

Strategic Landscape Capacity Assessment for Wind Energy in Angus





Final Report

Ironside Farrar

111 McDonald Road Edinburgh EH7 4NW

> March 2014 7933

СО	NTENTS	Page No	3.2.3 Further Analysis of Landscape Character
EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY		3.3 Landscape Designations
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1	3.3.1 National Landscape Designations
1.1	Background	1	3.3.2 Local Landscape Designations
1.2	Consultancy Appointment	1	3.3.3 Other Landscape Designations
1.3	National and Local Policy	2	3.4 Other Designations
1.4	Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impacts	2	3.4.1 Historic and Cultural Designations
2.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACT AND CAPACITY METHODOLOGY	3	3.4.2 Nature Conservation Designations
2.1	Purpose of Methodology	3	3.5 Wildness Mapping
2.2	Study Stages	3	3.6 Other Relevant Matters
2.3	Scope of Assessment	4	4.0 VISUAL BASELINE
2	.3.1 Area Covered	4	4.1 Visual Receptors
2	.3.2 Wind Energy Development Types	4	4.2 Visibility Analysis
2	.3.2 Use of Geographical Information Systems	4	4.2.1 Settlements
2.4	Landscape and Visual Baseline	4	4.2.2 Routes
2.5	Method for Determining Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity	4	4.2.3 Viewpoints
2.6	Defining Landscape Change and Cumulative Capacity	5	4.2.4 Analysis of Visibility
2	.6.1 Cumulative Change	5	5.0 WIND TURBINES IN THE STUDY AREA
2	.6.2 Determining Acceptable Levels of Change	6	5.1 Size of Wind Turbines and Windfarms
2.7	Presentation of Assessment and Findings	6	5.2 Wind Turbine Distribution in the Study Area
2.8	Detailed Guidance	6	5.2.1 Operating and Consented Wind Turbines within Angus
2.9	Potential Opportunities and Constraints	7	5.2.2 Proposed Wind Turbines in Angus
3.0	LANDSCAPE BASELINE	9	5.2.3 Proposals That Have Been Refused
3.1	Study Area	9	5.2.4 Consented Wind Turbines in 30km buffer outside Angu
3.2	Baseline Landscape Character Assessment	9	5.2.5 Proposed Wind Turbines in 30km buffer outside Angus
3	.2.1 Landscape Context	9	5.3 Landscape Character of Turbine Locations
3	.2.2 Landscape Character	9	

	16
	17
	17
	17
	17
	17
	20
	20
	20
	20
	23
	23
	23
	23
	23
	24
	24
	27
	27
	28
	28
	28
	28
IS	31
	31

6.0	ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE CAPACITY AND CUMULATIVE CHANGE	33	TABL	ES
6.1	Assessment Purpose and Process	33	2.1	Description of Levels of Cumulative Wind Turbine I
6.2	Guidance	22	3.1	Landscape Character Areas in Angus
0.2	Guidance	22	5.1	Wind Turbine Size Categories
6.2	.1 Turbine Size	34	5.2	Wind Energy Development Size Categories
6.2	.2 Turbine Group Size	34	6.1a	Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effect Energy Development: Highland Glens (TAY 1)
6.2	.3 Separation between Turbine Groups	34	6.1b	Highland Summits and Plateaux (TAY 2)
6.2	.4 Other Factors which Influence Guidance	34	6.1c	Highland Foothills (TAY 5)
6.3	Overall Assessment of Capacity and Cumulative Development	76	6.1d	Igneous Hills (TAY 8)
6.3	.1 Summary of Landscape Character, Sensitivity and Underlying Capacity	76	6.1e	Broad Valley Lowland (TAY 10)
6.3	.2 Existing and Consented Wind Turbines in May 2013	82	6.1f	Low Moorland Hills (TAY 12)
6.3	.3 Proposed Wind Turbines in May 2013	82	6.1g	Dipslope Farmland (TAY 13)
6 1	Landscane Canacity and Cumulative Landscane Effects	00	6.1h	Coast (TAY 14)
0.4		82	6.1i	Lowland Loch Basin (TAY 15)
6.4	.1 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Highlands	82	6.2	Areas Where Cumulative Impact Limits Further Dev
6.4	.2 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Lowland and Hills	83		
6.4	.3 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Coast	83		
6.5	Residual Capacity for Further Development	86		
6.5	.1 Areas with Highest Underlying Capacity	86		
6.5	.2 Areas with Limited Underlying Capacity	86		
6.5	.3 Areas with No Underlying Capacity	86		
6.5	.4 Areas Where Cumulative Impact Limits Further Development	86		
6.5	.5 Development within Built up Areas	87		
6.6	Guidance for Small Turbines	87		
GLOSS	SARY	91		

e Development	5
	10
	27
	27
fects and Guidance for Future Wind	
	39
	31
	43
	49
	53
	59
	64
	71
	75
Development	89

