds and is suitable for a wind farm development of this size.*
- *This is a brilliant site and should go ahead.*

**Scale of Development**

- *Saddened that amount of wind turbines has fallen from originally 40 to a miserable 14 turbines - those who protested against them should hold their heads in shame.*

**Government Targets**

- *The wind farm would help Scotland meet challenging Government targets of the country's electricity from renewable sources.*
- *The proposal is essential in securing the nation's power supply, combating global warming and meeting the Scottish Government's ambitious targets for renewables.*

**Visual & Landscape Impact**

- *The design and layout of the wind farm has taken into consideration the sensitivities of surrounding landscape and wouldn't detract from that landscape.*
- *Wind farms are an acceptable addition to the landscape given the urgent need for more renewable energy.*
- *Considering the pressure for renewable energy Europe wide but also being a great lover of the beautiful Scottish countryside, I think one should support any proposal which helps the one without destroying the other. This seems to be the case in this instance and I very much support the scheme.*

**Environment**

- *There will be substantial environmental benefits by emission reductions in CO<sub>2</sub>.*
- *Argyll can lead the way in providing clean power from wind, tide, wave and hydro.*
- *In making a decision on such a proposal, one of the key issues is the impact on the environment and a balance has to be achieved between the need for renewable energy and any adverse effects that the development might have. I am of the*

*opinion that in this case the site sensitivities in terms of fauna and flora are not high with none of the site, for example designated as a SSSI. In addition, the visual impact of the turbines is at an acceptable level given that Npower has reduced the number of turbines.*

### **Noise**

- *The proposal meets the noise limits prescribed in ETSU – R – 97 and therefore the development will not have any impact on those living in the surrounding area.*
- *There was a lot of objection to the two wind turbines on Luing and they are noisy but no worse than cars, tractors and planes.*

### **Climate Change**

- *The wind farm will make a substantial contribution in this region towards combating the threat of climate change by generating electricity using renewable energy.*
- *The wind farm will assist in reducing emissions of the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide.*

### **Future Energy Supplies**

- *Wind turbines have a limited life. When they approach their economic/engineering end it will give the community, public bodies and the Government both local and national the opportunity to review any continued need.*
- *Technology will certainly have advanced in the anticipated 35 year life of the turbines. However, we cannot wait for these advances, now is the time to start replacing fossil fuel for power generation regardless of any climate changed, perceived or actual.*
- *We are now reaching peak oil (watch the petrol prices going up) and peak coal is only 30 years away. We need to start investing in non-carbon energy now and we are going to have to get used to seeing more wind farms etc.*

### **Sustainability**

- *The provision of all forms of renewable and sustainable energy is becoming ever more important, and I believe that wind turbines have a vital part to play in this. In addition they are beautiful structures.*

### **Economic & Social Benefit**

- *Development of a wind farm would contribute to the local economy of Argyll through creation of construction jobs. Development of wind energy industry in Scotland will create jobs in the wider economy.*
- *The development has the potential to generate a range of economic and social benefits arising from creation and support of employment during the construction period where it is estimated that approximately 40 people will be employed during the 18 month construction period.*

- *Construction will benefit local businesses through the use of local services, accommodation, shops, etc by construction staff.*
- *During operation, the wind farm will contribute regularly to the Scottish economy through provision of Business Rates.*
- *As an added bonus there are the further benefits of job creation and infrastructure, as everybody is of course well aware.*
- *There is no doubt that such developments do provide local employment (a number of local people already earn their living in renewable) and this is clearly demonstrated by the article in the Oban Times last week regarding the good news about the expansion of tower production in Campbeltown.*

### **Community**

- *Following RWE Npower renewable consultations and public exhibitions they have listened to the community by reducing the number of turbines in response to local feedback and Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment guidelines.*

### **Technology**

- *I have visited wind farms on Gigha, Shetland and Wales and apart from Hydro generators are the best so far invented.*

### **Wind Speeds**

- *We have a valuable resource in our local wind speeds which should be used to good effect, wind farms are to be encouraged.*

## **AGAINST THE PROPOSAL**

### **Planning Policy/Decisions**

- *The Argyll & Bute Local Plan defines the proposed site of the wind farm as a 'Potentially Constrained Area' for three major reasons:*
  - 1. It is an Area of Panoramic Quality;*
  - 2. It is adjacent to nesting protected birds of prey, including Golden Eagles which are nesting within the High Sensitivity area as defined by the RSPB;*
  - 3. Its proximity to settlements of under 2km.**These are critical reasons not to build a wind farm in this area and should be upheld.*
- *The Local Plan's Area of Search for windfarms does not include this site.*
- *The Local Plan's suggested development zones for wind farms on these maps are significantly further inland from the coast than the Raera proposal.*
- *The proposed development sits within Sensitive Countryside and Very Sensitive Countryside zoning.*

- *The proposal is in breach of a number of major stated policies of the Local Plan: Policy ENV 1, Development Impact on the General Environment: “All development should protect, restore or where possible enhance the established character and local distinctiveness of the landscape in terms of its location, scale, form and design”. LP ENV 2, Development impact on Biodiversity and LP ENV 6 Development Impact on Habitats and Species: As well as Golden Eagles, the Raera Forest area is also home to bats, red squirrels, polecats, otters, black grouse, and wildcats to name but a few of the more important protected species as well as for example salmon, brown trout, red and roe deer. LP ENV 7, Development impact on Trees/Woodland in relation to protecting ancient woodland. The proposed area of clear fell (1,500+acres) includes Area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and Semi-Natural Woodland, Area of Long Established Woodland, Area of Great Landscape Value and also multiple archaeological sites, hence the Forestry Commission’s objection. Policy LP ENV 9, Development impact on National Scenic Areas: “this policy is to provide the best landscapes within Argyll & Bute with adequate protection against damaging development. LP ENV 10, Development Impact on Area of Panoramic Quality: Development in or adjacent to, an Area of Panoramic Quality will be resisted where its scale, location or design will have a significant adverse impact on the character of the landscape. If the Raera development is allowed to proceed while in breach of so many of the Local Plan policies it sets a dangerous precedent for our local community.*
- *It is contrary to several major policies in the Local Plan as follows: - Policy REN 1 – the site being within a constrained area as identified on the Local Plan wind farm map; Policy ENV 10 – Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; Policy LP ENV 1 – Development Impact on General Environment, specifically (b), (c) and (i). This potential breach of the Local Plan would set a dangerous precedent, contrary to National Policy via 2km exclusion zone.*
- *There were no strategic development plans for renewable energy in this area but a number of wind farms seem to be appearing randomly throughout the highlands of Argyll.*
- *Limit land allocations for wind farms*
- *No central thinking or co-ordination to these planning decisions*
- *Against National Policy*

### **Location, Siting, Design & Layout**

- *There is objection to the siting of the windfarm. This is not an unobtrusive area it will be seen for many miles around in all directions, and as this is an area of outstanding natural beauty which relies very heavily on the fact that tourists visit. For that reason it would be detrimental to the area and a lot of people’s livelihoods.*
- *Wind farms should be sited where they are least intrusive as possible.*
- *Unsightly appearance of large turbine blades and structural posts protruding above the countryside*
- *It is the wrong location for such an industrial development.*
- *Whilst a supporter of renewable energy in principle, the scale of the proposal is entirely inappropriate.*



- *The height of the proposed turbines – at 125 metres the tallest on any land in Europe at present – is both unnecessary and severely detrimental to the surrounding landscape.*
- *The scale of the development will have a significant and serious detrimental effect on the currently unspoilt wild natural beauty of the area, classified as an Area of Panoramic Quality.*
- *The size of the 15 proposed turbines is out of place, against the surrounding landscape on which they stand and would be visible from over 25 miles around. This natural wild and beautiful landscape is the principal reason why most tourists visit the area.*
- *Rural areas being industrialised for the benefit of urban areas.*
- *The height will dwarf hills on which they stand.*
- *Scale of development is dominant*

### **Alternatives**

- *While we support green and renewable energy - water sources of which there are plenty could be harnessed within the area for power.*
- *More consideration should be given to tidal and hydro schemes and less to wind power.*

### **Sustainability**

- *Infrastructure to build – indecent amount of energy in fabrication and construction*
- *Environmental costs are greater than the benefits of the wind farm*
- *We should reduce electricity consumption rather than destroy our environment.*

### **Flooding, Hydrogeology & Water Supply**

- *The site is the source of several private water supplies which may be adversely affected.*
- *Water Supply – the insertion of tons of concrete as a base for a turbine would be disastrous.*
- *Water pollution – large scale felling required*
- *Roots of trees (non-native) absorb large amounts of surplus water*
- *Release of surplus water will have an adverse effect on adjacent land and river systems*
- *Water pollution and deforestation*
- *Soil erosion – removal of forest*

### **Grid Connection**

- *Lack of information – no mention made of grid connection – adverse impact*
- *Pylons would have an adverse impact on the landscape*
- *In addition to the turbines a line of pylons even more ugly than the turbines sprawling over yet more countryside will be needed to carry the electricity away.*
- *The route to be taken by the power lines to link the wind farm to the National Grid at Taynuilt. One possible route is along Scammadale, which is one of the most beautiful glens in this part of Argyll and will not be enhanced by more poles and cables.*

### **Decommissioning**

- *Adverse impact of decommissioning*

### **Traffic Issues**

- *Further damage to the current badly maintained highways, due to the excess of heavy vehicles en-route to the construction site.*
- *Disruption to the roads and villages in the area which would be caused by large lorries.*
- *What may not be so well known is the antagonism of the local population dependent on the tourist industry and the abysmal effect on the public roads of such a density of heavy traffic over a significant period.*
- *Local Roads – the route is an upgraded drove road, steep and tortuous. A more unsuitable route to transport long, awkward turbines and other heavy materials can hardly be imagined. From the proposed pier at Melfort to the main road it is narrow and equally awkward. In places it goes between houses and the shore and cannot be widened.*
- *Lorry movements – adverse impact on roads - Bridge over Oude and road along Loch –na – Drimnan.*
- *Timber lorry traffic and transport of items to the site is a road safety and road maintenance issue*
- *Disruption generally – nuisance and hazard to users of the A816 – road safety*
- *Insufficient information – how equipment will be transported by sea and road*

### **Precedent**

- *The proposal will set a dangerous precedent*

### **Community Benefit**

- *Proposed Community Benefit package - no details received.*

- *Split financial benefit between Kilninver and Kilmelford and Isle of Seil – likely to be cause for friction.*
- *We would be wrong to fall for the deception that wind farms will provide long-term local employment and benefit to the local community.*

### **Community Council**

- *Recent meeting Kilmelford & Kilninver Community Council the vast majority of those present objected or had considerable reservations to the proposal.*
- *Kilmelford and Kilninver Community Council voted against the development.*

### **Profit**

- *This project will never be profitable.*

### **Tourism**

- *This destruction of our natural landscape will put at risk future visitor numbers to the area, undermining our local economy which is heavily dependent on tourism.*
- *Drastic impact on tourism industry – a large part of the livelihood of local population.*
- *The Scottish Government's study, The Economic Impacts of Wind Farms on Scottish Tourism, in section 13.7 Protection of Wilderness Areas: "There is evidence that the impact of wind farms is perceived to be greater on remoter, wilder landscapes. The local economies in these areas also tend to be very fragile and tourism extremely important. SPP6 currently states that designated areas should be protected".*
- *Local surveys show a clear risk of fewer repeat holidaymakers if their views are blighted by a wind farm, for example Kilninver Holiday Cottages where 62% surveyed said they would not return.*
- *Any decrease in tourism, as a result of this proposed development, both of visitors by land and by sea, will damage revenues of local shops, pubs, restaurants, tourist attractions and other businesses which are heavily reliant on the tourist industry, putting local jobs at risk.*
- *As a visitor to such a wonderfully unspoilt area I know a wind farm would be a travesty.*
- *I have been coming on holiday for years to the area. There have been several wind farms that have gone up in our area which have seriously affected the beauty of these areas and I find the area around the proposal one of the most magical places in Scotland and worry that this would be lost.*
- *I and many others from the UK and abroad come to this area for its unspoilt land, seascapes and wildlife and will be unlikely to return if wind farms proliferate. If others think as I do, this would have a most damaging effect on tourism that is so important to our economy.*
- *For the past 15 years we have taken a holiday cottage in the area. One of the attractions has been the unspoilt nature of the hills and countryside. The size of the proposed turbines would dominate the landscape and be visible from many points.*

- *If this proposal goes ahead I think it highly likely that we'll have to find another unspoilt area for our annual spring holiday.*
- *We would be naive to believe they will not adversely affect our tourist trade.*
- *In this area the hills are gentle, undulating and wooded. This is not an area of bleak remote moorland. It's easily accessible for walking to families and to pensioners who form the bulk of our holiday visitors.*
- *For 32 years we rented our holiday houses and during that time several families returned every year. They still return even though we have sold our houses. By the time we retired we were onto the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation of visitors – people who came as children are bringing their children. They are attracted by the exceptional charm and beauty of this small area.*
- *Almost everyone working here is involved in tourism. The beauty of our neighbourhood is our main source of revenue. A wind farm would change its character forever. It will not be possible to reverse the damage that such a scheme would do or to minimise its impact on so many people.*
- *Study should be done on Tourism Impact.*

