

Dunoon Community Council

 **Meeting of the Dunoon Community Council held in Queen’s Hall, Dunoon on Monday 09th September 2024.**

Present:

Tom Warren (TW) (Convener) Tom McCowan (TMc) (Secretary) Yvonne Love (YL) David Clough (DC)

Gillian Robertson (GR) Paul Graysmark (PG)

Via Teams:

Kerry Kennedy (KK) Lindsey McPhail (LM) Timothy Moss (TM)

ABC Councillors Attending: Dunoon Observer:

 Councillor Ross Moreland (RM) Chris Martin (CM)

 Councillor Daniel Hampsey (DH)

Members of the Public: Police Scotland:

 Chris Martin (CM) (Dunoon Observer) Not in attendance

Guest Speakers:

Iain Robertson (IR) (Statkraft) Ruth Semple (RS) (Statkraft)

Invited Guests:

 Councillor William Sinclair (WS) Frauke Thornton (FT)

 Jinny Baird (JB) Michael Burke (MB) (SCH)

 Mark Borland (Mbo) Janet Holme (JH)

Members of the public:

54 members of the public attended the meeting.

Apologies:

 Bobby Good (BG) (Vice-Convener) Abigail Apps (AA)

 Amanda Graham (AG) (Treasurer) Christine Cable (CC) Councillor Audrey Forrest (AF) Brendan O’Hara MP

 Jenni Minto MSP

1. Tom Warren (The Convener) opened the meeting at 1900hrs and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He also welcomed those attending on-line. The convener told those in attendance that the meeting was being recorded for the purpose of taking the minutes and the recording would be destroyed after the meeting scheduled for Monday 14th October 2024 and the minutes have been approved. He invited anyone not happy with being recorded to leave the room or remain silent. He reminded everyone that questions should be directed to himself and not to talk over people. He also asked members of the public to state their name and where they live when asking questions so the minutes can reflect who asked what questions. The convener introduced everyone at the table for the benefit of the members of the public. He also explained that this would be an unu
2. **Recording of members attending and apologies received.**

As Above:

1. **Declaration of Interest**. All previous declarations of interest still stand. DH declared that he sits on the Argyll and Bute Council planning committee and would not take part in the discussion but would remain in the room.
2. **Minutes of previous meeting were discussed**. There were no corrections or alterations made.

**Proposal. The minutes from the previous meeting are correct and bear a true reflection of the Dunoon Community Council Meeting held on Monday 12th August 2024.**

**Proposed: YL Seconded: PG**

**For (5) Against (0) Abstained (1) Result: Passed.**

Due to technical difficulties those attending online were unable to vote.

1. **Secretary Update**.
	1. The secretary went through the diary for Dunoon Community Council until 01 November 2024. DC Confirmed he will be attending the CTF in October.
2. **Treasurer’s Report** –In the absence of the treasurer, the convener went through the monthly financial report.

**Proposal. The financial report accepted as correct subject to audit.**

**Proposed: YL Seconded: TMc**

**For (6) Against (0) Abstained (0) Result: Passed.**

1. **Presentations –** ***Due to significant electrical interference between the microphones and the recording device, there are some areas of the recording that was in-audible and therefore couldn’t be used in the minutes.***

Ruth Semple (RS) and Iain Robertson (IR) from Statkraft gave a presentation to Dunoon Community Council. IR started by giving a brief introduction on himself and his role within Statkraft. This was followed by RS who likewise gave a brief introduction on herself and her role within Statkraft.

IR thanked Dunoon Community Council for the opportunity to give this presentation, He also thanked Dunoon Community Council for putting together their survey. He said that he was delighted with the response so far to what is a very good survey. IR went on to Say that Statkraft are the largest producers of renewable energy in the country by volume. Statkraft is a Norwegian state-owned company and the majority of the power we generate is through Norwegian Hydro power, and the origins of the company date back to the 1800’s. He said that they are now a multinational company with operations in many countries where they have invested heavily. The company has been operating in the UK for the past 18 years and currently employ around 500 people, with 50 of those being in the Glasgow office. IR then went on to show a slide and explained the current projects and future developments that Statkraft are involved with. Statkraft have been developing a variety of sites which include Wind, Solar, Hydro and in the future Hydrogen. He said that in the survey conducted by Dunoon Community Council, several people had mentioned the use of Hydrogen power, IR said that Statkraft acquired their second hydrogen project in December. He said that they hope to have this project running by 2026. IR started to discuss the Giants Burn Windfarm (GBWF). He said that the scoping document for this project hit the public domain in February this year, since then there have been a number of public consultations. He said that we are now moving into the next generation of wind turbines which are 200m tip to ground, and as such the turbines will be able to capture more wind and be much more efficient than older versions. He said the proposal consists of a maximum of 9 wind turbines on the site with an installed capacity of 50MW. They are currently considering the colocation of the battery storage facility to maximise the potential for the green electricity produced. IR continued to say the exact location of the turbines may change as and when the site surveys come online, and the designs of the turbines are confirmed.

