
From:
Sent: 18 May 2015 15:47
To:
Subject: FW: Release-authorized: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464

Attachments: Report_14-675-WHA-1.pdf; Berriedale and Dunbeath community cluster support letter-gibson-04-03-14.pdf



Report_14-675-WHA-1.pdf (384 K... Berriedale and Dunbeath commun...

Dear

Further to our conversation just now, please find a copy of an email I sent back to Jack in April last year. This deals with why we may or may not have objected to various turbine developments in the vicinity of Hill of Lychrobbie in the past.

I hope this is helpful.

Kind regards

Please note that from mid June my new email address will be

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: 22 April 2014 17:11
To:
Subject: release-authorized: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464

Dear

As promised, here is a more complete response to your letter of 10/4/14 from Avi-tica.

I have already indicated that our Radar Subject Matter Expert has concluded that the buildings mentioned in the report will not shield the Lychrobbie turbines from the Lossiemouth ATC radar.

With regard to the table detailing our response to other wind energy planning consultations, our records show the following.

We were consulted about a development called Buolfrnich/Dunbeath in March 2001. I am unable to access records regarding this consultation, so I am unable to comment on whether we concluded that it would be detectable by the radar or not.

Upper Smerral was initially assessed as being detectable by the radar. We were re-consulted following a proposed reduction in height. Detectability was assessed as being "borderline" and at that time, October 2010, the operational impact of this was considered to be manageable.

We did, indeed, object to the development at Newlands of Housry but withdrew this objection subject to a suspensive planning condition. This condition stipulates that the development can only become operational if technical mitigation is put in place which addresses our concerns regarding radar interference.

Rumator Forest was initially assessed as being detectable by the radar, but a level 3 assessment was carried out which concluded that the turbine was unlikely to be detectable. Consequently our objection was withdrawn.

Lower Rumator and Upper Clyth were both assessed from the outset as being undetectable. This is why we did not object to either of them.

We were consulted about Burn of Whilk in 2010. It was assessed as being detectable but we did not object because, at that time, 2010, the operational impact was deemed to be acceptable.

From the above you will see that we have not objected to two developments which were definitely assessed as being detectable by the radar at Lossiemouth; Upper Smerral and Burn of Whilk; and that both of these no objection responses were issued in 2010. As far as I am aware, only one of these developments, Burn of Whilk, has been built.

Moving on to the conclusions section of the report: Your consultants observe that there have been no flight safety occurrences recorded as a result of turbine interference. From this they conclude that there is no evidence that any turbines have a negative impact on flight safety. It is known that turbines present aircraft like returns to radar, that they create blind spots and that they desensitise radar. It is a fact that controllers have to vector aircraft flying in low visibility at least 5km around the returns presented by turbines. From the above, it follows that turbines which are visible to radar have both operational and air safety implications. The fact that controllers have successfully managed to work around these implications so far cannot be taken as a reason to sanction additional turbine interference.

Paragraph 5.2 is not the case. Please see above.

With regard to the request that we monitor the detectability of existing turbine developments; checking if other turbines in the area are detected is not an accurate methodology.

There maybe many reasons why turbines are or are not showing on a particular day; they may not be operating; the speed may be too slow or the direction they are facing may be giving a poor radar cross section. There are also occasions when radars detect turbines - due to atmospheric effects - which cannot be predicted as line of sight.

Additionally the MCD does not have the resources required to visit sites in order to make comparative checks like this as and when required. The use of a software based prediction tool is consistent, fair and repeatable.

I hope that this addresses all of the issues raised by the report. If you would like to discuss any of the above in further detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

25

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 06 March 2014 16:49

To:

Subject: Mill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464

I am writing in regards to a recent objection from the MoD to the proposed Lychrobbie wind turbines, your reference 19464, planning application reference number 13/04194/FUL. For this application Wind Harvest is acting as an agent on behalf of the two landowners who have decided to make this project a community project by giving two of the three wind turbines to local community.

With the refusal at appeal of the Dunbeath wind farm, the Mill of Lychrobbie wind turbines represent an important chance for the community to benefit from and contribute to the low carbon economy. An aviation consultant has been commissioned to study the case closely and the report is attached. It suggests that there is merit in looking at the circumstances in more detail and I request that the assessment is revisited by the MoD with a view to lifting the objection, as per the attached report.

This project has a great deal of local support, including from the Member of Scottish Parliament for the area, and I have included his letter of support.

Regards,

--