### **Economic Impact**

- *The risks to our local economy far outweigh any potential compensation from the corporate developer.*
- *Major loss of income from the tourist trade as people come to Argyll to view the countryside in its natural state and not to have these views impeded by huge turbines.*
- *Turbines will come from Europe – no boost to local economy*
- *Economic degradation*
- *Viability of holiday businesses will be affected.*
- *Principal economic activity – provision of tourist accommodation – significant component – local income.*
- *Kilninver Estate – 60% income from letting holiday cottages.*
- *Wind farms have not been common feature for long enough for evidence to be available regarding their economic impact.*
- *The operators are 'subsidy farming' at the taxpayers' expense. In these days of astronomical National Debt, this is just an additional drain on our country's resources in order to try and "appear" green.*
- *Threat to income*
- *Cost to local environment (fiscal and environmental)*

- *Local economy depends greatly on tourism and this is even more important at these critical times. Encouraging home tourism is very much more “green” than driving tourist away to fly overseas.*

### **Noise, Vibration & Adverse Health Impacts**

- *Potential noise nuisance, health hazard and possible psychological effect on nearby residents (actual or perceived)*
- *The noise level from the blades when in motion plus negative side effects of low frequency noise and vibrations generated by large turbines.*
- *It is generally accepted that new wind farm projects should be at least 2kms from housing to prevent the possibility of their noise inducing health problems. Yet there are houses within 2km of Raera and at Clachan, several houses are less than 500 metres from the site.*
- *Most serious concern is the prospective noise level at houses at Lagganmore which are 1.6km’s line of sight from the nearest turbine. Recently BBC ‘Countryfile’ interviewed a couple who lived within 650 yds from a wind farm and were forced to leave their house permanently because of the noise. 1.6km is much further away than 650yds but the general direction of the prevailing wind is from the site to Lagganmore, thus increasing the distance that turbines might be audible.*
- *Noise at Blaran would be 60db based upon smaller wind turbines. Research shows a causal link between unwanted sound and sleep deprivation and stress.*
- *Adverse Health Effects – reference to study by Dr Nina Pierpoint. Minimum distance of dwellings from turbines should be 2km and living in Kilmelford, probably well beyond this safe distance – not convinced would be unaffected (bigger than wind farm in Dr Pierpoint’s study). This is of particular concern as we have a severely autistic son who has heightened sensitivity to many external stimuli and profound sensory disruption in his auditory, visual and defactory perceptions and processing. I’m very worried that he might be affected by the turbines where a neuro-typical individual without his issues may well be unaffected.*

### **Shadow Flicker**

- *Adverse impact of Shadow Flicker.*

### **Visual Impact**

- *The application material shows that the proposal would be clearly visible across a wide area including the islands of Seil, Torsa, Shuna, Jura, Luing, Scarba and Mull; Kilninver , Kilmelford and from the higher ground and local paths and tracks. This will impact future visitor numbers to the area, undermining the local economy, which is heavily dependent on tourism.*
- *Visual impact proposal will have from Toberonochy – tourism is a major earner and visitors highlight the peace and quiet and unspoilt nature of Toberonochy.*
- *The skyline will be changed by the proposal, I appreciate some concerns have been met, but please ensure restrictions are imposed to limit the height/scale of the turbines.*

- *Visual impact of excessively large turbines from a number of viewpoints or houses.*
- *The submitted photomontages are misleading*
- *Photomontages at exhibition showed tree covered slopes*
- *It is not possible to mitigate the visual impact*
- *Visibility and impact on tourism*
- *There will be significant visual impact from: high ground, principal roads (A816 and B844), and on local paths and tracks.*
- *Oban town will be screened but they will be visible in many of its higher suburbs. It will be seen from much of Kerrera, Lismore and the coast of Morvern and Ardgour beyond, to the north. To the west of Seil, Luing, Lunga, Scarba 'The Isles of the Sea', Colonsay and across the Firth of Lorn to Mull and to the south Shuna, Jura, the northwest and south east sides of Islay (yes about 80km away) and much of Knapdale and possibly Kintyre. It would be a spectacular eyesore on a truly epic scale.*
- *Will not have to climb very high on Ben Cruachan to be offended by the sight of them.*
- *One of the great beauties of the Highlands are the surprise glimpses of the great hills in the far distance. An intrusive sight of turbines would be most unwelcome.*
- *Careful examination of Ordnance Survey Map reveals height of monster machines is more than half the average altitude of the land on which they might be built. They will tower over everything for miles around.*
- *The proposal would be surrounded by and visible from 4 villages: Kilmelford, Kilninver, Balvicar and the Island of Seil. It would also be visible in the distance from the islands of Mull, Luing and Jura.*
- *The proponents of this wind farm are not local people but they have worked hard on their sales tactics. Their optimistic spin has left many residents with the false belief that it would be environmentally or politically incorrect to object. However, depictions of how the Raera and Clachan wind farm's will look are a cause for alarm: visible for miles around, they will be in stark contrast to the areas natural beauty.*

### **Landscape Impact**

- *The proposed wind farm would have a significant and serious detrimental effect on the currently unspoilt wild natural beauty and tranquillity of the area, a sensitive landscape classified as an 'Area of Outstanding Panoramic Quality'*
- *At 125m tall the height of the 15 proposed turbines would dwarf the hills on which they stand and would be visible from over 25miles around.*
- *The turbines are completely out of proportion with, and would therefore ruin, the local landscape where the coastal ridge is only 160-250 m tall and directly impact the National Scenic Area of Scarba Island and its surrounds (Garvellachs, Lunga) as it would be highly visible from that area, which is one of only seven such areas in our county.*

- *Raera forest sits high on the local hills and will benefit from the full effect of the prevailing south-westerly winds. There is simply no reason to erect turbines of the height proposed they will dominate the landscape, an area of considerable panoramic quality and contravene a number of policies stated in the Argyll and Bute Local Plan.*
- *Adverse impact on landscape – tree removal. Accelerated fell over 18 months instead of phased over many years. It is proposed to fell the forest with no plans for replanting.*
- *The proposal will be a blight on our beautiful landscape which generates massive income from tourism.*
- *Instead of jumping on the band wagon why don't Argyll and Bute take the lead in showing wind farms for what they are a 'blot on the landscape' and a terrible inefficient use of public money.*
- *The legacy of wind turbines in this area will be like that of Japanese Knotweed: once imported for the 'good of the environment' they multiply to become a blot on the landscape, extremely difficult to eradicate. Once this process has begun, the damage done to our wild and beautiful environment will be irreversible.*
- *Environment – desecration of solitude*

### **Cumulative Impact**

- *There are already two small wind farms on the island of Luing, these already dominate the skyline when viewed from the sea and the proposed turbines would be very much bigger than these.*

### **Natural Heritage & Ecology**

- *Destruction of the countryside and disruption to wildlife in the area. Temporary disturbance to wildlife habitats and permanent loss of habitat*
- *Ruination of an Area of Natural Beauty.*
- *This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which will be spoilt by this proposal.*
- *There are sea-eagles and golden eagles in this area which might be adversely affected.*
- *Adverse effect on what is probably a unique selection of wildlife, eagles, red squirrels, pine martins, and other rare species.*
- *Wildcats are critically endangered in Scotland with less than 400 left living in the wild. The West Highland Region, particularly Argyll, has been recognised by numerous experts and SNH as one of the species last strongholds. Wildcat behaviour is well understood; they are highly fearful of people, human development scares them out of areas and they like to have good forestry within their territory, so wind farm installations can present a very significant threat to them.*
- *The sudden arrival of people, plant machinery, new roads and noise will almost certainly send any resident wildcats out of the area, onto unfamiliar roads, into*

*conflict with other wildcats or onto unfamiliar farms and estates with snares and so on. Meanwhile the vacuum left over will most likely be filled by feral cats, these have little fear of man, over populate and are a significant threat to cattle farmers especially and besides preventing wildcats being able to return to the area, ferals also represent the greatest threat to the future of the wildcat through a cross breeding process called hybridisation.*

- *Beyond behavioural theory, the Wildlife & the Countryside Act makes it an offence to damage or destroy any place a wildcat uses for shelter or protection and this is reinforced by European Directive 92/43/EEC which seeks to protect natural habitats and wild animals and plants. Raera wind farm and its requirement for deforestation clearly goes against these legal protections.*
- *Compromises are necessary in achieving a carbon free energy system, but ripping down important habitat (including some ancient Caledonian forest) and further threatening one of our most endangered animals in order to be more balanced with nature simply makes no sense.*
- *In this region, the Scottish Wildcat Association certainly object to this proposal, in spite of a low human population we have eye witness sightings of wildcats from Ardnamurchan in Lochaber all the way across to Argyll Forest Park and feel this is without doubt one of the most important habitats left for the wildcat, our rarest mammal species in one of the last places they call home.*
- *“Acid Flush” – I understand that when there is a significant amount of deforestation then there is a good chance of a release of acidity into the surrounding rivers. This can lead to a major loss of invertebrates and subsequently loss of wild fish. Please confirm SNH, SEPA and AFT have been consulted about this potential hazard and that they have provided expert advice.*
- *Three types of bat in the area of Raera. Common Pipistrelles, Soprano Pipistrelles and Daubentons. Bats by law are a protected species. There is evidence that bats can detect a wind turbine and will not fly into it, yet their lungs cannot cope with the pressure difference caused by blades – their lungs explode causing a painful death. Turbines of this size are lethal to bats and the erection of them could be breaking the law.*
- *There have been local efforts to protect and improve the salmonids in the Euchar River and it would be a great pity if all of this work was put back by the proposal.*
- *The loss of habitat and apparent lack of any plan for the replanting of affected areas is also relevant.*
- *Npower have stated that the proposal will have a ‘low ornithological impact’. Some migrating birds fly at night in addition to the local nocturnal birds so the truth of the matter is that the total ornithological impact is unknown.*
- *Raera is within the hunting area of the resident pair of Golden Eagles in Scammadale and Sea Eagles have been seen roosting at Barnacerry.*
- *Deforestation – must be better sites that avoid clear felling.*
- *Glen Euchar – stunning ancient Oakwoods will be spoiled.*



- *Bird watchers – close to eagles nest at Scammadale – connection to grid could go right past nest.*
- *Disturbance to flora and fauna – migrant birds, eagles, buzzards, sparrowhawks, goshawks, pine martin, and otters.*
- *Significant population of red squirrels, black grouse, golden eagles, and wildcats all under pressure in dwindling habitat*

### **Built Heritage & Archaeology**

- *Adverse impact on historic environment*
- *Ancient historical value of surrounding area – landscapes, ancient historical value – where Christianity began, 1<sup>st</sup> Christian monastery, historic islands, Irish invasion building forts, churches, Iona, Garvellach monastery. Cave of the Crags (middle of development).*

### **Construction**

- *Adverse impact on local residents during construction phase*

### **Property Values**

- *Property values will be adversely affected by the presence of a wind farm.*

### **Commercial considerations**

- *Hopefully the promises made by the energy companies for vast profits won't be the main issue in persuading the Council into ignoring realities.*
- *No information about level of profit development might make nor amount taxpayer subsidy provision to development,*

### **Aircraft & Aerodromes**

- *Air Safety concerns for Scottish Air Ambulance Service.*

### **Ancillary Development**

- *As a direct consequence of granting a wind farm further intrusions occur in the form of more and higher voltage power lines, necessary for the distribution of any electricity generated.*
- *No details/consideration of ancillary structures.*
- *Residual matters – relies on other applications not submitted yet – jetty and grid connection – adverse impact should be considered.*
- *Cluster policy – once vast capital outlays made on jetty and grid – economic pressure from development to build even more wind farms in the neighbourhood.*

### **Government Energy Targets**

- *Argyll is already doing more than its fair share to meet renewable targets.*
- *Proposed as money making business and to meet Government and EU targets and will not benefit the local or wider population.*
- *If no grants – no wind farms*

### **Technology & Efficiency**

- *Whatever the output anticipated by the developer, the development would end up operating at a fraction of that suggested. Few windfarms operate at more than 22 – 25% efficiency and some even as low as 6 or 7%.*
- *Observations from my own meteorological station, with allowance for slightly greater exposure on the hill, only a couple of miles away, I estimate there would have been sufficient wind to run the turbines for 7% of the days during the very cold winter for 1/12/09 – 31/3/10. This is for the minimum 6 knots to turn the turbines, which does not produce much electricity. The remaining 29% days, below 6 knots would require 100% back up from other sources.*
- *Continental Europeans are protesting fiercely, albeit belatedly, about the damage done to their countryside by these unsightly structures which have turned out considerably less effective in providing energy than originally suggested.*
- *Wind farms inefficient generators of electricity since they only produce energy when the wind is blowing. Siting wind farms on hilly ground diminishes their efficiency further because of the turbulence caused by the uneven ground. To extract the maximum amount of energy, wind farms are better sited at sea where the wind is not affected by turbulence to the same degree.*
- *Offshore wind farms are up to 50% more efficient than onshore, due to superior aerodynamics. Power from waves generated in estuaries is also being developed. Large scale solar schemes are another source.*
- *Renewable energy to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – not the case with Raera*
- *Efficiency of wind farms not competitive and do not make sense without subsidies*
- *Wind farms are expensive, inefficient and unsightly and are not the solution to emissions and global warming. If we must have them they must be sited sensitively.*
- *In Denmark found not to be worth the amount of electricity produced given the quirks of the weather – venture would be a colossal waste of money.*
- *Wind farms are expensive to construct and do not produce continuous electricity.*
- *Lifetime is only 25 years and in calm weather they produce no electricity at all.*
- *Wind farms are inefficient and a waste of public money for countless reasons. Denmark, which pioneered wind farms and has the greatest density of turbines, stated in June this year that their experience had been an unmitigated disaster.*
- *It is now generally accepted that wind turbines are so inefficient and erratic in the production of electricity that the building of power stations is still necessary to ensure a guaranteed uninterrupted supply of electricity.*

- *Germany has spent billions on wind power and recently announced that it has found it 'unreliable, expensive and ineffective at cutting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.*
- *Wind farms suffer from a rather spineless degree of support – too little wind causes them to stop and too much causes them to be stopped artificially, so the various arguments in their favour do not necessarily equate to the rather exaggerated production figures and consequential value to the national grid. This must be well known to the developers.*
- *Wind turbines are at best 30% efficient*

### **Future Extensions**

- *Once permission is given for a few turbines, it makes it easier for extensions and new wind farms in the area to be granted.*

NOTE: Committee Members, the applicant, agent and any other interested party should note that the consultation responses and letters of representation referred to in this report, have been summarised and that the full consultation response or letter of representations are available on request. It should also be noted that the associated drawings, application forms, consultations, other correspondence and all letters of representations are available for viewing on the Council web site at [www.argyll-bute.gov.uk](http://www.argyll-bute.gov.uk)

## **(G) SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

**Has the application been the subject of:**

- (i) Environmental Statement (ES):** Yes
- (ii) An appropriate assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994:** No
- (iii) A design or design/access statement:** Yes
- (iv) A report on the impact of the proposed development e.g. Retail impact, transport impact, noise impact, flood risk, drainage impact etc:**

Yes – Environmental Statement (4 volumes); Planning Statement; Non Technical Summary; Pre-Application Consultation Report; and, Design and Access Statement

## **(H) PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

**Is a Section 75 agreement required:**

A Section 75 Legal Agreement is not required as the proposal is recommended for refusal.