RS said that they have been a number of public consultations. She said that they had been consulting with Dunoon Community Council, Sandbank Community Council and Kilmun Community Council. She said that they would be communicating with Hunters Quay Community Council and South Cowal Community Council due to their close proximity to the project. She said that they would be keeping other Community Council’s such as Helensburgh and Cardross informed. She went on to discuss the community benefit grant and who would be entitled to claim from it. She said that Statkraft will be following the Scottish Governments best practice regarding the community benefit grants and as such the initial conversations will be held with the surrounding Community Councils. She said that they have held a couple of online consultations, these were held between 15th April and 5th of May. She said that there was also a local mail drop where a letter was sent out to over 10000 residencies where people could return a feedback form. There were 440 responses. Statkraft have been responding to the feedback forms, however due to GDPR regulations they will only be able to respond to those who ticked the box stating they were happy to be contacted. She said that the closing date for the feedback was 15th May, however, they would continue to receive and respond to any feedback. This can be done through their website at any time.

RS then talked about the key themes. The fist one covered was the landscape and visual effect. She said that there had been several studies conducted on the visual impact of the turbines and the effects it would have on the local economy. She then talked about the community benefit grants and talked about the host community councils. She said that there is no set format on how the community benefit grants are administered. She said that these conversations would happen much further down the line. She spoke about the community shared ownership, she said there was talk that if the community invested in the windfarm, then the noise levels could be higher, she said this is not the case with this project. She said there were a large number of questions regarding tourism and the impact the windfarm will have on the local economy. The results of the studies have shown that there is no correlation between tourism and jobs with windfarms.. She went on to talk about the socioeconomic impact of the project. She said there are several studies being conducted including an environmental impact study of the project and the effects this could have on the local economy. RS said that she was not sure if the study could include figures just for the Dunoon area, but she will raise the questions.

IR said that several questions had been raised regarding the connection to the grid. He said that the windfarm would be connected to the grid at the power substation in sandbank (Ardnadam Substation). IR said that he wished to clarify last weeks paper where it was reported that the community grant was £374000. He said the figure was £324000 over 50 years. IR then spoke about the transportation of the turbines to site, he said this would present a considerable logistical challenge. He said that there were a number of options being explored at the moment. He said that they were looking at bringing the turbines to site via the road network from Glasgow along the A82/A83/A815 and one of the other options was to use the water ways as they did in Campbeltown. He said no decision has been made yet. He said that there was good access via the current forestry track network, and this could be upgraded if required. IR then spoke about recreational access to the site and said that walkers would be able to get up to the site using the tracks, he said there would be some disruption during the construction phase. He then spoke about Ornithology of the site. He said that there are several studies being undertaken, these have been ongoing for the past three years. The studies are being conducted by Nature Scotland to establish exactly what birds are around the site. He said that they are also looking at other animal habitats. He said that there were a lot of questions regarding the peat on the site, he said that they have completed phase 1 of their studies and identified that there is grade 1 & 2 peat on the site. He said that there are ongoing scientific studies to identify exactly how much of each grade is present and where it is so it can be avoided where possible.

