**Cromarty & District Community Council – Wind Turbines questionnaire - Comments from residents**

1. I would like more information on the route of the construction lorries.
2. Details of the route of the construction vehicles and turbines.
3. Bright Spark have sent round a flier – we did not receive one so therefore find it difficult to comment on their response to several issues highlighted in the “Davidston Flier” such as reduced community payback and not meeting WHO/ISO Scottish Planning Standards.
4. Undecided. I am reading to make up my mind and would appreciate further info.
5. Get rid of them.
6. If this project goes ahead it will affect the people most in areas A and B with an ugly view – also wildlife especially the flocks of winter geese that come to the area. The measly £30,000 if it goes ahead is a joke. The only winners here would be the power company and farmers whose land it would be built on.
7. Am slightly disturbed that we were led to believe only 3 turbines would be erected. Have we been misled in other areas?
8. The Community Council should decide if it is in favour – if it is then negotiate early and hard to secure a good deal for Cromarty.
9. Great if the local community can financially benefit and use funds for projects that the community chooses/supports/suggests.
10. No consultation. Only one field away from house. Back directly out on farmland and woodland. Noise factor. Here are nesting red kites at farm.
11. Too big and too close.
12. There has been no consultation. These turbines back straight onto our farm and are only a field away from our house – noise factor – there are nesting red kites at farm.
13. The Chair of the CC appearing in three papers supporting the proposal was disgusting.
14. This will damage tourism in this area. What about our TV signal?
15. Will ruin the attraction for tourists to the area and businesses will suffer – area will go down hill.
16. It is far too close to houses.
17. The money paid out to fund these turbines counteracts any benefits.
18. Another misguided grant aided disaster that people try to pass off as green.
19. So sad to see the Black Isle beautiful countryside being destroyed.
20. Far too close to houses. Very concerned about lack of information about health issues.
21. I have heavily invested in a new business in this area which relies on tourism and this is a very harmful development in that respect.
22. Too large – too near.
23. Our Isle is beautiful please keep it that way.
24. The windfarm is too close to the houses!
25. They will spoil the view. The noise may disrupt my children’s sleep not to mention what effects to our health. Will we get compensation if health problems occur?
26. Not only are they too close to the houses they will be very distracting on 2 very bad bends on the road. There have been a number of accidents on these corners over the years without this added distraction.
27. I have lived on the Black Isle all my life. I can’t believe anyone can suggest this. This will spoil our beautiful Black Isle. This is far too near Davidston.
28. I have objections to the proposal because of: noise pollution, damage to local environment, ecology, landscape, heritage, closeness to housing.
29. Too close to houses! Noise pollution, damage to environment, landscape, ecology, local economy, cultural heritage of Cromarty area.
30. Would be a massive blot on the landscape – not benefiting locals.
31. I would like to see some modelling of actual shadow flicker effects on Davidston/Braehead when the sun is low in the SE sky ie in winter.
32. Far too big and too close to houses.
33. Too close to human habitation. Negative visual impact. Negative impact on wildlife.
34. Too close to human habitation. Negative visual impact. Negative impact on wildlife.
35. Please don’t allow these monstrosities on the Black Isle for all the reasons ticked above.
36. I don’t think the countryside of the Black Isle should be unnecessarily industrialised. Similar our house is within the 2km red line – measure 4cm from the nearest blue spot.
37. Reduced tourism will reduce economy. Reduce value of houses. Much too close to houses. Development out of scale for this environment. No pylons on the Black Isle.
38. Too big for open farming land. Wrong place and will lead to other developments and therefore pylons!
39. The proposed reliance on wind power to supply electricity requirements is politically driven and is not supported by informed rational understanding and projections.
40. The size and make up of this development is totally inappropriate in this landscape and is much too close to houses. The argument for wind power as a valuable alternative source of energy has not been demonstrated it is politically and economically driven.
41. This type and size of development is totally unsuitable for the local area and will bring absolutely no value.
42. Proposal is totally out of scale with the environment. The Black Isle grows a lot of trees giving a positive contribution to global warming – we shouldn’t have to put up with the proposed eyesores in addition.
43. Smaller turbines and less of them would be acceptable.
44. Inappropriate developments alienate people against renewable energy. Far too large for this site – will dominate surrounding views – visualisations submitted are grossly misleading. Far too close to nearby settlements (700m!). Developer has refused to meet WHO noise standards.
45. I believe we need to accept the consequences of our lifestyle (ie heavy carbon use) BUT the impact of 50m at 750m from Davidston is in excess of the intrusion of 100m masts at 2km. The masts will be as visible as 130m masts at 2km given effect of perspective. As noise diminishes according to inverse square law. Masts at 1km will be four times as noisy for the same size turbine as those at 2km. The proposals place the nearest mast at 750m from the settlement of Davidston. The Highland Council draft guidelines preclude development with an impact similar to this development – and these standards are important to protect communities. If the mast were relocated further east I would not be opposed, however the Community Council and THC must put the safety and wellbeing of local people ahead of admittedly attractive economic gain to the community.
