

**Gordon Mooney**

---

**From:** MIKE GIRVAN [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 October 2010 21:14  
**To:** Gordon Mooney  
**Subject:** Corrimony windfarm

Hello Gordon

Attached is our response to the SNH submission.

We have been in dialogue with RSPB and have discovered that we are in agreement on the timing of activities through the Corrimony Reserve. The confusion has arisen in the use of the word "site". RSPB used the word site when referring to the RSPB Corrimony Reserve whereas we use the word site to describe the area where the wind turbines are erected. So the time restrictions referred to by RSPB in their submission refer to the Reserve and not the turbine site. We are in agreement with what they have submitted other than the allowance of light vehicles through the reserve before 9am and after 6pm. They have agreed to this.

I will send you a map of the planning area tomorrow night.

Kind regards

Mike Girvan

---

This email has been scanned by Netintelligence  
<http://www.netintelligence.com/email>

---

12/10/2010

Corrimony Energy Ltd  
13 East Road  
Kirkwall  
Orkney  
KW15 1HZ

Mr Gordon Mooney  
Planning and Development Services  
Highland Council  
Glenurquhart Road  
Inverness  
IV3 5NX

4<sup>th</sup> October 2010

Dear Mr Mooney,

In response to the SNH submission we would make the following points:

Designated sites - Only the sites flagged up in the SNH scoping response were considered - in the main report we were careful to state this and to say that none of *them* were within 10km. Unfortunately we were not quite so careful in the summary, which is where they picked up their quote from...

Mammals – we are happy to follow SNH's advice here and, at this stage, commit to a pre-construction Otter survey and to the various mitigation/contingency proposals as suggested:

- that work would be stopped if an Otter holt was found within 250m or a Wildcat den within 50m;
- that ramps will be placed in all excavations overnight;
- that all contractors will be advised accordingly;
- that a method statement will be produced for working near trees suitable for bats.

These essentially complement what has already been proposed for Water Voles.

Birds - again, as SNH advise, we would be happy to commit to a pre-construction survey for Annex 1 birds (as already done for the the various Schedule 1 species along the lower access track) and to agree to draw up contingency plans for Annex 1/Schedule 1 species found nesting in the vicinity of the development.

Habitats - it is in this regard that all of the requests for additional information arise, and we summarise these below:

1. method of cable-laying through different habitats, in order to be able to assess the extent of disturbance, and assessment of the implications for following the path (on species, habitats and recreation);
2. the temporary working area to be identified and impacts assessed;
3. clarification of the role of the woodland creation, and specific assessment (which would require survey) and mitigation measures, *if it is to be regarded as an integral part of the development*;
4. consideration (and presumably assessment) of the potential hydrological isolation of the spur, from above and below, due to the track;
5. preparation of a Habitat Management Plan.

Regarding 1, this means that SNH have not accepted the impact assessment as it stands regarding the cable route, but does it need to be a major concern. The main issue regarding the cable under the path is probably runoff (the path is steep) and/or recreation (very limited there, we would think).

2 speaks for itself - our assessment was based on the assumption that it would all fall on wet heath, but this might not turn out to be the case.

Point 3 – We are quite happy to accept that the 50ha of Native Woodland is not a part of the development but is something we will commit to doing for the overall benefit of the biodiversity of the area.

Point 4 is a very valid one, which we had not thought about. However, it can be seen from the contours that there is very limited flow from above down onto the spur, most of which would disappear to either side before it reached the track. The only vegetation likely to be affected due to this is the flushed wet heath immediately below the southern turbine - construction methods would be important here in allowing as natural a flow of water through/under the track as possible. Regarding flow down from the spur, there is only one small area where deep peat vegetation runs down from the spur and is crossed by the track (at the southeast, where a tongue of the M17b bog joins up with a strip of M17a bog). Presumably provision of enough suitable through-drainage here would minimise any effect. We would have thought that careful culverting of any runnels crossed (there aren't many) and similar through-drainage along the length of the track loop should suffice elsewhere.

Point 5 – It would be possible to prepare a Habitat Management Plan.

Further points that are brought up :-

The 2 upper borrow pits are not re-opened once the project is completed. The lower of these 2 pits is close to where otter activity has been noted. We will not use this as a borrow pit and will open one up closer to the turbine site well away from the gorge where the otter activity has been noted. This will remove the worry about disturbance to otters.

Management of Access and Recreation – This will be dealt with in the Construction Method Statement.

We will organize a peat survey and will microsite the route and turbine sites to follow the shallowest areas of peat.

Kind regards

Mike Girvan