- (I) Has a Direction been issued by Scottish Ministers in terms of Regulation 30, 31 or 32:**

No Direction has been issued by Scottish Ministers in this case, in terms of Regulations 30, 31 or 32 of the The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008

---

**(J) Section 25 of the Act; Development Plan and any other material considerations over and above those listed above which have been taken into account in the assessment of the application**

**(i) List of all Development Plan Policy considerations taken into account in assessment of the application.**

Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002)

Policy STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development  
 Policy STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside  
 Policy STRAT DC 7: Nature Conservation & Development Control  
 Policy STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control  
 Policy STRAT DC 9: Historic Environment & Development Control  
 Policy STRAT DC 10: Flooding & Land Erosion  
 Policy STRAT FW 2: Development Impact on Woodland  
 Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development

Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)

Policy LP ENV 1: Development Impact on the General Environment  
 Policy LP ENV 2: Development Impact on Biodiversity  
 Policy LP ENV 6: Development Impact on Habitats and Species  
 Policy LP ENV 7: Development Impact on Trees/Woodland  
 Policy LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality  
 Policy LP ENV 11: Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes  
 Policy LP ENV 12: Water Quality and Environment  
 Policy LP ENV 13a: Development Impact on Listed Buildings  
 Policy LP ENV 14: Development in Conservation Areas and Special Built Environment Areas  
 Policy LP ENV 16: Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments  
 Policy LP ENV 17: Development Impact on Sites of Archaeological Importance  
 Policy LP ENV 19: Development Setting, Layout and Design  
 Policy LP BAD 1: Bad Neighbour Development  
 Policy LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development

Policy LP SERV 4: Water Supply  
 Policy LP SERV 6: Waste Related Development and Waste Management in Developments  
 Policy LP SERV 9: Flooding and Land Erosion  
 Policy LP TRAN 4: New and Existing, Public Roads and Private Access Regimes  
 Policy LP TRAN 6: Vehicle Parking Provision  
 Policy LP TRAN 7: Safeguarding of Airports

Note: The Full Policies are available to view on the Council's Web Site at [www.argyll-bute.gov.uk](http://www.argyll-bute.gov.uk)

**(ii) List of all other material planning considerations taken into account in the assessment of the application, having due regard to Annex A of Circular 4/2009.**

- EU, UK Government and Scottish Government policy,
- National Planning Framework
- Scottish Planning Policy, Advice and Circulars
- National Waste Management Plan
- Environmental Impact of the proposal
- Design of the proposal and its relationship to its surroundings
- Access,
- Provision of Infrastructure
- Planning History
- Views of Statutory and Other Consultees
- Legitimate Public Concern and Support expressed on 'Material' Planning Issues

**(K) Is the proposal a Schedule 2 Development not requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment:**

This proposal is a Schedule 2 Development, but, in this case it was considered that an Environmental Impact Assessment was required, due to the potential for significant Environmental Impact.

**(L) Has the application been the subject of statutory pre-application consultation (PAC):**

Yes, this application has been the subject of formal pre-application consultation, as it was submitted when this process was a statutory requirement.

**(M) Has a sustainability check list been submitted:**

No separate consideration of the proposal's degree of sustainability has been required as the concept was implicit to and wholly integral with the Environmental Impact Assessment process for this case.

**(N) Does the Council have an interest in the site:**

No.

**(O) Requirement for a hearing (PAN41 or other):**

There is a requirement to hold a Discretionary Hearing given the extent of representation received.

**(P) Assessment and summary of determining issues and material considerations**

- The proposal seeks the construction of wind farm comprising fifteen turbines, crane hard standings, 3 anemometer masts, access tracks onto site and between turbines, temporary construction compound and laydown area, five borrow pits (required to be subject of separate planning applications), and an electrical sub-station incorporating a site office.
- SNH has objected to the proposal, on the grounds of the significant adverse impact the proposal will have on Landscape Character. The site is located within a '*Potentially Constrained Area*' in terms of the local plan wind farm map, as well as being designated '*Sensitive Landscape*' and an '*Area of Panoramic Quality*'. There are, habitats, species and scenic designations in the surrounding area, including the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area, which would be affected by the presence of a wind farm, the significance of which has been assessed in the Environmental Statement accompanying the application, the validity of which has been reviewed by SNH and other relevant consultees. The principal issue in this case is the consequence of the presence of the development for the landscape character of the site and for adjoining landscape character areas. All other technical details raised by relevant consultees can, if required, be dealt with by planning condition or Section 75 Legal Agreement. Notwithstanding the contribution that this development can make towards combating climate change, development giving rise to inappropriate environmental consequences cannot be viewed as being sustainable. Development which would erode the landscape and scenic qualities of the area would be inappropriate as it would undermine the primary assets which support the tourism economy. Accordingly it is recommended that permission be refused.
- The proposal can be considered consistent with the requirements of:
  - PAN 81: Community Engagement – Planning with People;
  - Policies STRAT FW 2 – Development Impact on Woodland;
  - STRAT DC 7: Nature Conservation & Development Control;
  - STRAT DC 9: Historic Environment & Development;
  - STRAT DC 10: Flooding & Land Erosion of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002) and Policies
  - LP SERV 4: Water Supply;
  - LP TRAN 4: New and Existing, Public Roads and Private Access Regimes;
  - LP TRAN 6: Vehicle Parking Provision;
  - LP TRAN 7: Safeguarding of Airports;
  - LP BAD 1: Bad Neighbour Development;
  - LP ENV 7: Development Impact on Trees/Woodland;
  - LP ENV 2: Development Impact on Biodiversity;
  - LP ENV 6: Development Impact on Habitats and Species;
  - LP ENV 11: Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes LP ENV 13a: Development Impact on Listed Buildings;
  - LP ENV 14: Development in Conservation Areas and Special Built Environment Areas;
  - LP ENV 16: Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments;
  - LP ENV 17: Development Impact on Sites of Archaeological Importance;
  - LP ENV 12: Water Quality and Environment;
  - LP SERV 6: Waste Related Development and Waste Management in Developments, and
  - LP SERV 9: Flooding and Land Erosion of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009);
- The proposal is considered contrary to:
  - PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies;

Scottish Planning Policy;  
 Policies STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside;  
 STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control;  
 STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development;  
 STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development; of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002); and Policies  
 LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development;  
 LP ENV 1: Development Impact on the General Environment;  
 LP ENV 9: Development Impact on National Scenic Areas;  
 LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality;  
 LP ENV 19: Development Setting, Layout & Design;  
 of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)

- Scottish Natural Heritage; Kilmelford & Kilninver Community Council; and Seil & Easdale Community Council object to this proposal. All other consultees are satisfied subject to appropriate conditions/Section 75 Legal Agreement.
- A total of 276 letters of representation have been received of which 237 are objections

**(Q) Is the proposal consistent with the Development Plan:**

No.

**(R) Reasons why planning permission should be refused:**

This proposal is inconsistent with the provisions of the Development Plan. All 'other' material issues have been taken into account but these are not of such weight as to overcome the significant adverse impact consequences of the scale and location of the development upon landscape character, which cannot be overcome by relevant planning conditions or by way of legal agreement.

**(S) Reasoned justification for a departure to the provisions of the Development Plan**

There is no justifiable reason for a departure to be made from the provisions of the Development Plan in this case.

**(T) Need for notification to Scottish Ministers or Historic Scotland:**

There is no requirement for notification to Scottish Ministers (other than in the event of Members being minded to support the application which would be contrary to the views of a statutory consultee which would prompt the need for Scottish Ministers to consider 'calling-in' the application for determination. .

Reviewing Officer: Richard Kerr

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> October 2010

Angus Gilmour  
Head of Planning

**REASON FOR REFUSAL RELATIVE TO APPLICATION 09/01874/PP**

1.	The development proposed would be inappropriately located on elevated land in a coastal location where its presence on the skyline would, by virtue of its height, scale and movement, assert a commanding presence upon its surroundings, which in turn would have adverse consequences for landscape character. This influence would be particularly significant when experienced in terms of close quarter views from and in the vicinity of the A816, from locations across and above Loch Melfort and Loch Feochan, from locations above the Loch Avich Road, and from the island of Luing; particularly from the panoramic vantage point above Cullipool. It would also impact upon more distant panoramic views
----	--



from the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area, which is vulnerable to inappropriate changes in surrounding landscape character, due to the sensitivity of receptors visiting this particularly scenic location.

The height of the development is disproportionate to the scale of the landform upon which it is to be situated, would impact adversely upon the scenic sensitivity this landform derives in establishing the inter-relationship between seascape and landscape, and would have adverse consequences for the maintenance of landscape character. The introduction of prominent development into the upland area containing the site, having regard to the role it performs in defining and enclosing Seil Sound and Loch Melfort, and with the availability of views across water, would extend the influence of windfarm development to a sensitive coastal fringe area not currently subject to such influence, thereby degrading part of Argyll's prime landscape resource. The value and distinctiveness of this landscape is recognised by its designation as an Area of Panoramic Quality by the adopted development plan. Furthermore, the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs NSA recognises the special qualities to be enjoyed in a remote island setting which this development would influence. The development will adversely impact on the enjoyment of the landscape as currently experienced, detracting from the quality of visitor experience of the area. Its presence would degrade the scenic contribution which the area as a whole makes to the wider tourism resource of the west coast.

The foregoing environmental 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 have a significant adverse landscape impact, along with adverse implications for views available from key viewpoints, to the detriment of the scenic quality and tourism value of the landscape, contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development; STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside, Policy STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control; and Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2009) along with Policies LP ENV 1: Development Impact on the General Environment; LP ENV 9: Development Impact on National Scenic Areas; LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; and LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development of the 'Argyll & Bute Local Plan' (adopted 2009).

## APPENDIX B – RELATIVE TO APPLICATION NUMBER: 09/01874/PP

### PLANNING LAND USE AND POLICY ASSESSMENT

#### A. SETTLEMENT STRATEGY & WIND FARM PROPOSALS MAP

This site lies within a '*Potentially Constrained Area*' for windfarm development identified by the 'Argyll & Bute Local Plan' Wind Farm Proposals Map and '*Sensitive Countryside*' on the Proposals Maps subject to the effect of Structure Plan policy STRAT DC 5. '*Sensitive Countryside*' is defined in the Structure Plan as countryside area which is very vulnerable to adverse development impacts.

In special cases, Policy STRAT DC 5 states that: development in the open countryside and medium or large scale development may be supported if it accords with an area capacity evaluation. This proposal constitutes large scale development in the open countryside. However, it is not normal practice for an area capacity evaluation to be undertaken for a wind farm which has been subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (where consideration of alternatives is required). In this case, it has not been demonstrated that the scale and location of the development proposed will integrate sympathetically with the landscape, without giving rise to adverse consequences for landscape character.

Policy STRAT DC 5 also requires proposals to be consistent with all other Development Plan Policies. For the reasons detailed below in this report, it is considered that this proposal would have a significant adverse effect on: local communities, natural environment, landscape character & visual amenity.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy (2009); PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside and STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policy LP REN 1: Wind Farms & Wind Turbines of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

#### B. LOCATION, NATURE & DESIGN OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Planning Application is for a 15 turbine wind farm within an area of the Raera Forest, which is located approximately 8km south of Oban on the west coast of Argyll & Bute. Within a radius of 2km of the proposed Raera Forest Wind Farm lie the sea lochs of Feochan to the north, Melfort to the south, and with Seil Sound 2km to the west. The site is bounded immediately to the east by the A816, beyond which lies a mixture of upland moorland and coniferous plantation interspersed with a number of lochs and watercourses. The site is dominated by coniferous plantation (established between 1964 and 1985) overlying an undulating terrain.