FIGUI	RES	Page No
1.1	Extract from Current Scottish Government Guidance on Preparing Spatial Frameworks	1
2.1	Cumulative Impact and Landscape Capacity Methodology Flowchart	3
2.2	Illustrative Sketches of Wind Turbine Development (from SNH)	5
3.1	Study Area	11
3.2	Topography	12
3.3	Geographic Areas	13
3.4a	Landscape Character Types and Areas in Angus	14
3.4b	Landscape Character Types and Areas in Study Area	15
3.5	Landscape Designations and Landscape Character Areas	18
3.6	Natural & Cultural Designations	19
3.7	Scottish Wildness and Core Areas of Wild Land	21
3.8	Locations of Landscape Interest	22
4.1a	Transport Routes, Settlements and Viewpoints in Angus	25
4.1b	Transport Routes, Settlements and Viewpoints in Study Area	26
4.2	(a-f) Visibility from Settlements Ap	pendix 4
4.3	(a-f) Visibility from Routes Ap	pendix 4
4.4	(a-f) Visibility from Viewpoints Ap	pendix 4
5.1	Consented Turbines in Angus	28
5.2	Application Turbines in Angus	28
5.3a	Existing, Consented & Proposed Wind Turbines in Angus	29
5.3b	Existing, Consented & Proposed Wind Turbines in Study Area	30
5.4	ConsentedTurbine Location and Heights in Relation to Landscape Character	er 31
5.5	Application Turbine Location and Heights in Relation to Landscape Charac	ter 32
6.1a	Underlying Landscape Capacity (15-<30m turbines)	77
6.1b	Underlying Landscape Capacity (30-<50m turbines)	78
6.1c	Underlying Landscape Capacity (50-<80m turbines)	79
6.1d	Underlying Landscape Capacity (90-<125m turbines)	80
6.1e	Underlying Landscape Capacity (125m+ turbines)	81
6.2	Current Development: Wind Energy Landscape Type	84
6.3	Proposed Limits to Development: Wind Energy Landscape Type	85
6.4	Wind Turbine Development Opportunities and Constraints	88

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Current Policy and Guidance for Onshore Wind Energy
- Appendix 2: Cumulative Impact and Landscape Capacity Assessment Methodologies
- Appendix 3: Changes and Subdivisions to Angus Landscape Character Areas
- Appendix 4: Visibility Analysis for Wind Turbines in Angus
- Appendix 5: Factors Affecting the Landscape and Visual Impacts of Wind Turbines
- Appendix 6: Wind Turbines in Angus
- Appendix 7: Assessment of Landscape Sensitivity and Value for Landscape Character Types in Angus

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

This study has considered the capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate onshore wind energy development. The landscape capacity assessment is based on an assessment of landscape sensitivity and value of the different landscape character types and areas in Angus together with the evolving wind energy development scenario in Angus and a surrounding 30km buffer area. This has involved a staged process:

- Firstly assessing the underlying capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate wind turbine development;
- Secondly, assessing the degree of cumulative change resulting from operating and consented wind turbines in the study area and in Angus;
- Thirdly, assessing the extent to which cumulative consented development has reached the limit of the landscape's capacity to acceptably accommodate wind energy developments.
- Finally, assessing residual capacity and the level of further development that could acceptably be accommodated within areas of Angus.

The study is based on the premise that, given current renewable energy targets, it is accepted there will be a degree of landscape change and effects on visual amenity resulting from wind energy development that will require careful management. In applying the assessment process, the study has addressed a number of concepts and issues that affect the perceived significance and acceptability of cumulative changes caused by multiple wind energy developments in the landscape.

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The main report is divided into 6 chapters describing the assessment process, findings and conclusions. There are a number of appendices containing detailed information relevant to the assessment.