RS then spoke about the public consultation conducted by Statkraft earlier this year. She said that a report has been compiled and distributed amongst the Community Councils and local Argyll and Bute Councillors at the tail end of last week. The report has also been published on Statkraft’s website. She said it was fair to say that there were a broad range of opinions about the proposal. She then went on to discuss the findings of the consultation and survey they commissioned. She said that in terms of the next steps that Statkraft will be taking, they will be continuing with the feasibility studies, ornithology Studies, transportation studies so that they can come back with more detailed information at their next public exhibitions which were originally planned for the end of the year. She said that these have now been pushed back to the beginning of 2025 to allow time for the information to be collated. She said that they have been busy responding to the online feedback that was received from the last public exhibition and that is almost complete. She said that they were unable to respond to every question raised due to people not ticking the box that allowed Statkraft to contact them in the future. She said this would be a breach of GDPR. She said that all other feedback has now been completed. She said that they would be inviting local businesses to register to be preferred suppliers for the site. This concluded the presentation from Statkraft.

The convener laid out the plan for the rest of the evening where Community Councillors and the Argyll and Bute Councillors for the Dunoon Ward would be invited to ask any questions. This would then be extended to our invited guests who are sat on the front row. He will then read out questions that have been submitted to the secretary from members of the public. He said that if time permits, he would then invite questions from the public in the room.

The convener said that there are three community council area’s that are covered, Dunoon, Sandbank and Kilmun. He said that Sandbank does not have a community council and asked how it works with the engagement of statutory bodies. RS answered and said that there are two community groups in Sandbank that they are keen to engage with, one of these is the Sandbank Community Development Trust. She said that at this point discussions regarding the community benefit fund will not be happening until much further into the process. She explained that this was in part due to the turn around with people sitting on community councils and other groups. She said that Statkraft tend not to get involved in how the money from the community grant is spent, this is left to the community groups. The convener said that he was keen to know how Statkraft are engaging with residents of Sandbank seeing as they do not have a community council, yet they are the largest area effected by the proposal. He said that his second question was regarding battery storage. He said that the electric sub station at Ardnadam currently has a planning application submitted by SSEN for battery storage. He said that this predates the proposal and asked if this was connected in any way to their plans or would Statkraft be looking at additional battery storage further down the line? IR responded and said that they were unrelated to the current proposal. *The rest of the response was inaudible*.

The secretary said that he had two questions, the first question he asked why this site? What made Statkraft choose this specific site and not somewhere else? IR said that the process of choosing a site was quite complex. He said that they start by looking at what land is available, they then look and what constraints are in the area that would stop them building such as areas with low wind speed. He said that they also look at Argyll and Bute Council’s development plan. He said this site has good access routes, good wind speed and the area doesn’t have any special designations on it. He said that Statkraft are aware of the site’s history. He also said that there are no sites left in Scotland for a development of this kind. He spoke about the new national planning framework and the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park. The secretary then said that it had been recently reported in a national paper that the UK generates 420gw of electricity and current peak time demands sit at 58gw and therefore we are generating 7 times more electricity than the country needs. IR interrupted and said that the figures for on and offshore wind generated electricity is 38gw and didn’t know where the paper had got their sources from as they are incorrect. IR went on to say that in Scotland there is currently between 8 and 9gw of electricity generated by on shore wind farms. The Scottish Government have set a target to increase this to 20gw by 2030. The secretary then asked his final question on behalf of Mike Breslin who could not make the event. It has been widely reported that any community that can see the wind turbines can then apply to the Community Benefit Grant for funding. He said that the scoping document is incorrect as these turbines can be seen from much further afield than what is published. IR responded and said that if that was the case, could we apply for grants for the turbines that can be seen towards Glasgow. The secretary said that if that was part of the agreement, then yes, we could. IR said that Statkraft would firstly be engaging with the host community councils that RS had discussed earlier. He then criticized the article in last weeks paper where it said the amount paid would equate to a £1 per person. He said that would mean that there would be over 300000 people living in sight of the turbines. The secretary pointed out that the turbines could be seen from Glasgow, so the figure is not that inaccurate.

PG said that earlier RS has said that people’s response to the public consultation was good. He also said that their figures showed that there were more people against the proposal than were for it. He asked if this was a normal response to a public consultation? RS responded and said that it depended on where the projects were located and there are a number of factors that can affect the consultations. PG then asked for confirmation on how much would be paid the community benefit grant fund. IR said that it would be £5000 per 62.4mw of installed electricity. He reiterated that this is the installed figure and not what is generated. The convener asked if this figure is index linked over the duration of the project. RS confirmed that the amount paid will be index linked.

