
From: DES ADATS-Wind Farm SME
Sent: 02 April 2014 14:30
To: DIO ODC-IPS SG2a
Subject: RE: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464 FAO

Hi .

We've been asked this question previously in relation to other situations and the answer is that checking if other turbines in the area are detected is not an accurate methodology.

There maybe many reasons why turbines are or aren't 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 may not be predicted as line of sight.

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

Best Regards

Wind Farm SME

Telephone:

Email:

--- Original Message
From: DIO ODC-IPS SG2a
Sent: 21 March 2014 10:35
To: DES ADATS-Wind Farm SME
Subject: RE: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464 FAO Lucy Hogetts

Hi

Thanks for this.

As discussed, I think I need a bit more info before I go back to the developer on this one.

Having established that we can still see the development, despite the intervening terrain, we now need to address whether there is anything to be gained by looking to establish whether the radar can see other developments in the vicinity which may or may not be blocked by the same buildings.

The three developments in question are Dunbeath, Upper Smaerol and Baulfruch. As far as I can tell the development at Upper Smaerol has been refused, so we can discount this one. From our records, I am not clear which developments are being referred to by Dunbeath and Baulfruch, so I would need to go back to the developer to find out more about where these are and how tall.

Before I do this, however, think there might well be technical reasons why such an exercise would be pointless. Can you let me know your thoughts on this point?

Thanks and regards

Safeguarding Officer - Infrastructure Professional Services
Safeguarding
DIO Operations Development and Coherence
Defence
Infrastructure
Organisation

Telephone: | MOD Telephone: | Fax:

Email:

Website: www.gov.uk/mod-safeguarding

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

From: DES ADATS-Wind Farm SME

Sent: 24 March 2014 13:54

To: DIO ODC-IPS SG2a

Subject: RE: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464 FAC

Hi

The buildings shown in the report will make no difference to the detectability of the turbines. The radar antenna is on a tower 7.7 m agl which is a similar height to the buildings giving it a clear LOS to the proposed turbines.

Best Regards

Wind Farm SME

Telephone:

Email:

- Original Message

From: DIO ODC-IPS SG2a

Sent: 12 March 2014 15:51

To: DES ADATS-Wind Farm SME

Subject: FW: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464 FAC

Hi

Please see the attached report from Aviatika challenging our objection to a three turbine development at Hill of Lychrobbie (DIO 9464).

In one of the instances the report suggests that shielding may be provided by buildings on the Lossiemouth site itself. It goes on to point out that there are existing turbines, which we have assessed as being detectable, which are not shielded by buildings, and suggests that the detectability of the proposed Lychrobbie turbines might be determined with reference to these.

detectability of these other turbines.

I would suggest that the first step in dealing with this query would be to establish whether the buildings in question are likely to provide any shielding. If they are, end of problem.

If we think that the turbines will still be detectable, despite the buildings, we might then want to consider whether we want to look at the actual detectability of Eaolfriish, Ormeath and Upper Emerald which, the report claims are similarly blocked from the radar by the buildings. Could I pass this request to 1 Gp, could you advise on whether there would be anything to be gained from such an exercise?

Paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 seem to be raising operational questions (Why are we objecting to Lychrobbie when we have not recently objected to other detectable turbines in the vicinity?); so I will address these to 7 Gp if and when this becomes necessary.

Thanks and regards

Safeguarding Officer - Infrastructure Professional Services
- Safeguarding

DIO Operations Development and Coherence

Defence

Infrastructure

Organisation

Telephone: | MOD Telephone: | Fax:

Email:

Website: www.gov.uk/mod-safeguarding

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

From: DIO ODC-IPS SG2

Sent: 12 March 2014 11:53

To: DIO ODC-IPS SG2a

Subject: FW: Hill of Lychrobbie wind turbines you: ref: 19464 FAC

Further to our chat earlier today, I would be grateful if you could take the query forward.

I received it whilst on annual leave and I have not noticed this yet. Please could you let me know that you are dealing with it please.

Many thanks

Senior Safeguarding Officer - Infrastructure Professional Services
Safeguarding DIO Operations Development and Coherence

Defence

Infrastructure
Organisation

MOD telephone:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

Website: www.gov.uk/mod-safeguarding

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW EMAIL ADDRESS. EMAILS TO MY OLD EMAIL ADDRESS SHOULD BE FORWARDED AUTOMATICALLY.

Original Message

From:

Sent: 06 March 2014 18:49

To: D10 CMC IPS 802

Subject: Hill of Tychrobbie wind turbines your ref: 19464 FAO

I am writing in regards to a recent objection from the MoD to the proposed Tychrobbie wind turbines, your reference 19464, planning application reference number 13/04194/FUT. 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 Hill of Tychrobbie 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, Rob Gibson, and I have included his letter of support.

Regards,

--

Wind Harvest