Each wind turbine would have a capacity of up to 3 MW, providing a total maximum generating capacity of up to 45MW. The maximum height to blade tip would be 125m and the maximum hub height 80m.

The following elements are included in the planning application: 15 wind turbines; crane hard standings adjacent to each turbine; three anemometer masts, of lattice construction up to 90m high; permanent access tracks onto the site and between the turbines; temporary construction compound and lay down area; five borrow pits designed to provide stone for a variety of construction activities (which are required to be the subjects of separate planning applications); and an electrical sub-station, incorporating site office.

Should this proposal be successful, notwithstanding the requirement for separate mineral planning applications for the borrow pits; a further application/notification would also be required for:

- 1) a jetty on Loch Melfort to allow delivery of components to the site (Scoping Opinion has already been provided) and
- 2) an overhead line from the site to the 132 kV electricity distribution network (details of this grid connection do not form part of this application).

In relation to the power line, jetty and wind farm, objectors and consultees have raised concern about the fact that separate applications are required and the difficulty this creates in enabling the total impact of the overall development to be assessed. However, firstly, the grid connection/power line will not require planning permission as it will constitute 'permitted development' as it will constitute work carried out by a statutory undertaker in terms of the General Permitted Development (Scotland) Order 1992. Secondly, the wind farm site and jetty site are geographically separate and therefore in terms of planning law require separate consideration and must be the subject of separate planning applications.

The general design of the turbines and ancillary structures is acceptable with the exception of the substation building. It is considered that the design of this building would appear unsympathetic in the landscape were permission to be granted. As it is only an ancillary aspect of the wider proposal, it is not considered that it is eligible to be included in the reasons for refusal as design could be controlled by means of a condition in the event of an approval.

Whilst the design of the development is appropriate for a windfarm, its intended location is not due to the adverse impacts upon the receiving environment and therefore in terms of the overall sustainability of the proposal, it is considered that it would have an adverse consequences for the conservation of the natural environment, landscape character and the character of settlements.

**The proposal conflicts with the provisions of Policies LP ENV 1: Development Impact on the General Environment and LP ENV 19: Development Setting, Layout & Design of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009), insofar as the development fails to respect the context into which it is to be located and fails to protect the established character and local distinctiveness of the landscape into which development is to be introduced. Furthermore, that in light of the proposals likely adverse landscape and visual impact it would be unsustainable and inconsistent with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policy STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002).**

## **C. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER & LANDSCAPE IMPACT**

Landscape impacts may be considered in terms of the disturbance, damage or loss of individual features of landscape character, such as streams, woodlands and open moorland. Landscape character is a fundamental starting point for assessing whether a landscape is suitable for assimilating wind energy development successfully, without giving rise to unacceptable impacts upon the countryside.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) have objected to the proposal as it would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and the qualities of a distinctive and valued coastal landscape the protection of which is in the national interest, as it would adversely affecting a number of its key views, including some located within the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area (NSA). SNH has not identified any mitigation that will change this position. SNH believe this is the wrong location for this type and scale of development. They have taken account of the socio-economic benefits and wider environmental effects of the proposal based on current information, and do not consider that the likely impacts on the natural heritage are clearly outweighed by wider public interests.

The landscapes of Argyll's coastal edge are distinct in Scotland, made up of features including sea lochs, islands and peninsulas (which are often forested and with raised beaches), rising sharply to the coastal ridge and the start of craggy uplands. Behind the craggy uplands highlands can be glimpsed in the form of mountains such as Ben Cruachan. It is the inter-relationship of these landscape features that makes Argyll's coastal landscape so distinct. This regional landscape pattern can be found in and around Raera, the site of the proposed development.

The value of this landscape is recognised by the fact that Argyll & Bute Council has designated it as an 'Area of Panoramic Quality'. Furthermore, the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area recognise the special qualities to be enjoyed in a remote island setting which this area also influences. Scottish Planning Policy recognises that some parts of our coasts are of national significance.

Transport and recreational routes in these coastal landscapes are dictated by landforms, whether via the sea navigating sounds in between and around islands or on land, travelling around the fringes of sea lochs and over dips in the shoulder of a peninsula before dropping down towards the next sea loch. The landform often forces road and recreational routes to double back on themselves. Subsequently, the user experiences this landscape from many different perspectives, which are constantly changing whilst on a single journey. These will include views out to open sea, across sea lochs to the craggy uplands coastal ridge with glimpses of highlands, from the head of sea lochs out to sea, seascapes with islands and the mainland in the background and stretches along and over coastal ridges.

The mixture of landscape features, from open sea through to craggy uplands and glimpses of highlands, in a relatively confined narrow area creates a visually very complex landscape inviting exploration and understanding. The transport corridors through the landscape facilitate a rewarding and intimate experience with discovery round every bend.

The majority of developments in these coastal landscapes are small scale, along the coastal edge, and do not dominate or overpower the natural landform or the experience of the landscape. In addition, the scale of the existing development is such that it does not impact on the experience and enjoyment of the landscape and the relative distances and relationships of its individual components.

This proposed development will introduce turbines, which in turn introduce movement, on a large scale into this regionally-important landscape. The elevated location of the development site means the impact will be over a large area both in its own right and cumulatively (sequentially) with other wind farm development, introducing a dominant, overpowering landscape feature. This will have the effect of changing the landscape experience from one of where human influence has been moulded by the landform and has not changed its sense of scale, to one which is dominated by human influence, reducing the landscapes grandeur and scale by the sheer size of the development and the large area over which it has an impact.

This dominating aspect has the potential to be exaggerated due to the coastal ridges, which, whilst appearing quite high, are, in reality, quite low (approximately 300m). In many views the development will sit on or behind the coastal ridge. These ridges will still be perceived as high but, in turn, the turbines will be interpreted as being massive, further increasing the perception of overpowering presence of human influence. Due to the interaction of the turbines with glimpses of the highlands, the scale of the mountains such as Ben Cruachan will be diminished in some views. Additionally, the turbines may appear to be located close to Ben Cruachan. This effect will be exacerbated on clear days.

One of the main ways visitors enjoy the area is to tour. As such, the resident community and visitors will experience the dominating impacts of this development from a large variety of

different locations and landscape settings. SNH believe that this development will adversely impact on the enjoyment and benefits of the landscape as currently experienced, detracting from the quality of life for the resident communities and the quality of visitor experience of the area. It is for this reason that SNH object to this application.

The impacts on some views from within the afore-mentioned NSA itself are adverse and will erode the quality of the NSA. There are also cumulative impacts on the Craggy Uplands landscape character type in Argyll. SNH do not consider that these impacts alone would merit an objection. The objection relates to the totality of the proposed development's impact on the sensitive and important coastal landscape.

Due to the proposal's sensitive location, where its influence is over a wide area and the individual views and context are so varied, it has not been possible to identify any significant mitigation of visual impacts. SNH do not believe, for instance, that the removal of 1 or 2 individual turbines or a redesign of the proposed development would make it acceptable.

The developer does not agree with SNH's advice and has submitted a response to SNH's objections/concerns entitled 'comments on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, dated September 2010 (this is available on the Council's website). SNH have advised that the content of this letter in no way alters their position with regards to the adverse impact of the proposal.

The views expressed by SNH in respect of landscape impacts are endorsed by officers. The application site is located on a sensitive coastal edge, recognised for its scenic qualities derived from the interplay between the land, the sea and the islands. It constitutes part of Argyll's prime landscape resource, valued for its inherent character and qualities and also for the role which it plays in the local tourism economy. The introduction of a development of the scale proposed would impose itself upon its landscape setting to the detriment of landscape character and would impinge on key views, some from panoramic viewpoints, where receptors would be particularly sensitive to change of this magnitude. Approval of the development would represent an unwelcome move away from the location of approved windfarm developments in upland areas inland, where they do not exert such a degree of influence over the appreciation of the coast and those landscapes which are characterised by the interplay between the land and the sea and the views available from one to the other.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that this proposal will have a significant adverse impact on Landscape Character, will adversely affect a number of key views and will degrade designated scenic assets including an 'Area of Panoramic Quality' and a National Scenic Area. it is therefore inconsistent with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development; STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside, Policy STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control; Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2009) and Policies LP ENV 9: Development Impact on National Scenic Areas; LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; LP ENV 11: Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes; LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

#### **D. VISUAL IMPACT**

Visual impact relates to the proposal's visibility and its impacts on views, as experienced by people. In determining the proposal's visual impact, the layout of the wind farm has been assessed from key viewpoints. Visually sensitive viewpoints include those where there are views to, or from, designated landscapes (e.g. National Park); however, sensitivity is not confined to designated interests. Visually sensitive viewpoints can include those which are frequently visited by people (such as well-used transport corridors, tourist roads, or picnic

spots), settlements where people live, other inhabited buildings or viewpoints which have a landscape value that people appreciate (and which they might visit for recreational pursuits such as the National Park or areas for hill walking, cycling or education).

In order to assess the visual impact, the developer has selected a series of viewpoints identified to reflect the sensitivity of receptors. These are located in local settlements, transportation corridors, places of cultural/historical interest and known popular viewpoints. It is accepted that photomontages and other visual information can only give an indication of the relative scale of the proposals in relation to the surrounding landscape. There is no disguising the visual impact of the proposal, as 125 metre tall structures will be clearly seen in the surrounding area.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) object to the proposal as it will have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and the qualities of a distinctive and valued coastal landscape whose protection is in the national interest, adversely affecting a large number of its key views, including some located within the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area (NSA). SNH has not identified any mitigation that will change this position. SNH have specific concerns regarding the quality of the supporting visuals and advise caution in their use for making informed decisions when determining the application as they believe they underplay the impact of the development. SNH did not request additional work to be undertaken as an improved Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment would not change the adverse landscape impacts or SNH's position with regard to the development.

SNH further advise that the impacts on some views from within the afore-mentioned NSA itself are adverse and will erode the quality of the NSA. However, SNH do not consider that this impact alone would merit an objection. SNH's objection relates to the totality of the proposed development's impact on the sensitive and important coastal landscape. The developer does not agree with SNH's advice and has submitted a response to SNH's objections/concerns entitled 'comments on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, dated September 2010 (this is available on the Council's website). SNH have advised that the content of this letter in no way alters their position with regards to the adverse impact of the proposal.

The views expressed by SNH in respect of visual impacts are endorsed by officers. Although appropriate representative viewpoints have been chosen by the applicants to inform the assessment of the visual effects of the development, officers share the reservations expressed by SNH as to how the photomontages depict the suggested impact of the development, as appreciation on the ground does wholly reflect that which would be gained from consulting the photomontages (although it is accepted that these are intended as an aid in appreciation of the development when visiting the viewpoints, rather than being relied on independently).

Officers consider that the impact of the development on key views from the following locations would be particularly detrimental, given the disproportionate scale of the turbines relative to their landscape setting and the overall sensitivity of the receiving environment:

- Close quarter views from and in the vicinity of the A816 (even though they would only be experienced by travelers over short distances);
- From locations across and above Loch Melfort and Loch Feochan;
- From locations above the Loch Avich Road (footpath routes);
- From the island of Luing (particularly from the panoramic vantage point above Cullipool);
- From within the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area (due to the sensitivity of receptors visiting this scenic location).

**Having due regard to the above, it is considered that in terms of visual impact although its influence is not widespread, in terms of certain key views the impact will be significant particularly given the sensitivity of receptors experiencing such views. The proposal conflicts with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development;**

**STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside Policy STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control; Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2009) and Policies LP ENV 9: Development Impact on National Scenic Areas; LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

#### **E. CUMULATIVE IMPACT (NOISE, VISUAL, AVIATION, LANDSCAPE, ECOLOGICAL & HYDROLOGICAL)**

Cumulative impact is difficult to assess and can have significant land use planning implications, particularly in relation to noise, visual, aviation, landscape, ecological, and hydrological impacts. The acceptability of proposals depends on the nature and character of the location, and sensitive visual receptors, wildlife species, and habitats. The Cumulative Impact Assessment considers other existing or approved wind energy developments and those subject to a scoping opinion (where information about the development was available).

SNH advise that there will be cumulative impacts on the Craggy Uplands landscape character type in Argyll. However, they do not consider that this impact alone would merit an objection. Their objection relates to the totality of the proposed development's impact on the sensitive and important coastal landscape.

Consultees have not raised any concern about adverse cumulative impact in terms of: noise, aviation, ecological or hydrological impact. Non-cumulative concerns/comments they may have are detailed in the appropriate sections of this report.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that in terms of 'Cumulative Impact' this proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development; STRAT DC 5: Development in Sensitive Countryside Policy STRAT DC 8: Landscape & Development Control; Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2009) and Policies LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

#### **F. ECOLOGICAL IMPACT**

Argyll & Bute is rich in natural heritage. Several areas of Argyll & Bute have been designated to reflect their international, national or local importance for the protection of species, habitats, geology, landforms, or a combination of these. However, there are many other habitats and species of importance found out with designated sites. Proposals outwith designated sites, can still affect areas of natural heritage protected under national or international designations. To assist in the consideration of the magnitude of ecological effects SNH, The Salmon Fishery Board and the Local Biodiversity Officer have been consulted

In terms of Habitat and Species impacts, SNH agree with the conclusions of the ES and the proposed mitigation it contains for all the natural heritage resources relating to habitat and species.