DC said that there are several questions he needed answers to. The first question he asked, how many local businesses have registered for Statkrafts supplier list? RS said that she did not know the figure, but she said that it was not many. She will find out and report back to DC through the secretary. DC asked if the response would include who has registered or just the number of those who had registered. RS said she would only be able to give the figure. She also said that they were a long way off this phase of the project. IR interjected but this was again inaudible. DC said there was some considerable concern locally regarding the visual impact of the turbines. DC said there is a large percentage of the local community who do not trust the images produced by Statkraft and as such this has led to alternative images being produced by a local protest group. He asked if Statkraft can produce more detailed imagery based on five metre contours rather than the 50m contours used with the current images. He also asked if when producing them, could they be taken from more viewpoints, such as the West Bay and other locations. He also asked that this work be completed by an independent company who are recognised for this type of work. RS said that she is sorry that people do not trust Statkraft. She said that the GA was part of their EIA (Economic Impact Assessment) where they employed landscape architects to carry out the landscape imagery. She said the images produced have been tested against industry standards and follow the recognised format and comply with current planning legislation. She said that as the application progresses, a lot of these key points will be considered, and more detailed photo montages will be included. IR said that when they held the public exhibition, the landscaping architects were there with their IPADs and these had detailed images for people to see. He said that they were using modern technology that would allow people to see the images from any viewpoint. He said that they are professional people who have to stand up in public enquiries DC said that Statkraft have to understand that the biggest impact in the area will be felt by those living in Kilmun and Strone who instead of looking out on a hillside will now have to look out at an industrial windfarm and therefore you need to provide them with detailed images from viewpoints around those area’s. DC then went on to ask if Statkraft have been in dialogue with any of the local educational establishments in the area, such as Dunoon Grammar School, the University of the Highlands and Islands or Glasgow University regarding apprenticeships for local teenagers and if so, can they provide any evidence of this. IR responded and said that Statkraft operate in lots of different areas throughout the Highlands and Islands. They are working with UHI and Glasgow University on research and development for their hydro projects. He said that they also work in partnership with the University of Strathclyde. He said that they had been in Dunoon Grammar School today where they have spent several hours with the S1 – S3 pupils. DC then asked if Statkraft can provide their financial detail for the last financial year where it shows their value to the UK economy that would include corporate salaries, income and expenditure, payment of UK taxes and national insurance contributions to the UK Government. He also asked for confirmation that the project would be built and managed by Statkraft UK and not some offshore subsidiary. IR responded and said there was a lot of detail in this question and pointed DC in the direction of an independent report by the school of economics. *The rest of the response is inaudible*. DC asked if the information would be provided. IR said that it was all available in the public domain but would forward it on to DC. DC then asked if they knew how much concrete was required for each turbine. He said that these are extremely large structures and there is local concern regarding the disruption to the environment and local waterways. He asked if Statkraft could comment on how much concrete will be used. IR said that it isn’t known yet for this site, but the general rule is approximately 1000 cubic metres of concrete per turbine. He said that this will all depend on geological conditions and at this point was unable to give an accurate figure. DC then asked for clarification that the payment of £324000 over a period of 50 years equates to a total payment of £16.2m. IR confirmed this and said that this was the calculation using today’s figures, however the payments are index linked so will increase. RS said that these payments were dependant on the installed capacity.

MB asked for clarification, he said that the output of the windfarm was 72.84mw. IR said that it was 72.4mw. MB challenged IR and said that this is not what is quoted on the scoping documents. IR said it shouldn’t say that. Each turbine is an 8.2mw turbine. MB said that on the TEC (Transfer of Energy Capacity) says there is only 44mw allocated to it, is this a mistake. IR said that they have only secured 44mw as that is all the capacity they could get. He said that the way a windfarm works is that it does not work to capacity all the time. MB asked if they have any plans in the future to add to the 9 wind turbines as the space they have, is twice as much as is needed.IR said that there was a restriction on capacity. MB pushed IR for an answer, IR responded and said that the reason they probably would not expand is due to the lack of capacity. He did say that sometimes windfarms are extended by a different developer. MB asked about curtailment and what happens when the turbines are not turning. IR said that at first these will be transition protected assets and will then be a distribution connection. MB interrupted and asked if developers would still be paid for curtailment, and will this effect the community benefit grant? IR said the grants were calculated on the installed capacity and not the output capacity. He said that the grants would be paid regardless of whether the turbines were turning or not. MB asked if Statkraft have any anemometers installed? IR said there were none at present. MB asked if there are no anemometers installed, how can they tell the amount of power that will be generated from the site. He said that the figure used is based on the data gathered. Details of which are in the planning application.