Chapter 1 Introduction describes the background to the project

Chapter 2 Method describes the basis of the assessment of cumulative effects and landscape capacity. It describes the key criteria used in assessing landscape sensitivity and value and in determining the degree of cumulative impacts on the landscape. The method is a staged, transparent process, balanced between objective assessment and informed professional judgement. Chapter 2 navigates the reader through the rest of the assessment process, outlining the purpose of each chapter and the relevant tables and figures

Chapter 3 Landscape Baseline describes the physiography, landscape character and landscape designations of the study area. It focuses on Angus, with a 30km buffer zone that includes significant parts of Perth & Kinross; Aberdeenshire and the Cairngorms National Park.

Chapter 4 Visual Baseline describes the visual sensitivity assessment. This involves a computer generated intervisibility assessment across the study area, focussing on visibility of the Angus landscape to settlements, transport routes and key viewpoints.

Chapter 5 Wind Turbines in the Study Area describes the distribution of consented and proposed wind energy developments, from single turbines to windfarms, across Angus and the wider study area.

Chapter 6 Assessment is a detailed capacity and cumulative impact assessment. It assesses the underlying capacity of the landscape for wind energy development; the extent to which current development has utilised the underlying capacity and the remaining or residual capacity for wind energy development. The assessment process for each of the landscape character types in Angus is detailed in **Table 6.1**. Chapter 6 also gives detailed guidance on the appropriate size and siting of wind turbines and windfarms in the landscape character areas. The analysis of capacity and cumulative development across Angus is shown spatially on maps in **Figures 6.1 to 6.3**.

The study concludes with a summary map, **Figure 6.4**, indicating areas with underlying capacity for wind energy development and overlapping areas in which cumulative impact limits development (i.e. where consented development limits the potential for future development due to occupying the underlying capacity). The summary figure is also shown as **Figure A** following this executive summary.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Angus Landscape

The landscape of Angus is characterised by a transition from coastal landscapes in the southeast progressing northwest to agricultural lowland and lowland hills, thence to highland landscapes in the northwest that grade into the Cairngorms National Park. The bulk of the population lives in small towns and villages in the lowland and coastal areas, through which the main transport routes pass.

The transition between highland and lowland is particularly dramatically presented in Angus, in the form of the Highland Boundary Fault separating the broad valley of Strathmore from the Grampian Mountains. This is a key factor in affecting the capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate wind turbines.

Assessment of Underlying Capacity

The assessment has determined that there are no areas of Angus with an underlying capacity for extensive windfarms with large scale turbines. In contrast with much of Scotland there is no capacity for wind turbines in the highest upland areas, due to the high visual sensitivity and landscape value of these areas within Angus. Larger scale lowland farming, forestry and hill areas have the greatest underlying capacity for wind turbine development. Some smaller scale lowland areas, highland foothills and the coast have more limited capacity.

Some areas such as the Sidlaw Hills and parts of the Low Moorland Hills, Strathmore and the Dipslope Farmland have capacity for small groups of larger turbines up to 80m

height. However, most areas have more limited capacity, for occasional groupings of turbines up to 50m height. There are limits on cumulative development in all areas if significantly adverse levels of landscape change are to be avoided

Consented Wind Energy Developments at May 2013

Operational and consented wind turbines in Angus comprise a total of 116 turbines over 15m high. The vast majority are turbines less than 50m tall, grouped singly or in small clusters in lowland and highland foothill areas. One windfarm of eight 81m turbines is located at Ark Hill in the Sidlaw Hills. The main concentrations of wind turbines are in the southwest and northeast of the lowland areas. There are very few turbines in the mountains and glens of northern Angus or in the coastal areas.

In the 30km area surrounding Angus; including Perth & Kinross, Aberdeenshire, Dundee City and Fife, there are over 400 consented turbines and several significantly sized windfarms, including one close to Angus at Drumderg in Perthshire. There are no turbines over 15m in the Cairngorms National Park to the north. There are no consented offshore windfarms.

Past Planning Decisions

A number of applications for windfarms in Angus have been refused or dismissed at appeal. All the applications have been for large turbines, between 84m and 132m in height and two to eleven turbines located in highland, lowland and coastal landscapes. The reasons for refusal vary, but all the decisions include landscape and visual impacts relating to the large size of turbines as a factor.