The Salmon Fishery Board overall has considerable concerns about the Raera wind farm development given the amount of potential disruption to watercourses within the site and the scale of the development itself. The main areas of potential impact on 'in river' species,

including fish are: silting due to road building and forestry clearance; chemical (including concrete) pollution to water courses; and inappropriate bridges and culverts preventing fish access. It is recommended that these matters be controlled by appropriate planning conditions should Members be minded to grant permission.

The Council's Local Biodiversity Officer has reservations in terms of the mitigation for protection of a number of species and peatland and freshwater habitats, and would recommend the requirement for an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (to include species and habitats named in the site reports) to reflect the site preparation process and subsequent completion of the wind farm. The EMP should include the timing of operations to have the least impact on the habitats and species, primarily, ground nesting and migratory bird species, bat species, otter, lichens and bryophytes, fish and invertebrate species. This plan should be submitted prior to any development to allow time for natural heritage and biodiversity interests to assess the information. In the meantime, the Local Biodiversity Officer reserves her opinion on this application until an Environment Management Plan has been submitted and agreed. This could be secured by way of an appropriate planning condition in the event of permission being granted.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that subject to appropriate conditions (should planning permission be granted), the ecological Impact of the proposal is acceptable and subject to the implementation of an Environment Management Plan the proposal is capable of being consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT DC 7: Nature Conservation & Development Control of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Adopted 2009) and Policies LP ENV 2: Development Impact on Biodiversity and LP ENV 6: Development Impact on Habitats and Species of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

## **G. ORNITHOLOGICAL IMPACT**

Development of a wind energy development can affect bird species either in terms of bird strikes or in terms of disturbance to foraging and nesting sites. The construction of turbines, tracks and ancillary development in those areas frequented by breeding birds should occur outwith the nesting season. The risk of disturbance to bird species during operation should be seriously considered (PAN 45, 2002).

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds does not object to this proposal but does have concerns regarding: the proposal's potential to impact on raptors, namely golden eagle and hen harrier (Annex 1 species of the EC Bird Directive) and has provided advice and suggested mitigation measures to minimise these impacts in the form of planning conditions. Scottish Natural Heritage has not raised any objection to the proposal in relation to ornithological concerns.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that subject to appropriate conditions (should planning permission be granted), the ornithological Impact of the proposal is acceptable and the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT DC 7: Nature Conservation & Development Control of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Adopted 2009) and Policies LP ENV 2: Development Impact on Biodiversity and LP ENV 6: Development Impact on Habitats and Species of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

## **H. HYDROLOGICAL IMPACT**

Hydrology and the potential effects of drainage from turbine, access tracks and other ancillary development should be considered, as there could be significant effects on or adjacent to the application site. Watercourses, underground streams and private springs should be avoided, and private water supplies should not be adversely affected.



SEPA do not object to the planning application provided that, in the event that planning permission being granted, conditions are attached relating to: impacts on the water environment (to ensure that the risk to groundwater and private water supplied in the vicinity of the development is adequately assessed); impact of borrow pits on general environment and hydrogeology (this is not applicable as they must be subject to separate planning applications); detailed specification for surface water drainage arrangements; construction method statement; full site specific environmental management plan; and watercourse crossings.

The developer has submitted some of the information requested by SEPA in relation to private water supplies (initially required to be controlled by condition). The information submitted clarified that the private water supply locations in the ES referred to the location of private water supply properties. SEPA have confirmed that the information provided is satisfactory and are of the view that the private water supplies for the properties detailed are unlikely to be at risk from the development, given the distance between them. They also note that the details of how the private water supplies will be protected during construction will be detailed in the Construction Method Statement and Environmental Management Plan (should permission be granted).

**Having due regard to the above, subject to appropriate conditions, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of: Policy STRAT DC 10: Flooding & Land Erosion of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policies LP ENV 12: Water Quality and Environment; LP SERV 6: Waste Related Development and Waste Management in Developments, and LP SERV 9: Flooding and Land Erosion of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

## **I. PEAT IMPACT**

A Peat Stability Assessment is contained within the Technical Appendices of the Environmental Assessment. The wind farm site has been assessed for peat stability; the assessment has been based on a thorough inspection of the digital terrain map, detailed mapping of the proposed access route and turbine locations and constraints, and a four day walk-over and peat probing survey. The overall conclusion regarding peat stability is that there is an existing low risk of peat instability at the site. Given these ground conditions, the proposed site activities do not constitute a significant hazard, thus the risk of causing instability is assessed as low. Should the potential for peat stability occur locally, it may be mitigated by appropriate design, construction methodology and supervisory control of construction works.

SEPA advise that although peat is found on site it is not seen as a significant hazard. They note from BGS maps that peat is mapped around turbine no. 6. SEPA recommend that a peat survey is undertaken in this area to evaluate peat stability around the turbine foundation. They further advise that mitigating measures may be required to deal with peat stability and drainage.

The peat survey includes an investigation of the ground around Turbine 6. The survey found that the peat at these locations is between 0.5m and 1.0m thick and is predominantly associated with small patches of deeper peat contained within hummocky terrain. No groundwater seepages were noted and surface water was beyond 50m from the location. There was no significant slopes noted at the location and the survey concludes that peat instability is unlikely.

SEPA has requested that a condition is attached to any grant of planning permission to secure a site specific Construction Method Statement. Furthermore, they have noted from the Environmental Statement that construction control measures to mitigate peat damage will be defined and included in the Construction Method Statement.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the stability of peat deposits has been given appropriate cognisance and the proposal is consistent with the provisions of**

## **Policy LP REN 1 – Wind Farms and Wind Turbines of the Argyll and Bute Local Plan (2009).**

### **J. BUILT HERITAGE & ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT**

The built and cultural heritage of Argyll & Bute contributes towards the identity of the area, and every effort must be made to protect it. Advice has therefore been sought from Historic Scotland and the Council's Archaeological Service, to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on the site or setting of scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas or any historic design landscapes.

Historic Scotland has undertaken an appraisal of the ES and their comments concentrate on their statutory remit at the national level for: scheduled monuments and their settings; category A listed buildings and their settings; historic gardens and designed landscapes appearing in the inventory. Historic Scotland do have some concerns with some of the criteria employed in the ES to assess the relative significance or sensitivity of historic environment assets of national importance in the vicinity of the development. Despite this, Historic Scotland accept conclusions reached in the ES that any impacts on sites of national importance are not as such a level of significance to warrant an objection. It has therefore been concluded that the proposal will not harm any built and cultural heritage within or relative to the site.

The West of Scotland Archaeology Service does not object to the proposal providing a condition is attached to any grant of planning permission to secure a programme of archaeological works and written scheme of investigation to be agreed by the Council and the West of Scotland Archaeology Service.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal will not have adverse impact on the Built Heritage & Archaeology of Argyll (subject to recommended conditions should permission be granted) and is therefore consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT DC 9: Historic Environment & Development Control of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (adopted 2009) and Policies LP ENV 11: Development Impact on Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes; LP ENV 13a: Development Impact on Listed Buildings LP ENV 14: Development in Conservation Areas and Special Built Environment Areas; LP ENV 16: Development Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments; LP ENV 17: Development Impact on Sites of Archaeological Importance of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

### **K. TOURISM, RECREATION & ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE IMPACT**

Argyll & Bute's landscapes and townscapes are a major economic asset for the tourism industry. The sensitive coastal edge within which the application site is situated forms part of Argyll's most valued prime landscape resource, with recognition of this being given in the scenic designation of the area. It also influences an area of national landscape importance in the Scarba, Lunga, and Garvellachs National Scenic Area.

Wind farm proposals are expected not to result in the unacceptable loss of amenity to individuals who enjoy recreation pursuits on land or water. Proposals should also have no adverse effect on any existing or proposed public access for walking, cycling or horse riding, unless it retains existing or potential public access, while maintaining or enhancing its amenity value; or an alternative access is provided, which must be no less attractive and is safe and convenient for public use. In light of this proposal's likely adverse landscape and visual impacts detailed above, it must be concluded that the presence of development in a location of sensitivity in terms of landscape character and with turbines of the scale proposed, would be likely to have an adverse impact on tourism within Argyll & Bute by adversely affecting unique landscapes and townscapes which are important local and national tourism resources. This is

especially the case where tourists visit an area specifically to appreciate landscape, seascape and panoramic views and are particularly sensitive receptors as a consequence.

Although studies commissioned to assess the sensitivity of tourists to the presence of windfarm developments have not produced entirely consistent responses, it should be noted that in recent Scottish Ministers appeal decisions, in both cases, the Reporters accorded weight to the extent of the importance of tourism on the local economy in Argyll & Bute. (14 turbines Corlarach Hill, east of Glen Fyne, Bullwood Road, Dunoon, PPA-130-209 dismissed 27<sup>th</sup> May 2009 and 16 turbines Black Craig to Blar Buidhe, Glenfyne, Cowal, PPA-130-214 dismissed 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009).

The Access Officer has no objections to the proposal, however, notes that from records and from Ordnance Survey data it appears that a number of paths cross the site. These paths could be valuable and should be protected ensuring access is maintained and improved. The Council has an obligation to ensure that access is maintained along existing paths. This means that paths and access rights are a material planning consideration. Conditions are recommended to protect these paths should planning permission be granted.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on access and is consistent with the provisions of Policy LP ENV 1 (B): Development Impact on the General Environment of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009). However, it is considered that due to the adverse impact this proposal will have on the landscape, this proposal will have consequent adverse implications for tourism resources and it is therefore inconsistent with the provisions of the Scottish Planning Policy and PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies; Policies STRAT SI 1: Sustainable Development; Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2009) and Policies LP ENV 10: Development Impact on Areas of Panoramic Quality; LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

## L. IMPACT ON WOODLAND

If a wind energy development will result in the felling and reshaping of existing woodland, a forest design plan, including felling and restructuring, proposals should be supplied as part of the application. The forest design plan should be carried out and presented in accordance with Forestry Commission guidelines.

Forestry Commission Scotland object to the proposal as it currently stands. The main reason for their objection is that the proposal seeks to permanently remove some 720 hectares or thereabouts of forest (as well as not replanting a further 100 hectares or so of forest awaiting replanting after routine felling) and therefore does not comply with the Scottish Government's '*Policy on Control of Woodland Removal*' nor the statutory guidance on woodland removal contained in the National Planning Framework 2. In short, it does not take into account the need to minimise the inappropriate loss of existing woodland or the strong presumption in favour of compensatory planting where woodland is removed in association with development.

SNH agree with the Forestry Commission on the need for the developers to compensate for the loss of carbon storage. The provision of carbon storage provides an opportunity for some habitat enhancement. As such SNH recommend that any habitat management of the site, to offset carbon storage loss, compliments and enhances the existing semi-natural ancient broadleaf resource to be found in and around the site by seeking to further expand this habitat type. Such management should also protect any existing important habitat types found on the site, including those along the side of rivers and burns.

The developer has responded to the concerns raised by the Forestry Commission in correspondence dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2010. Further analysis has indicated that replanting the area from the wind farm edge to the 500m radius boundary would be possible and it is proposed that these areas are replanted with short crop sitka spruce. Comments are also provided in relation to Forest Structure; Updated Felling Design Plan; Red Squirrel (no evidence of red squirrels has been found); and Deer Management (the developer has agreed to provide the Forestry Commission with deer management plan).

Deer management is not a planning issue and will be dealt with jointly by the Forestry Commission and Scottish Natural Heritage. The developer is aware of the protection which is afforded red squirrels in terms of the Wildlife and the Countryside Act and surveys undertaken have not identified any evidence of red squirrels. However, should permission be granted 'red squirrels' will be protected by the Wildlife and the Countryside Act should any be discovered on site during construction.

This leaves the matter of the strong presumption in favour of compensatory planting for the woodland proposed to be removed. In the event that Members are minded to grant planning permission, it will be necessary to secure a scheme of compensatory planting to be agreed with the Forestry Commission by way of condition/Section 75 Legal Agreement (whichever is the most appropriate mechanism). It should be noted that in order to satisfy the Forestry Commission's requirements, compensatory planting would not necessarily have to take place in the vicinity of the development site, nor necessarily within the confines of Argyll.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that providing a scheme of Forestry Plan/Compensatory Planting is agreed with the Forestry Commission and secured by an appropriate mechanism, the proposal will not have any adverse impact on woodland in terms of the National Planning Framework 2 and National Policy and would therefore be consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT FW 2 – Development Impact on Woodland of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002) and Policy LP ENV 7: Development Impact on Trees/Woodland of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009).**

## M. NOISE

Potential noise nuisance an issue raised by several objectors. The developer has confirmed to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer that the requirements of PAN 56 will be met in relation to noise and its impact on neighbouring residential properties.

In assessing the impact of noise from this proposal regard has been paid to the best practice document published by ETSU and the DTI '*The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (ETSU-R-97)*'. This is accepted as a national reference for the assessment of noise from wind farms and details criteria and standards that should be considered and applied.