JH said she wanted clarification on a comment made earlier, she said that it was said that we could apply for funding from the wind farms in Bishopton and Ayrshire, how is that possible when they can’t be seen. The convener pointed out that these can in fact be seen from Dunoon.

CM said that there are houses close to the proposed development, have these been taken into consideration during the planning. *The answer was inaudible*. CM said that he wanted to go back to the secretaries point as he felt the question was not answered. He asked, why this site? *Again, the answer was inaudible.*CM then asked why it must be so close to residential properties, 600 metres in some cases. *Again, the response from IR could not be heard.* RS said that when choosing a site around residential properties, they look at the constraints. RS said that she understands the concerns and pointed out that they are still in the very early stages of the project.

FT said that the Holy Loch Nature Reserve is very close to the proposed site which has a large variety of plants, animals and birds. She said that in other area’s windfarm developers have to pay compensation to these reserves for damage to habitats etc. Will this be the case with this development? IR said that as part of the planning process, they have to prove that the biodiversity will not be adversely affected by the development.

WS said that he is a board member of the National Park and the chair of the Planning Committee. He said that it is interesting to hear Statkraft commenting on the national parks. He said that he has been a member since 2022 and can not recall a single occasion where there has been a vote at planning that has been in favour of any wind farm. IR said that when he was talking before, he was talking about the friends of Loch Lomond and Trossachs Park. WS interrupted and said that he clearly stated that it was the National Park that he mentioned earlier. WS said that when mentioning things like this, Statkraft need to be absolutely correct as these are two different organisations. The convener interrupted and said that he acknowledged that IR had said the National Parks but had meant the Friends of Loch Lomond and the Trossachs Park and invited WS to move on with his questions.

The convener then moved onto questions that had been submitted to the secretary via email. He said that names would not be used.

Question 1: Why are we building more windfarms than we actually need? RS said that the Scottish Government has set a target to produce 20mw of electricity through wind by 2030. She said that Scotland is currently producing around half of this target.

Question 2: Given the concerns of the impact of the proposal on the landscape and the local biodiversity, is it possible for Statkraft and the Scottish Government to work together and find an alternative location that meets the national ambitions of economic growth, energy security and the reduction of greenhouse emissions? IR said that the Scottish Government do not get involved in site finding. He said they decide the policy and its down to the developers to find a site that fits into the policy. The convener then asked in relation to the development, who is the landowner? Statkraft said they could not give any details but said the landowner was local to Sandbank.

Question 3: Local residents have written to Statkraft and have not received a response. Why is this and what are Statkraft hiding? This windfarm will have implications on our hometown, but you are not answering any of our questions. RS said that it has that it has taken longer than they would have liked to respond, but they have been overwhelmed with responses to the community engagement events. She said that they are working through all the responses/questions and are replying to all those who ticked the box to give their consent to be contacted. DC asked if RS could quantify the number of responses given to date? RS said that she could not remember of the top of her head the number of responses that had ticked the contact box. She said that the number was around 110.

Question 4: What is the impact on property prices in Dunoon and the Shore villages? RS said that the latest research is quite old and is dated 2006 and said there wasn’t a relationship between windfarms and property prices. She said that she appreciates that no everyone will like this response. She said that this is the latest research that they have and would be willing to provide a link to those reports.

Question 5: The next question centred around the risks of landslips, the area around the proposed site is mainly peat. With the ground being disturbed by the construction of these turbines and vast quantities of soil being removed. What is the risk to nearby properties? IR said that there have been a number of studies completed by experts in their respective fields.

Question 6: The EIA (Economic Impact Assessment) 2.6.1 says the project is planned for 50 years, yet the lifespan of a turbine is around 25 years. Has the shortened lifespan been considered when calculating the carbon footprint of the entire project? IR said that this is an industry that is using the latest technology and is moving forward very fast. He said that the older turbines had a much shorter lifespan, but as time goes by, and technology progresses, the lifespan of the turbines is increasing to well beyond 25 years. The convener said that the question was saying that they have not seen anywhere, where a turbine has lasted 50 years and therefore, why was the proposal for 50 years. IR said the first windfarm that was commissioned was in Hampshire and this was in 1995. He said that in now in the process of being depowered and the turbines being removed. The turbines used today are far larger and more efficient than previous turbines, they require fewer turbines to produce more energy, and the design and construction makes them last a lot longer.