Wind Energy Proposals at May 2013

Current applications for a total of 51 wind turbines include two windfarms in the eastern Sidlaw Hills and one s36 application for 17 135m turbines at Nathro in the Highland Summits and Plateaux. In the 30km area beyond Angus there are applications for 112 turbines. This includes a windfarm proposal in Perthshire directly adjacent to highland Angus and several wind turbines in Aberdeenshire, northeast of Strathmore. There are three offshore proposals south and east of Angus at scoping stage: Inchcape at closest 15km; Neart na Goaithe at 30km and Firth of Forth & Tay Alpha and Bravo arrays at 27km and 38km.

CAPACITY FOR FURTHER WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

This assessment has demonstrated that the landscape of Angus has the underlying capacity to accommodate wind energy development of an appropriate type and extent. Appropriate development relates to the varied characteristics of the landscape; the visual sensitivities of the population spread across lowland Angus and the higher value or sensitive context of some areas of landscape. The particular characteristics of Angus means there is no scope for the larger scale of windfarm development seen elsewhere in Scotland.

The main underlying capacity for development lies within some of the larger scale more extensive lowland areas which can accommodate larger turbines sizes, but not the largest sizes and not in large groupings. Other areas have a more limited underlying capacity, which would not be appropriate for larger turbines sizes, and some areas have very limited or no capacity for wind energy development.

At current levels of development there is residual capacity in Angus for further appropriate wind energy development in most areas that have underlying capacity. Future development in each landscape type or area should follow the guidance given in Chapter 6. The aim of the guidance is to ensure that the acceptable capacity for development in terms of turbine sizes, group sizes and spacing between turbines and groups is not exceeded, and that other issues guiding or limiting development are taken into account.

The main opportunities and limitations on capacity are discussed below and the areas concerned illustrated in schematic form in **Figure A** at the end of this summary.

Areas with Highest Underlying Capacity

Figure A identifies in dark green four areas which have the highest underlying capacity in Angus for wind energy development:

- Careston Broad Valley Lowland to the north west of Brechin. 1)
- Muir of Pert Broad Valley Lowland to the east of Brechin. 2)
- Montreathmont Forest and farmland to the south of Brechin. 3)
- 4) The Sidlaw Hills with contiguous areas of Dipslope Farmland to the south and east and Low Moorland Hills south of Forfar.

These areas have the capacity to accommodate larger sizes of turbine and/or greater numbers and concentrations relative to other areas of landscape in Angus. This is based on a combination of one or more factors including suitable landscape character, lower visual sensitivity or lower value. Not all of these factors are present in every area identified and the analysis and guidance in Chapter 6 should be followed.

Wind turbines are already located in some of these areas, utilising some of the underlying capacity and therefore reducing residual capacity. The limitations resulting from this are discussed below.

Areas with Limited Underlying Capacity

Most of the remaining lowland and coastal areas of Angus have some underlying capacity for wind energy development but are generally not suited to larger turbines, large groupings or extensive concentrations of wind turbine development. The areas are shown in light green in figure A. Capacity varies from the ability to accommodate only very occasional small/medium wind turbines in some of the Upper Highland Glens to more frequent medium turbines across much of the Highland Foothills, Broad Valley Lowlands and Dipslope Farmland. Some areas of the Dipslope Farmland may be able to accommodate occasional single medium/large turbines subject to detailed assessment of local characteristics.

Currently there are limited numbers of existing, consented and proposed smaller scale developments (mainly single small/medium and medium size turbines). Guidance in Chapter 6 is intended to steer future development in these areas to an acceptable level.

Areas with No Underlying Capacity

Significant areas of Angus have no underlying capacity for wind turbine development. These are left uncoloured in Figure A:

- 1) All of the Highland Summits and Plateaux LCAs, due to their importance to the Angus landscape, connectivity with the Cairngorms National Park, high visual prominence, high relative wildness and recreational value;
- 2) Some upper parts of Highland Glens and Highland Foothills which extend into the Lochanagar and Mount Keen draft Core Area of Wild Land and are contiguous with the Highland Summits and Plateaux.
- 3) Some prominent summits, viewpoints and hillforts in the Sidlaw Hills, Highland Foothills and Low Moorland Hills.

It is recommended that these landscape types and areas remain undeveloped with turbines to protect their character, avoid widespread visibility, protect key viewpoints and features and particularly to protect the key feature of the Highland Boundary Fault and its backdrop of the Grampian Mountains.

When assessing the acceptability of larger turbine proposals in neighbouring landscape character areas, proximity to the sensitive areas described above should be taken into account.