46. The beauty and tranquillity of the Black Isle is what draws tourists and supports its economy. This project will jeopardise both.
47. This development is nothing more than a short-term economic sticking plaster. The 2km red line is inaccurate – our house falls within the 2km boundary – please measure 4cm from the nearest blue spot.
48. The proposed site is well inside the recommended 2km distance of any turbines from human habitation. Rotors of this size will definitely cause a continuing noise disturbance to all those scores of people living at Davidston and within the 2km radius. While renewable energy in general is desirable as an alternative to fossil fuels and nuclear, this scheme is a commercial venture aimed at securing public subsidy. The scale of these turbines will make them highly visually intrusive, a massive blot on a beautiful landscape, an absolute minus for the natural environment. The scale and noise of the rotors will be potentially distracting to the A832 traffic. The proposal represents a colossal intrusion into the daily life of everyone living at the northern end of the Black Isle, with no tangible economic benefit in jobs or income resulting. It should be rejected.
49. Because climate change is by far the biggest current challenge to humankind, providing more renewable energy generation is critical. Onshore wind farms can contribute to this essential reduction in carbon – but should not be sited in areas of great landscape value or where important wildlife would be damaged. I sympathise with many of the points made by those opposing this scheme and would rather it used more modest sized turbines and was initiated by, or provided more benefits to, the local community. However because of the overriding importance of promoting renewable, I am marginally in favour of the current proposal.
50. Not suitable for development as it would be too intrusive and on bird watching location.
51. Yes – I detest the blight as more and more appear on our lovely landscapes.
52. Too big, too close to our community. No proposals for locals to benefit at all – only negative effects on our economy and unspoilt historic town.
53. Think it will have a negative effect on tourism and local wellbeing.
54. Too big for that site and economic benefit probably more for developer than Scotland.
55. The area around Davidston, Eathie Mains, Glenurquhart is an area used by large numbers of pink footed geese during winter, I regularly count 5000+ birds in this area between October and April.
56. The area around Davidston, Eathie Mains, Glenurquhart is frequented by large numbers of pink footed geese during winter – an important part of our natural world!
57. This scheme is a visible disaster – waste of time and money.
58. Not against windfarms entirely. I just think they should be in larger groups in more remote areas.
59. I am objecting to 12/01650/FUL because of damage to landscape, local economy, local ecology, cultural heritage and noise pollution.
60. What are the economic benefits to the villages of Cromarty and surrounding areas?
61. Size and proximity to nearby residents totally unacceptable!
62. All turbines should be small and blend in any land areas but it would be better for all to be offshore turbines.
63. What are the benefits for the community compared to landowner/Brightspark, regarding government subsidy for 25 years or FIT Feed in Tarriff scheme.
64. Wind generation is utterly unreliable, grossly oversubsidiesd by electricity users and taxpayers and highly intrusive both visually and aurally.
65. Not against wind farms per se but they should be situated in more remote areas with more turbines to be more economic.
66. I think farm land should be kept for farming.
67. The negative impact on tourism and all businesses in the area would be terrible. If this is approved it will make a mockery of keeping Cromarty as traditional as possible. If putting double glazing on a house or not allowing a bamboo fence is not allowed why this!!!
68. Motorists will stop and park to take photos and this will happen on a bend on the road.
69. This should not be allowed to go ahead on the Black Isle.
70. It would seem fair for the folk in zone A to get their power free for the sometimes disturbance!
71. No development companies to make money from our beautiful land.
72. As with any local project, you are more likely to receive negative feedback than positive. I’d therefore like to add a few comments that wouldn’t fit in the Further Comments section of the form. 1) Alternative to Fossil Fuels: I think that renewable energy is necessary and to be encouraged. We need to get off using fossil fuels as they are wasteful and very polluting, and it’s a no-brainer to use renewable sources instead. Wind energy plays an important part in that. 2) Energy Waste Education: People have become too used to being able to flick a switch or turn a key to have access to as much energy as they want. We need to learn that this has costs, both financial and environmental, and generating power locally, and seeing this happen, is educational and will help people connect energy use with energy creation. Local wind turbines are a good way for people to make that connection and understand their responsibilities, and maybe try to reduce their energy usage. 3) Nimbyism: I live in zone C on your map, and therefore some distance from the proposed turbines. However, as I think turbines are good things I would still support them as strongly if they were placed near my house. Frankly I’d like to see every house have its own mini-turbine where that is practical, as well as other renewable such as solar panels and water heaters. 