Question 7: Does the amount of carbon calculated take into account the mining of minerals and the destruction of the environment elsewhere in the world? Do they audit the figures provided by the manufacturers to ensure they are correct and if so, who is responsible for the audit? Are the results of the audit publicly available? RS said that carbon calculator does not take these elements into account. The carbon calculator was put together by a range of experts and is held by the Scottish Government. Every windfarm uses this calculator. The carbon calculator gives the timeframes of how long it will take to offset the carbon footprint of each development. She went onto say that as an industry, they are looking to get the carbon calculator to be updates to take these kinds of things into account and provide a more accurate calculation. She said that these changes can take years to implement. She also talked about replacing the blades on the turbines and said that some of the blades are expected to last around 48 years. These blades are some of the most technologically advanced blades available at this time.

Question 8: How much local employment (Less than 10km) has been created in other rural communities with the installation of windfarms? How long did this employment last for? RS answered and said that this has not been previously recorded. She went on to discuss the EIA and the benefits to national and local council economies. IR said that most of the direct employment comes during the construction phase of the development. He said this then boosted local economies due to the contractors spending money locally on accommodation etc.

Question 9: Given Statkrafts experience with hydropower, (as mentioned earlier on and the presentation) why are they not looking at hydropower as an alternative to wind power in the area? IR said that this is more a question of economics. He said that there are the number of hydro schemes around Scotland. These were introduced in the post war years. He said to build hydro power on the scale needed would be a major infrastructure project. He mentioned another project that Statkraft were involved with, He said that this site was capable of producing 500mw of electricity and this employed around 500 people during the 5 years it took to construct. He said that there is not the scale or economic requirement for a development of that kind here. He said that he believes that the Dunoon Project are planning to put hydro power into the Bishops Glen but that would only generate a few hundred kilowatts and no where near what is required.

Question 10: The MOD who are also consultees in this project, use this area for low flying training. How will these turbines affect this? IR said that is true regarding the MOD being consultees in the project and that they are awaiting feedback from them. He said that there are a number of options that are being looked at, this is down to the progression of technology. He said that they were looking at solutions such as directional lighting or radar activated lighting. He said that different projects use different lighting schemes dependant on their locations and requirements. RS said that the plan is to minimise the amount of lighting required whilst improving safety. She said that on some windfarms only the corner turbines have lighting to mark out the perimeter of the site, but they will be guided by the technical experts and current legislation.

Question 11: It has been widely reported that the Norwegian Government has put a ban on any future windfarm developments in their own country. Why is it acceptable for a Norwegian company to be building wind farms in Scotland? RS said that there are currently 12 new windfarms being developed in Norway and will happily forward on the information to the convener.

Question 12: Under what conditions would it be necessary to disturb the class one peat as you have outlined in your scoping document and what would distinguish these conditions from the intention to disturb class two peat as indicated in your scoping document? The convener also asked them to clarify the difference between class one and class two peat for the benefit of the audience. IR said the difference between class on and two peat all depends on the depth and quality of the peat. He said that there is also class three peat on the site too. He said that it would be difficult to tell at this point until the detailed survey have been concluded.

Question 13: Can you explain where the access points will be and what will be needed to construct them. What is the infrastructure required to get onto the hills etc. Will any sensitive habitats be destroyed or damaged whilst constructing these roads and tracks? IR said that at this moment they do not know for sure where the access points will be, he said that anyone that knows the area will know there are numerous points that can be used for access and that there are also a number of forestry road/ tracks that can be used.

DC asked one final question. He asked if any of the staff employed directly by Statkraft had been employed to carry out any of the surveys, for example the Economic Impact Survey or was it contracted out to experts in their fields. RS said that they were all independent contractors and not employees of Statkraft.

The convener said that this concluded the questions from the Community Councillors, A&BC Councillors, our invited guests and those that were submitted via email. He was now going to proceed to the next agenda item. He said that there would be time for a couple of questions from the public at the end of the meeting. The convener asked that members of the public clearly state their name and what community council represents them.