The Environmental Health Officer has no objection to the proposal and advises that the conclusions in the ES confirm that the noise levels likely to be produced by the operations of the wind farm will have no impact upon the residential properties around the development site.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse noise impact and is consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policies LP REN 1: Wind Farms & Wind Turbines and LP BAD 1: Bad Neighbour Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

## N. SHADOW FLICKER

Another issue to be considered is that of shadow flicker. Under certain combinations of geographical position, time of day and time of year, the sun may pass behind the rotor and cast

a shadow over neighbouring properties. When the blades rotate, the shadow flicks on and off; the effect known as “shadow flicker”.

The seasonal duration of this effect can be calculated from the geometry of the machine and the latitude of the potential site. PAN 45 advises that where separation is provided between wind turbines and nearby dwellings (as a general rule 10 rotor diameters). At the proposed site the ES confirms that the separation between the wind farm and the nearest residential property is greater than 10 x rotor diameter (10 x 90m = 900 metres). Under accepted good practice and guidance, this will ensure that shadow flicker will not present a problem and the Council’s Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with the proposal in this regard.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of ‘Shadow Flicker’ and that it will not have any adverse impact on amenity and is consistent with the Provisions of Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policies LP REN 1: Wind Farms & Wind Turbines and LP BAD 1: Bad Neighbour Development of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

#### **O. TELEVISION RECEPTION**

Television reception can be affected by the presence of wind turbines. This is of a predictable nature, and can be alleviated by installing or modifying the local repeater station or some cable connection. Terrestrial television services for domestic reception within the UK are the joint responsibility of the BBC and Ofcom. In the event of television reception problems, there may be straightforward potential solutions such as improving the receiving aerials or providing affected households with an alternative source of suitable television signals – off air from a different transmitter, from an existing cable system, or in some circumstances from a satellite. This source should be analogue or digital. Details of this would need to be included in a Section 75 Legal Agreement should planning permission be granted for the proposal.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and that it will not have any adverse impact on amenity and is consistent with the Provisions of Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policy LP REN 1: Wind Farms & Wind Turbines of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

#### **P. AIRCRAFT, AERODROMES & TECHNICAL SITES (SAFEGUARD ZONES & ELECTRO-MAGNETIC INTERFERENCE)**

Tall structures such as wind turbines can potentially interfere with electromagnetic transmissions of aviation operations, depending on their size, shape, construction materials and location. Their support structure and rotating blades can have an effect on communication, navigation and surveillance by giving off false radar returns and masking (shadowing) genuine aircraft returns.

Tall structures can also act as obstructions to low flying aircraft as they take off and land or interfere with visual aids such as landing lights. There are also issues of cumulative impacts that should be considered - Cumulative impact is a significant concern to the British Aviation Authority (BAA). For this reason, major airports and technical sites (civil and military) must be safeguarded. Consequently, the relevant licensee and operators have been consulted about this proposal and have confirmed, subject to certain conditions, that they are satisfied with the proposal.

Defence Estates has no objection. However, in the interests of air safety, they recommend that the turbines are fitted with 25 candela omni-directional red aviation lighting at the highest practical point. This night-time lighting and its consequential visual impact, albeit small, is of

concern, due to the proposed location of the wind farm in a rural area with limited light pollution. Although such lighting will have minimal environmental impact, it is recommended that should permission be granted a condition is attached requiring the use of Infra Red lights as an alternative. This will ensure that there is no environmental impact on the surroundings as the Infra Red will be invisible to the naked eye.

National Air Traffic Services advise that the proposed development is unlikely to impact on their electronic infrastructure and they have no safeguarding objection to this proposal.

BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding has no objection to the proposal; it has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria as it is out with the area of concern for Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen Airports.

The Civil Aviation Authority has no objection to the proposal providing consultation is undertaken with the Airport licensee/operators, MoD, NATS, BAA and Local Emergency Services and they are afforded the opportunity to comment upon the application and that any concerns expressed are taken into account during any related future planning deliberations. Several conditions are also recommended should permission be granted for the scheme, relating to: aviation lighting, paint colour and the proposal being charted on civil aviation maps.

The Scottish Ambulance, South West Division & National Air Wing have confirmed that the wind farm would have no impact on air ambulance operations.

The Oban Airport Manager has not formally responded to the consultation sent by Development Management. They have confirmed in correspondence to the agent that they have looked at ES and advised the agent that they will not be raising objections or conditions against the proposal.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT RE 1: Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002) and Policies LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development and Policy LP TRAN 7: Safeguarding of Airports of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

#### **Q. ELECTRO-MAGNETIC INTERFERENCE (COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS)**

Wind turbines produce electro-magnetic radiation, which can interfere with broadcast communications and signals. It is impossible to obtain a definite picture of all the transmission routes across any proposed site for a wind energy development due to the large number of bodies who use communication systems.

Relevant authorities and bodies which use communication systems such as: Defence Estates, British Aviation Authority, Civil Aviation Authority, National Air Traffic Control Service, Ofcom, and the Joint Radio Company have been consulted in order to identify any potential wireless communication issues and have confirmed that the proposal would have no adverse impact on the communication networks under their jurisdiction.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Policy STRAT RE 1: Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (approved 2002) and Policies LP REN 1: Commercial Wind Farm and Wind Turbine Development and Policy LP TRAN 7: Safeguarding of Airports of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009)**

#### **R. ROAD NETWORK & TRANSPORT MATTERS**

Transport Scotland advise that: 'Overall there will be a minimal increase in traffic on the trunk road, during the operation of the facility, therefore the proposed development is not likely to have a significant impact on the operation of the trunk road network. However, it is likely that as many of the construction loads may be categorised abnormal, authorisation from their management organization Scotland Transerv (ST) may be required. Transport Scotland have advised that ST be consulted on the feasibility of transportation of items to site and that due to the frequency and number of these loads it is UK policy to restrict these movements via the nearest suitable port. Consequently, should Members be minded to grant planning permission for this proposal, it would be appropriate to attach an advisory note to this effect.

The Area Roads Manager has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions (should Members be minded to grant planning permission) on the basis that discussions are entered into with ABC with respect to suitable traffic management arrangement for construction traffic delivering materials to the site and the access via the proposed jetty is subject to a separate planning application.

**Having due regard to the above, and subject to the recommended conditions should planning permission be granted, it is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse road network or transport impact and the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Policies LP TRAN 4: New and Existing, Public Roads and Private Access Regimes and LP TRAN 6: Vehicle Parking Provision of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (adopted 2009).**

#### **S. INFRASTRUCTURE**

Scottish Water has no objection to this proposal. They advise that there are no public sewers or public water mains in the vicinity of the proposal. SEPA has confirmed that it is unlikely that the proposal will have any adverse impact on private water supplies.

**Having due regard to the above it is concluded that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on private water supplies and is therefore consistent with the provisions of Policy LP SERV 4: Water Supply of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

#### **T. HEALTH & SAFETY**

The Health and Safety Executive were consulted on this application and made no comment on the environmental statement.

#### **U. WIND REGIME**

Wind farm proposals should be located in areas of suitable wind speeds. An anemometer which was subject to separate planning permission has been erected on site for quite some time and has provided data demonstrating that wind speed on site is at an acceptable level.

#### **V. GRID NETWORK**

The best wind speeds are often some distance from a national grid connection point. There are also issues relating to the capacity of the national grid, and although this is not a matter of land use policy, many wind farm proposals may sit in abeyance for a number of years before capacity can be made available. No details of the grid connection have been provided as part of this application. It has been indicated that this may comprise an overhead line from the site to the 132 kV electricity distribution network. Several objectors and consultees have raised concerns about the exclusion of the grid connection from this application. However, as detailed previously in this report there is no legal requirement for it to be included.

#### **W. COMMUNITY BENEFIT**

Several representees have raised the issue of 'Community Benefit'. This issue has not been considered as a 'material planning consideration' in the determination of this proposal. In the event that permission were to be granted, the negotiation of any community benefit, either directly with the local community or under the auspices of the Council, would take place outside the application process.

## X. DECOMMISSIONING

Wind turbines are temporary structures, with an estimated life span in the region of 25 years, and decommissioning needs to be considered.

A requirement for decommissioning and site clearance should be included in the planning condition(s) and/or legal agreement, should the application be approved, which will be triggered by either the expiry of the permission or if the project ceases to operate for a specific period (PAN 45, 2002).

**Having due regard to the above, as decommissioning can be controlled by condition/Section 75 Legal Agreement, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of Policy STRAT RE 1: Wind Farm/Wind Turbine Development of the Argyll & Bute Structure Plan (Approved 2002) and Policy LP REN 1: Wind Farms & Wind Turbines of the Argyll & Bute Local Plan (Adopted 2009).**

## Y. SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT ADVICE

### Scottish Planning Policy

Planning authorities should support the development of wind farms in locations where the technology can operate efficiently and environmental and cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily addressed. Development plans should provide a clear indication of the potential for development of wind farms of all scales, and should set out the criteria that will be considered in deciding applications for all wind farm developments including extensions. The criteria will vary depending on the scale of development and its relationship to the characteristics of the surrounding area, but are likely to include: landscape and visual impact; effects on the natural heritage and historic environment; contribution of the development to renewable energy generation targets; effect on the local and national economy and tourism and recreation interests; benefits and disbenefits for communities; aviation and telecommunications; noise and shadow flicker, and cumulative impact.

The design and location of any wind farm development should reflect the scale and character of the landscape. The location of turbines should be considered carefully to ensure that the landscape and visual impact is minimised.

### Planning Advice Note 45 'Renewable Energy Technologies'

Developers should seek to ensure that through good siting and design, landscape and visual impacts are limited and appropriate to the location. The visual effect will be dependent on the distance over which a wind farm may be viewed, whether the turbines can be viewed adjacent to other features, different weather conditions, the character of the development and the landscape and nature of the visibility.

**Having due regard to the above and based on the likely adverse Landscape & Visual Impact it is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with this advice.**

### Planning Advice Note 81 'Community Engagement – Planning with People'



Community engagement and consultation at all stages is an increasingly important aspect of all development proposals, as a result of the responsibility set out in the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006. This PAN provides advice on how best to carry out the community engagement process. This application was subject to the Pre-Application Consultation process and the developer has undertaken community engagement and submitted the results in their 'Pre-Application Consultation' document.

Scottish Government is strongly committed to developing wind power and other renewable technologies. It is Government policy to seek to stimulate the development of new renewable energy sources whenever they have the prospect to be economically attractive and environmentally acceptable in order to contribute to diverse, secure and sustainable energy supplies and a reduction in the emission of pollutants. As a result a market based support mechanism for renewable energy has been introduced which places an obligation on electricity suppliers to buy an increasing proportion of their electricity from renewable sources. This is called the Renewables Obligation Scotland (ROS) and to enable this to happen the Government has advised Planning Authorities in its National Planning Guidance to provide positively for renewable energy developments *where this can be achieved in an environmentally acceptable manner*.

**Having due regard to the above it is considered that the developer has engaged with the community appropriately and the proposal is consistent with the provisions of PAN 81: Community Engagement – Planning with People. However, due to the potential adverse landscape, visual and cumulative impact the development could have it is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with the provisions of PAN 45: Renewable Energy Technologies and Scottish Planning Policy.**

## **Z. SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGETS & ARGYLL & BUTE'S CONTRIBUTION**

In assessing the acceptability of windfarm developments, it is necessary to have regard to the macro-environmental aspects of renewable energy (reduction in reliance on fossil fuels and contribution to reduction in global warming) as well as to the micro-environmental consequences of the development proposed (in terms of the impact of its presence upon its surroundings).

Scottish Government's '*Climate Change in Scotland Annual Report 2009-10*' - this report states that in terms of renewables targets Scotland is currently committed to achieving a headline target of 20% of total Scottish energy use coming from renewable sources by 2020. In terms of electricity, the target is to achieve 50% of gross electricity consumption from renewable sources by 2020, with an interim target of 31% by 2011. The 2011 milestone for renewable electricity generation equates to around 5 GW of installed renewable generation capacity. This target is one of the Scottish Government National Indicators and is reported on annually by the Scottish Government. Current performance against this indicator stands at 22%, based on 2008 electricity generation statistics.

Based on the Council's most up to date wind farm proposal map and associated information there are a total of 9 operational wind farms in Argyll & Bute, namely: Carn Gaibhre, Taynuilt; Deucheren Hill by Carradale; Beinn an Tuirc by Carradale; Tangy by Kilkenzie; Cruach Mhor, Glendaruel; Isle of Luing; Clachan Flats by Cairndow; Isle of Gigha; Tangy by Kilkenzie 2; and, An Suidhe. The total capacity of these amounts to approximately 175.5 MW or 0.175 GW. These figures do not include wind farms with permission which have not been constructed yet.

Whilst the 45 megawatt maximum capacity of the development is palpable in terms of the additional resource the development could add to Argyll and Bute's contribution to Scotland's renewable energy commitments and aspirations, it is not considered that the macro-environmental benefits of the proposal in terms of renewable generating capacity are such as to

warrant the setting aside of the other development plan policy considerations identified above which have prompted the recommendation of refusal of the application.