4): There will no doubt be arguments made that the turbines will kill birds. This is possible, but unlikely to result in more than a very few deaths. Those who object on these grounds would do well to consider that cars travelling to and from work in Inverness in a single day probably kill more birds than an entire wind-farm does in a year. And the RSPB estimates that domestic cats kill over 80 million birds a year in the UK, but I hear no calls to ban cats. 5) Noise, Visual Impact and Tourism: Large wind turbines do make some noise. However, modern designs are much better than the 1980s Californian ones which created the bad reputation for noisiness. I have travelled to Skye to see the turbines at Edinbane, and not only are they very beautiful, and a striking addition to the landscape (like giant kinetic sculptures) but are inaudible until you are within 200 metres. I was impressed by these and would be quite happy to live in a house situated nearby. I also do not believe that they have a negative impact on tourism or local house prices, a view confirmed by studies in other areas.
73. Please can community have half on the Sutor?
74. Whilst traffic connected with the site may increase, tourist traffic would be likely to lessen.
75. Cromarty- attractive conservation village – much money spent on Church, Brewery, Courthouse, Stables etc, encouraging people to visit. Now much money spent on this wind farm, Nigg industrial site, and another possible wind farm on North Sutor, encouraging people to stay away – where’s the sense in that.
76. Generally in favour of utilising wind energy, but in the right place. CC need to ensure that “Community Benefit” is appropriate to size of development now.
77. Too big, will have negative impact on tourism. Too close to Davidston and to the road.
78. I feel very sorry for the people who live near the site. I feel that we should not be bribed into agreeing, with £20k (who will decide how that is spent anyway – it should be on only green projects like perhaps?) But I think we should take control of our own green energy as communities and not in greedy businesses. And what about the HORRIBLE pylons that will be needed to export the leccy – they are an eyesore, and not good for health of community near them. I am pro green, but think these may be ultimately damaging. A wee wind farm, community owned, producing leccy for the community – now that would be much better. Good on council for doing this- it’s much needed, hope you do more like this.
79. If the company had sent individual letters of how it would affect the local community, less people would against it. Instead of offering the community bonuses, they should be concentrating on individuals within a set area of the proposed site and offering them free/highly discounted electricity for life.
80. No mention of the wind turbine at Nigg??? I am against all wind turbine energy plans.
81. Apart from being an absolute eyesore, the site is unsuitable due to being on a bend – I believe traffic accidents will occur due to people gawping at them.
82. Turbines too large for location and too close to Davidston houses.
83. The most inefficient method of producing electricity by relying on wind power.
84. It is hard enough to get planning for an extension for a house, how can they even think about that things! They will wreck our countryside, I just can’t believe the planners have let it go this far.
85. Delighted to see these in the community.
86. Great project – all for it!
87. Objecting to 12/01650/FUL because of noise & low frequency pollution due to lose proximity to houses at Davidston, damage to local economy and landscape.
88. I find it strange that this survey has not mentioned Community Benefit funds?
89. Too big and too close to houses.
90. They are too big and too close to houses.
91. Much rather have local wind farms than nuclear waste in Highland (or anywhere!)
92. This is a moneymaking project for the company with no concern for the local area, Windmills are so heavily subsidised, by the time they are paid for they will have to be replaced, with result of no benefit to anyone!
93. No benefit to Cromarty!
94. The public has been conned into thinking “Community benefit” is a gift from the developers. The community benefit is a small portion of the subsidy paid by us to the turbine owners, guaranteed for 20 years. They are giving us back our own money; it is nothing short of bribery.
95. The size and siting are critical for public agreement.
96. Area should be kept natural.
97. We should preserve our area from developers.
98. Exploitation of our environment.
99. I consider Cromarty & the surrounding area a conservation area – why do we have to battle for planning for satellite dishes etc, and then something like this is even considered! They are far too close to Davidston, who would barely benefit from this “Community Benefit” money – it is more like kiss-off money!
100. I am strongly opposed to this wind farm, mainly due to the health issues that the developer is clearly ignoring.
101. We are not against wind/renewable power, but this proposed wind farm is totally over the score – it will dominate the local landscape and spoil the Black Isle, It is in the wrong place. It is not a community scheme, it is a large developer doing it to make large amounts of money.
102. This subsidised business does not benefit the community.
103. I strongly feel that the community council should not be giving any opinion on the planning application as there is an obvious conflict of interest due to the community council receiving benefit on behalf of the community. Any opinion the council would give would be conflicted by the cash received if the planning application is successful.