1. **Any Other Business.**
	1. No other business was raised.
2. **Questions from the Public.**
	1. Philip Norris (PN) (HQCC) He said that we are on the doorstep of two National Parks and Dunoon is the maritime gateway to these National Parks. He said that in the past couple of years there have been four windfarms proposed in the local area, none of these have been successful. They have either been refused or withdrawn as they have been deemed inappropriate by the Scottish Government and despite that, you are still carrying on with this proposal. IR said he would deal with the second point first. He said that they had discussed earlier the change in policy. PN interrupted and said that does not change what was wrote. IR said that NPF4 had changed the presumption. PN said that he disagreed with him. He said that you can not change what was written about the area and if it was inappropriate then, its inappropriate now. IR said that if you look at the survey results, you will find that some people find it to be in an appropriate location. He said that is not why they were looking at it again. He said that in terms of the policy constraints things have changed. PN interrupted again and said that it was inappropriate. He said that he isn’t against renewable energy provided that they are the right renewable in the right location. He said that as we are so near a National Park, it is ridiculous that they are considering it. Incidentally, the same thing is happening in the Vale of Leven where Statkraft are proposing the same thing. IR said that they do recognise that there will be differences of opinion, and this is respected. He said that this site complies with the growing constraints.
	2. A Hunters Quay resident (Name not audible) said in relation to the impact on property prices, she said that they have came here tonight and supplied us with Data that is 18 years old. She said that at the recent meeting of Save Cowal’s Hills there was a respected local estate agent present who said that the impact of this proposal was around 10% already. IR asked if they as developers should be sponsoring that kind of research. The member of the public said they most certainly should, and they should be embarrassed to come to this Community Council and present data that is 18 years out of date. IR said that they were not presenting that data as their own. He said that this is the only published data that they are aware of. The lady responded and said that they should be presenting up to date data, IR asked who was going to commission this research. The lady again responded and said that they had no issues commissioning other research and surveys. RS said that if Statkraft commissioned the data, then it wouldn’t be independent. The lady said the estate agent from a couple of weeks ago had recent data. The convener asked if Renewable Scotland had more up to date data than what is provided and asked if they could find out if there was anything available.
	3. Neil Weir (NW) (DCC) wanted to raise two issues, firstly the effect on local tourism and the second is how are they going to bring all the equipment into Sandbank as there are only two routes he can see being used, the first one being up the Clyde to Sandbank and through the village or coming over the A83 Rest and be Thankful, and as everyone knows, this is prone to closure and huge detours. IR said that this has been discussed but there are a number of options open to them. They could come via road down from Erskine or another route to avoid the A83 Rest and be Thankful would be via Campbeltown. NW said that the routes being discussed would bring chaos to the roads when these turbines are being brought to site. RS said that part of the planning application will require a detailed traffic management plan, so this will be looked into with great detail in order to minimise disruption to road users.
	4. An unknown gentleman said we are paying £100’s of millions of pounds to these companies every year while pensioners have lost their winter fuel payments. He went on to say that he had looked at windfarms all over the world. He said that the only people happy to have windfarms anywhere near them were those involved in the development. He said that windfarms adversely affect people’s health and wellbeing, they also affect plant and animal life. He said he has spent the past 60 years as a health care scientist and says that nobody he has spoken to during his research has spoken well of windfarms. He asked if Statkraft can give a written guarantee that peoples health will not suffer from this windfarm? He also raised the issue regarding the quality of the “experts” being used and very much doubts that they all agree with Statkraft. IR responded and said that during the period of 2010 – 2022 when the fuel subsidy tariff was in place, a lot of small communities throughout Scotland took the opportunity to build their own windfarms so that they could benefit from the feeding tariffs. He said that there are many examples of wind and hydro energy having a positive impact on communities. He said the experts that are used, are appropriately qualified in their fields.

RS wished to thank Dunoon Community Council for hosting them this evening and giving up their valuable agenda to allow them to give this presentation and answer some questions raised by the local community.

The Convener thanked Statkraft for coming and giving their presentation. He thanked the invited guests for coming along and their contributions, and finally thanked the members of the public for attending and contributing in a positive manner. He then brought the meeting to an end at 2059hrs. The next meeting will be held on Monday 14th October 2024 in meeting room 1, The Queens Hall, Dunoon at 1900hrs.
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