## APPENDIX C – REPRESENTATIONS RELATIVE TO APPLICATION NUMBER: 09/01874/PP

### AGAINST THE PROPOSAL

M MacNeil	1 Cnoc Achalltuinn Clachan Seil PA34 4TR	18/06/2010	O
M McPhee	1 Gylen Close Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RL	05/07/2010	O
The Occupier	1 Kilbrandon Cottages Balvicar Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA	06/07/2010	O
Colina MacInnes	1 Rowantree Cottages Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TP	18/06/2010	O
Jayne And Roy Gillions	10 Picasso Place Aylesbury Bucks HP19 8SX	08/06/2010	O
Mr And Mrs P Hines	11 Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF	09/06/2010	O
J L Alexander	11 Cullipool Isle Of Luing Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4UB	25/06/2010	O
Caroline Johnston	112 Balcarres Avenue Glasgow G12 0QR	21/03/2010	O
B J Smith	12 Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF	29/06/2010	O
Derek Lyall	12 Easdale Island Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB	06/07/2010	O
Mary Withall	13A Easdale Island By Oban Argyll PA34 4TB	08/06/2010	O
Lucy H G Files	14 The Glebe Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4XF	05/07/2010	O
P J Long	14B Easdale Island Oban	08/07/2010	O

S Wharton	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB 15 Balvicar Seil Island Oban	28/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF 15 Kersley Street London	06/07/2010	O
The Occupier	SW11 4PR 15 Langton Street London	28/09/2010	O
Karl Pipes	SW10 0JL 16 Forestry Cottages Eredine Dalmally Argyll And Bute PA33 1BS	30/03/2010	O
Mr S P Hines	174B Iverson Road West Hampstead London	06/07/2010	O
Martin Wadell	NW6 2HL 2 Kilbrandon Cottages Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	18/06/2010	O
Myra Waddell	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA 2 Kilbrandon Cottages Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	09/06/2010	O
Captain And Mrs James Briggs	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA 2 Pitcote Lane Poundbury Dorchester	24/03/2010	O
J R F Kruse	Dorset 2 Valley View Prudhoe Northumberland	13/04/2010	O
Mrs Deborah Anne Macdonald	NE42 5BL 21 Lindisfarne Road Newcastle Upon Tyne	14/07/2010	O
The Occupier	NE2 2HE 22 Iona Drive Trowell Nottingham	01/07/2010	O
Hugo Struthers	NG9 3RF 23 Cairns Drive Glasgow	14/05/2010	O
Mrs A L Struthers	G62 8AJ 23 Cairns Drive Milngavie	21/05/2010	O
I And C Taylor	G62 8AJ 25 Dunmore Gardens Dundee	05/07/2010	O
Heather Chaplin	DD2 1PP 3 Easdale Island By Oban Argyll	30/07/2010	O
The Occupier	PA34 4TB 3 Park Lane Lunga Craobh Haven	09/06/2010	O
A Kennedy	PA31 8UU 3 Rowantree Cottages Clachan Seil	18/06/2010	O

H Tarball	Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TP 33a Easdale Island By Oban Argyll PA34 4TB 34 Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban	30/06/2010	O
Donald And Lynn MacPherson	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 38 Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban	21/06/2010	O
J D MacKay	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 39 Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban	07/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 39 Toberonochy Isle Of Luing Oban	18/06/2010	O
Denise Cowley	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UE 4 Cnoc Beag Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	11/02/2010	O
H Clark	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TH 4 Creag Bhan Village Glengallan Road Oban	09/07/2010	O
C Dryden	Argyll And Bute PA34 4BF 4 Seaview Terrace Easdale By Oban	26/08/2010	O
Mr And Mrs Johnston	PA34 43g 4 Whinbank Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	01/07/2010	O
Margaret Morrison	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TW 41 Ellenabeich Easdale By Oban	21/06/2010	O
George Doyle	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 42 Easdale Island Oban	24/06/2010	O
Alistair Knox	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB 46 Easdale Island Oban	06/07/2010	O
A Clayton	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB 46 Easdale Island Oban	08/07/2010	O
Mrs A Clayton	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB 55 Easdale Island Oban	07/06/2010	O
Keith Oversby	Oban Argyll And Bute	08/06/2010	O

	PA34 4TB		
Tina Jordan	55 Easdale Island Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TB 6 Acha Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	21/06/2010	O
R K And J C Stowe	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RJ 6 Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	28/06/2010	O
Eileen Clark	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF 6 Cnoc - A - Challtuinn	09/07/2010	O
Mr P Gillespie	Clachan Seil PA34 4TR 6 Seaview Terrace	18/06/2010	O
J And L McLean	Easdale PA34 4RG 61 Ellenabeich Easdale Seil By Oban	23/06/2010	O
Ruth Morris	Argyll PA34 4RQ 61 Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban	11/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 7 East Vows Walk Kirkcaldy Fife	11/06/2010	O
Mr J R And Mrs P J Pattison	KY1 1SQ 8 Seaview Terrace Easdale Oban	13/07/2010	O
Linda Brown	Argyll PA34 4RG 8 Wallace Terrace Barrhill Girvan	11/06/2010	O
Lily And Douglas Niven	KA26 0QS 9 Osborne Terrace Wester Coates Edinburgh	30/06/2010	O
Richard Glover	EH12 5HG Ach Na Clach Clachan Seil Oban	25/03/2010	O
Elizabeth Galloway	Argyll PA34 4TL Achnaseilach Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	18/06/2010	O
Mr G W Stewart And Mrs J M Stewart	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TJ Alma Cottage Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	04/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	09/08/2010	O

Professor M S Baxter	Ampfield Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	08/06/2010	O
Mrs S Downie	An Cala Isle Of Seil Argyll PA34 4RF An Fhuaran Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	08/06/2010	O
Carol Collis	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Ard Gorm Barran Kilmore	25/06/2010	O
Donald McBurnie	Argyll PA34 4XR Ard Gorm Barran Kilmore Oban	11/02/2010	O
Donald McBurnie	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XR Ardencaple Farm Clachan Seil Oban	11/02/2010	O
J K Taylor	PA34 4TN Ardmaddy Castle Ardmaddy Oban	02/06/2010	O
Mr A J Struthers	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Ardmaddy Castle Ardmaddy Oban	14/05/2010	O
Mrs S Struthers	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Ardmaddy Castle Ardmaddy Oban	13/05/2010	O
Sabrina And Archie Struthers	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Ardmaddy Castle By Oban	03/09/2010	O
Charles Struthers	Argyll PA34 4QY Ardmaddy View Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	12/05/2010	O
A Shann And Y Shann	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TN Ardross Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	03/06/2010	O
Frances Hill	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Ardruighe Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	18/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	01/07/2010	O

Doreen And James Gilbert	Ardshellach Farm Ardmaddy Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Arran Cottage Ardmaddy Oban	11/02/2010	O
Mrs T Campbell	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Arran Cottage Ardmaddy Oban	09/06/2010	O
N Campbell	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QY Asselholm Cottage Pinmore	09/06/2010	O
Mr Charles Welsh	Grivan KA26 0HY Balvicar Stores Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	01/07/2010	O
Mr A McFarlane	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TE Balvicar View Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	28/06/2010	O
Mr J E Ferris	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Balvicar View Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	18/06/2010	O
Mr J Ferris	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Barndromin Farm Knipoch By Oban	18/06/2010	O
Mrs Morag Mellor	Argyll PA34 4QS Barndromin Farm Knipoch By Oban	12/02/2010	O
Jamie Mellor	PA34 4QS Barocheal Kilninver By Oban	12/02/2010	O
Nigel Mitchell	Argyll PA34 4UT Barochreal Kilninver By Oban	10/02/2010	O
Mrs A N M Mitchell	PA34 4UT Barochreal Kilninver Oban	21/01/2010	O
Antionette N M Mitchell	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UT Barochreal Kilninver Oban	10/02/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UT Barrmore Cnoc Achalltuinn Clachan Seil	19/01/2010	O
Barbara MacAlister	Isle Of Seil	30/06/2010	O

	By Oban Argyll Belnahua Seaview Easdale By Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RF Belvoir Cottage Bells Drove Welney Wisbech		
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RF Belvoir Cottage Bells Drove Welney Wisbech	24/06/2010	O
Mr A Darvill	Cambs PE14 9TG Braefoot Farm Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	12/02/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA Braeside Guesthouse Kilmore	09/06/2010	O
John Freeman	By Oban PA34 4QR Bragleen House Kilninver	14/01/2010	O
A C Robertson	Oban PA34 4UU Bragleenbeg Kilninver	22/01/2010	O
Jackie Handley	By Oban Argyll PA34 4UU Caladh Cottage Easdale	12/02/2010	O
Helen Simcox	Oban Argyll PA34 4RF Callanish Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil	23/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TN Callanish Clachan Seil	09/06/2010	O
Felicity Barr	Oban Argyll PA34 4TN Camus Nan Eun Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil	19/07/2010	O
The Occupier	Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Castle Hill Filleigh Barnstaple	02/07/2010	O
The Occupier	Devon EX32 0RQ Ceo Na Mara 12 The Glebe Kilmelford	06/07/2010	O
Dr Graham Wardle	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XF Ceo Na Mara The Glebe	19/01/2010	O
Val Wardle	Kilmelford	28/01/2010	O



The Occupier	PA34 4XF Charene North Connel Oban Argyll And Bute PA37 1RD Clach Na Sula Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	04/06/2010	O
T Robilliard	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QZ Clachan Beag By Oban	07/07/2010	O
Lesley Addison	Argyll PA34 4RH Clachandubh House Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	14/06/2010	O
Dr M Brooks	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA Cnoc Crom Clachan Seil By Oban	28/06/2010	O
S Mitchell	Argyll PA34 4QZ Cnoc Fennaig House Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	14/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF Coast House Kings Saltern Road	21/06/2010	O
C H Layman	Lymington SO41 3QD Coille Dharaich Kilmelford Oban	29/03/2010	O
Peter Stott	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XD Coille Dharaich Kilmelford Oban	11/02/2010	O
Peter Stott	Argyll PA34 4XD Craggie House Daviot Inverness	12/02/2010	O
Neil MacPherson	IV2 5XQ Craig House Colmonell Girvan	16/06/2010	O
Harriet Ellis	Ayrshire Craigiebeag Clachan Isle Of Seil Oban	02/07/2010	O
K Hall	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Craigiebeag Clachan Isle Of Seil Oban	01/07/2010	O
F M Hall	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	01/07/2010	O

R McCann	Craobh Deargh Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4QZ Craobh Mor Clachan Seil By Oban Argyll	10/06/2010	O
Henry M Hiscock	PA34 4TJ Craobh Mor Clachan Seil By Oban Argyll	30/06/2010	O
Mrs M L Hiscock	PA34 4TJ Craobh Mor Clachan Seil By Oban Argyll	30/07/2010	O
The Occupier	PA34 4TJ Creachan Cottage Lagganmore Kilninver Oban Argyll And Bute	30/06/2010	O
David Stevenson	PA34 4UU Creachan Cottage Scammadale Kilninver Oban Argyll	09/02/2010	O
D J Stevenson	PA34 4UU Cruach Scarba Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute	11/06/2010	O
Dr L Reid	PA34 4TL Cullipool House Cullipool Isle Of Luing Oban Argyll And Bute	21/06/2010	O
Mr Peter Cooke	PA34 4TX Dorus Mor Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute	28/05/2010	O
Jim Cunningham	PA34 4TR Duachy Farm Kilninver By Oban Argyll	18/06/2010	O
Patrick And Gill Cadzow	PA34 4QU Dunaverty Easdale By Oban	07/06/2010	O
David And Jean Ausley	PA34 4RR Dunfillan Cuan Ferry Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute	30/06/2010	O
Goodwin	PA34 4RB Dunmor Farm Easdale By Oban	16/06/2010	O
Fiona Gully	By Oban	19/07/2010	O

	Argyll PA34 4RF Dunmor Easdale Oban		
Edward Gully	Argyll PA34 4RF Dunvegan Cnoc-A-Challtuinn Clachan Seil Oban	19/07/2010	O
Mr And Mrs D Pearson	PA34 4TR Fasgadh Clachan Seil Oban	21/06/2010	O
David Foster	Argyll PA34 4TJ Fearnach House Kilmelford Oban	29/06/2010	O
Ken Scaife B.Vet.Med	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XD Fearnach House Kilmelford Oban	08/02/2010	O
Diane Scaife	PA34 4XD Feorlin Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban	28/01/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF Fioryn Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute	28/06/2010	O
Mr. T. Davies	PA34 4TJ Glenfearnach House Kilmelford Oban	29/01/2010	O
Jennie Campbell-Gibson	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XD Glenfeochan House Kilmore Oban	10/02/2010	O
Hugh And Elizabeth Whittle	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QR Glenfeochan House Kilmore Oban	09/02/2010	O
Hugh Whittle	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QR Glenshellach Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	09/03/2010	O
Mr T J B Sinclair	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TR Grove Cottage Wooddalling Norwich	07/07/2010	O
Colin De Chair	NR11 6RS Harbour Cottage Ellenabeich	30/06/2010	O
E J Reid	Isle Of Seil	04/06/2010	O

Daniel Pearce-Higgins	Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ Hawkhurst Farm Bromyard Herefordshire HR7 4SB Innie Kilninver Oban	05/10/2010	O
Robin And Anne Grey	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UX Innish Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	11/02/2010	O
Michael G Breslin	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QZ Innish Clachan Seil Oban	10/06/2010	O
Mrs Irene Breslin	Argyll PA34 4QZ Innishail Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil	10/06/2010	O
James Mellor	Argyll PA34 4TJ Inshaig House Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban	07/06/2010	O
Fioan Baroness Thyssen	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RF Kames Lodge Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute	08/06/2010	O
Lorna Hill	PA34 4XA Keepers Cottage Kilninver By Oban	14/06/2010	O
Ian Tegner And Meriel Tegner	Argyll PA34 4UT Kenmore Barn Kilmelford Oban	22/02/2010	O
H J Gassert	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XA Kenmore Barn Kilmelford Oban	11/02/2010	O
Vivien Gassert	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XA Keno Hill Isle Of Seil Oban	11/02/2010	O
C Hartley	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TN Keno Hill Isle Of Seil Oban	09/06/2010	O
Lorne D Fowler	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TN Kilbrandon House Balvicar	09/06/2010	O
The Hon Michael Shaw	Isle Of Seil	28/05/2010	O

	Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RA Kilchoan Farm Kilmelford Oban		
Helen Keate	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XD Kilchoan Farmhouse Kilmelford	08/03/2010	O
Diarmid Campbell	Argyll PA34 4XD Kilchoan House Kilmelford By Oban	24/03/2010	O
Mrs Susan Keate	Argyll PA34 4XD Kilchoan House Kilmelford Oban	02/03/2010	O
H R Keate	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XD Kildalton Cottage Cuan Ferry Isle Of Seil Oban	02/03/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RB Kildalton Cottage North Cuan Ferry Isle Of Seil By Oban	14/07/2010	O
M Brown	PA34 4RB	14/07/2010	O
Ewen Kennedy	Kilmelford Kilninver House Kilninver Oban	15/02/2010	O
Rebecca Nicholson	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UT Kilninver House Kilninver Oban	10/02/2010	O
Robin Nicholson	Argyll And Bute PA34 4UT Laroch Kilmelford Oban	10/02/2010	O
John Rentoul	Argyll PA34 4XA Laroch Kilmelford Oban	12/02/2010	O
Mrs Jane Rentoul	Argyll PA34 4XA Lavenderhead Winston	12/02/2010	O
K Walker	Winchester SO21 3LR Lendal Lodge Lendalfoot Nr Girvan	13/07/2010	O
Ms Heather Shuckburgh	South Ayrshire KA26 0JB Little Torwood The Glebe Kilmelford Oban	12/07/2010	O
Mrs Margaret Cross	Argyll And Bute	09/02/2010	O

	PA34 4XF		
	Loch Melfort Hotel And Restaurant Arduaine By Oban		
Calum And Rachel Ross	PA34 4XG Lochend Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute	12/02/2010	O
Dorothy Bark	PA34 4XD Lochend Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute	07/02/2010	O
Iain Bark	PA34 4XD Lochend Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute	07/02/2010	O
Malcolm Bark	PA34 4XD Luing Chalet Balvicar Chalets Balvicar Isle Of Seil By Oban	07/02/2010	O
Kneale B Smith	PA34 4TE Mansefield House Pinwherry Girvan Ayrshire	14/06/2010	O
Mr Rory Boyle	KA26 0RU Mansefield House Pinwherry Girvan Ayrshire	30/06/2010	O
Mrs Victoria Boyle	LA26 0RU Maolachy House Lochavich Taynuilt Argyll	30/06/2010	O
James Dalton	PA35 1HJ Maolachy Lochavich By Taynuilt	22/02/2010	O
A D F Dalton	PA35 1HJ Maolachy Lochavich By Taynuilt	22/02/2010	O
Mrs G Dalton	PA35 1HJ Melfort House Kilmelford Oban Argyll And Bute	01/02/2010	O
Mr M Anderson	PA34 4XD Model Farm Holkham Wells-next-the-Sea Norfolk	11/02/2010	O
The Countess Of Leicester	NR23 1RP	05/07/2010	O
The Earl Of Leicester	Model Farm Holkham	05/07/2010	O

	Wells-next-the-Sea Norfolk NR23 1RP Morleen Kilninver By Oban Argyll PA34 4UY		
J A MacLean		18/02/2010	O
Allan And Sarah Henderson	No Address Given	06/07/2010	O
Andrea Lea	No Address Given	24/03/2010	O
Angela E McLeod	No Address Given	02/06/2010	O
Ann Cunningham	No Address Given	18/06/2010	O
D McLeod	No Address Given	02/06/2010	O
Elma And Danny Nee	No Address Given	18/06/2010	O
Ewen Kennedy	No Address Given	10/02/2010	O
J E And J C Bisp	No Address Given	28/06/2010	O
J J Lund	No Address Given	25/08/2010	O
K L Barrett	No Address Given	18/06/2010	O
Mrs Patricia Bedford	No Address Given	10/02/2010	O
Mrs Patricia Bedford	No Address Given	10/02/2010	O
S Robertson	No Address Given	23/06/2010	O
The Occupier	No Address Given	09/06/2010	O
Tom Dalton	No Address Given	22/02/2010	O
	North Cuan Croft Cuan Ferry Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RB		
Mrs Ruth Jacqueline Coney		15/07/2010	O
Dorothy Bark	Not Given	11/02/2010	O
Ian Bark	Not Given	11/02/2010	O
Malcolm Bark	Not Given	11/02/2010	O
	Oban Caravan Site Oban Argyll		
H Fleming		25/06/2010	O
	Oban Seil Farm Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TN		
Bette Hunter		08/03/2010	O
	Olig Clachan Seil By Oban Argyll		
A J Durley		19/07/2010	O
	PA34 4TL Olig Clachan Seil By Oban Argyll		
Susan Durley		19/07/2010	O
	PA34 4TL Port Beag Kilninver By Oban Argyll		
Mrs Vanessa Kilpatrick		08/02/2010	O
	Port Beag Kilninver By Oban Argyll		
Mr David R Kilpatrick		03/02/2010	O
	PA34 4UT Raera Farm Kilninver Oban Argyll		
S A And J W Inglis		12/02/2010	O
	PA34 4UT		

H M M Blakeney	Reay Cottage Clachan-Seil By Oban Argyll PA34 4TL Rectory Farm Glen Road Castle Bytham Grantham Lincs	23/06/2010	O
Annabel Buik	NG33 4RJ Rectory Farm Glen Road Castle Bytham Grantham LINCS	27/07/2010	O
D B Buik	NG33 4RJ Rock Cottage Clachan Seil Oban	06/07/2010	O
The Occupier	PA34 4TL Scottish Wildcat Association C/o Shepherd And Wederburn LLP 1 Exchange Crescent Conference Square Edinburgh	24/06/2010	O
Steve Piper	EH3 8UL Seil Chalet Balvicar Chalets	07/07/2010	O
Linda Findlay	Isle Of Seil PA34 4TE Seil Haven Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	19/08/2010	O
Jean Miller	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Seilcreag Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	04/06/2010	O
A J Barr	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Sona Fardach Clachan Seil By Oban	09/06/2010	O
C Breslin	PA34 4QZ Sona Fardach Clachan Seil By Oban	15/06/2010	O
Karen Breslin	PA34 4QZ Stone's Throw Cottage Easdale Island Oban	15/06/2010	O
Mr J Penney	Argyll PA34 4TB Sunderlandhall House Galashiels Selkirkshire	30/06/2010	O
Dick And Heltie Smyly	TK1 3PG The Bield Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	02/09/2010	O
S J Croft	Argyll And Bute PA34 4QZ The Bothy Achnaclach Clachan Seil By Oban	18/06/2010	O
Christopher Rose	PA34 4TL	01/02/2010	O



The Occupier	The Former Manse 9 Cnoc Mhor Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF	06/07/2010	O
Caroline Curley	The Haven Clachan Seil By Oban PE34 4TN The Longhouse Blackmill Bay Isle Of Luing By Oban Argyll PA34 4TZ	27/08/2010	O
The Occupier	The Longhouse Blackmillbay Isle Of Luing By Oban Argyll PA34 4TZ	12/07/2010	O
Owner/Occupier	The Old House Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	19/07/2010	O
Hugh Martin	The Old House Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	13/07/2010	O
The Occupier	The Old House Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	09/06/2010	O
J And M Blackstock	Tigh Creagan Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL	21/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Tigh Innis Balvicar Bay Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4TF	29/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Tigh Na Faire Acha Balvicar Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RJ	06/07/2010	O
The Occupier	Tigh Na Faire Acha Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4RJ	06/07/2010	O
The Occupier	Tigh Na Faire Acha Isle Of Seil Oban PA34 4RJ Tir Aluinn Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	05/07/2010	O
Mrs Iris Bell	Oban	21/06/2010	O

	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TL Torbeag Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban		
Stuart Reid	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TJ Traighuaine Tri Arduaine By Kilmelford Oban	20/01/2010	O
Neil Goulding	PA34 4XQ Tullach Ard Balvicar Seil Island Oban	12/02/2010	O
S Hunt	PA34 4TF Whin Cottage Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	29/06/2010	O
Denise MacMahon	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TJ Whin Cottage Clachan Seil Isle Of Seil Oban	08/06/2010	O
R J MacMahon	Argyll And Bute PA34 4TJ Willowburn Clachan Seil By Oban	09/06/2010	O
The Occupier	Argyll PA34 4TJ Zanadu Cuan Road Balivar Oban	24/06/2010	O
Mrs M Willoughby	Argyll PA34 4RA	22/06/2010	O

## FOR THE PROPOSAL

Mr And Mrs P Hammick	1 Cuilfail Terrace Kilmelford Argyll And Bute PA34 4XH 2 Seaview Terrace Easdale Oban	09/03/2010	S
Sheila Macgregor	PA34 4RG 6 Tramway Cottages Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban Argyll And Bute	01/02/2010	S
Paul Anfield	PA34 4RQ 6 Tramway Cottages Ellenabeich	30/01/2010	S
Mr Anfield Paul	Easdale	01/02/2010	S

	Oban PA34 4RQ 6 Tramway Cottages Ellenabeich Isle Of Seil Oban		
Mr Paul Anfield	Argyll And Bute PA34 4RQ 7 Seaview Terrace Easdale	03/02/2010	S
Mr Rodgers	Oban PA34 4RG 8 Cuilfail Cottages Kilmelford Oban	01/02/2010	S
Colin Clark	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XB An Caorann Kilmore Oban	15/02/2010	S
Robert K Clarke	Argyll And Bute PA34 4XR An Teallach Arduaine Oban	19/01/2010	S
Alastair Thom	PA34 4XQ Ardentigh Glenoran Road Rhu Helensburgh	29/01/2010	S
Terence Brownrigg	Argyll And Bute G84 8JU Balnahua Seaview Easdale Oban	15/03/2010	S
Mrs Constable	PA34 4RF Benton Farm Dingleden Benenden Cranbook Kent	29/01/2010	S
Dr Gudrun Von Tevenar	TH17 4JU Camasbeg Arduaine By Oban	04/03/2010	S
Peter Gerard-Pearse	PA34 4XG Camus Arsa Craobh Haven Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute	01/02/2010	S
Christine Sugden	PA31 8UU Caravan Stance Opposite 54 Easdale Island Oban Argyll And Bute	26/01/2010	S
Keren Cafferty	PA34 4TB Caravan Stance Opposite 54 Easdale Island Oban Argyll And Bute	13/01/2010	S
Mike Cafferty	PA34 4TB	13/01/2010	S

Caroline Younger	Carolineyounger@yahoo.com Corie Lodge Craobh Haven Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute	02/02/2010	S
Jane Wilding	PA31 8UU Fashven Musadale Road Kilmore Oban Argyll And Bute	26/01/2010	S
Julian Overnell	PA34 4XX Fuaim An T-Sruth South Cuan Isle Of Luing By Oban	02/02/2010	S
Margaret H G King	PA34 4TU Morven Cullipool Isle Of Luing Oban Argyll And Bute	19/01/2010	S
Mrs Elizabeth C Lyon	PA34 4TX Nell Beag Musdale Road Kilmore Oban Argyll And Bute	09/02/2010	S
Alistair Maccalman	PA34 4XX	02/02/2010	S
Keren Cafferty	No Address Given	15/01/2010	S
Mike Cafferty	No Address Given Otters Ardfern Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute	15/01/2010	S
Clive Brown	PA31 8QN Seall-Na-Mara Arduaine Oban Argyll	25/01/2010	S
J P Stannard	PA34 4XQ Smart Riverdale Barran Kilmore Oban	02/02/2010	S
Alexander And Heather Stuart	PA34 4XR Tahsis Musdale Road Kilmore Oban	26/01/2010	S
Keith Brimelow	PA34 4XX The Swallows South Cuan Isle Of Luing By Oban	29/01/2010	S
Peter Hooper	PA34 4TU The Walled Garden Craignish Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute	28/01/2010	S
R W Goudy	PA31 8QS	27/01/2010	S

A And J Robertson	Tigh Phadruig Barran Kilmore Oban Argyll And Bute PA34 4XR Traighuaine Ard Arduaine Oban	09/02/2010	S
Fiona Wyllie	Argyll PA34 4XQ	18/02/2010	S

## GENERAL REPRESENTATIONS

A E And P D Wharton	4 Craggyknowe Blackfell Village Washington Tyne And Weir NE37 1JY Bolam 1 Grianach Gardens Oban	02/07/2010	R
Mr C S G Liversedge	Argyll PA34 4LB Corranbeg House Ardfern Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute	21/01/2010	R
Sandy Mackiligin	PA31 8QN Mardavhal Shore Road Strone Dunoon Argyll And Bute	26/01/2010	R
David Moore	PA23 8TB	04/02/2010	R
Jane Wilding	No Address Given	02/02/2010	R
R W Goudy	Not Given Torbeag Clachan Seil Oban	02/02/2010	R
Mr Stuart Reid	PA34 4TJ	14/01/2010	R