My “against” re view on the wind farm would change to “For” if the “Community Benefit” is shared equally to every address contained within the map, i.e. cheque/annum & residential only.

1. Positives outweigh negatives & we need renewable energy. They are, however, not in my back yard so affect me less, which probably has a bearing on my view.
2. Although I live in C my water supply originates within 100m of the nearest proposed turbines – so I can be classified as A in your zone survey.

I am concerned that this spring supply of water will be destroyed leaving 4 household without a water supply and living ~1 mile from the nearest mains supply.

I am also very concerned regarding the transport of large prefabricated pieces, and numerous heavily loaded lorries with building materials across the roads of the Black Isle, with the consequent damage to roads, bridges, foundations and buildings close to the roads.

Apart from farming, the main economic value of the Black Isle is from Tourism – building these large turbines beside the main tourist access road, and opposite and close to the cruise boat dock at Invergordon, severely alters the unspoilt atmosphere and attractiveness of the area. Building these turbines jeopardises this tourism income, and all of our ongoing welfare.

These wind turbines are far too big for the location , more suited to remote sites and certainly pose a health risk to the close residents of Davidston junction, Eathie, Muirhead, Upper Eathie and Davidston itself .( given the minimum recommended distance for residences from such turbines is 1.5km )

This development is too close to what are already dangerous bends in the A832 road and the dangerous junction on one of these bends – all shown within zone A on the map.

This area is above an area that is designated for migrating birds and in an area where significant reports of golden eagles and other rare birds have been recorded. As the wildlife in the Highlands is one of our major tourist draws , to site such large wind turbines in the proposed position jeopardises the tourist income as well as the wildlife itself.

The proposed average wind speed in this application is higher than any average wind speed that has been recorded in the Highlands and Islands area.

Given that compared to many other mountain and west coast sites, this site is considerably more sheltered , then the proposed power returns from these turbines are unlikely, to say the least.

Hence the overall return of carbon reduction, given the immense investment of energy and carbon dioxide production in the construction of these turbines and the concrete used in their foundations etc, is unlikely to be recouped in 20 years – if not longer.

I am thoroughly in support of changing our carbon usage and the use of renewable energy. This development, however, will not achieve this aim for many years and the governments (our) money could be much more usefully directed towards other renewable schemes.