Areas Where Cumulative Impact Limits Further Development

As described above, a number of landscape types and areas in Angus have an underlying capacity to accommodate wind energy development. However, existing and consented development in or nearby some of these areas means that further significant development may exceed the acceptable cumulative capacity of the landscape. The five areas where current cumulative impact limits capacity for further development are shown as hatched areas in Figure A.

- 1) Alyth Foothills / Glen Clova
- 2) Menmuir / Hill of Ogil
- 3) Brechin and Muir of Pert
- 4) Letham to Firth Muir of Boysack
- 5) Central Sidlaws and Tealing

They are defined by several factors including: The developed areas and the extent of their impacts on the surrounding landscape; underlying landscape capacity within the surrounding landscape and the extent of area within which development should be limited to avoid extending cumulative landscape and visual impacts.

The boundaries shown in Figure A are indicative. They are described in more detail for each area in Chapter 6 Table 6.2, together with the main objectives for limiting further development. In the case of specific development proposals there should be an assessment relating to these criteria.



IronsideFarrar

Executive Summary

			Km
0	2.5	5	10

INTRODUCTION 1.0

1.1 Background

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP 2010) states that local authorities should make positive provision for the development of windfarms in locations where the technology can operate efficiently and environmental and cumulative impacts can be satisfactorily addressed. The Scottish Government has strongly stated its support for renewable energy developments and encouraged Planning Authorities to ensure appropriate planning guidance is in place.

Angus Council's wind energy guidance is being reviewed as part of the Local Development Plan Process and the Scottish Government's instruction to incorporate a locational framework. It will also reflect the recent increase in proposals for wind energy projects, particularly single or small groupings of turbines as a result of the introduction of the Feed in Tariff. Given this factor and existing levels of development in upland areas, Scottish Government web based guidance (Onshore Wind Turbines, July 2013) states:

'Planning authorities are more frequently having to consider turbines within lowerlying more populated areas, where design elements and cumulative impacts need to be managed'.

Scottish Government policy in SPP and web based guidance clearly indicates that cumulative development within areas may lead to eventual limits on further development and that this should be considered as a significant constraint. Areas where cumulative development has reached a threshold of acceptability are a Stage 1 constraint in a Spatial Framework, requiring significant protection from further development:

Figure 1.1: Extract from Current Scottish Government Guidance on Preparing **Spatial Frameworks**

Stage 1 – Identify areas requiring significant protection

- Sites designated for their national or international landscape or natural heritage value
- Green belt •
- Where the cumulative impact of existing and consented wind farms limit further development

Stage 2 – Identify areas with potential constraints

- · Consider matters relating to the historic environment; regional and local landscape and natural heritage designations; tourism and recreational interests; communities; aviation and defence interests; and broadcasting installations
- Where proposals will be considered on their individual merits against identified criteria

Stage 3 – Identify areas of search

- Where there are no significant constraints on development
- Where appropriate proposals are likely to be supported subject to detailed consideration against identified criteria

Angus's existing guidance (Renewable Energy Implementation Guide, 2012) gives guidance for applicants for wind turbine development. It includes an indication of varying landscape capacity based on the findings of a study carried out by Ironside Farrar in 2008. (Angus Windfarms Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impacts Study). That study determined the capacity for windfarm development across Angus, based on analysis of landscape character, quality and value and an assessment of significance of landscape change resulting from different potential scales of development.

The Ironside Farrar study found that Angus has little capacity for larger scales of wind energy development due the sensitive location of its uplands; spread of its population in lowland and coastal areas, modest scale and settled character of the landscape. Highland and coastal areas were not deemed suitable for windfarm development due to their landscape guality and visual sensitivity. A number of recent planning appeal dismissals for windfarms in or near these areas have underlined this finding.

Consultancy Appointment 1.2

Ironside Farrar, together with Envision 3D, has been appointed by SNH, Angus and Aberdeenshire Councils to undertake a strategic landscape capacity assessment with respect to wind energy development across the two neighbouring local authority areas. The key purpose of this study is to provide detailed guidance on the capacity of the landscape across both areas to accommodate wind turbine development and to inform the review of the Development Plans' spatial frameworks and supplementary guidance.

The key study objectives are:

- To identify the sensitivity of the landscape to different types and scales of wind energy development;
- To identify viewpoints, routes and features, and the views from these, which are particularly sensitive to wind energy development;
- To advise on the capacity and potential for the landscape to accommodate different types or scales of wind energy development;
- Identify areas where cumulative impact is potentially at, or near, capacity, and provide an indication of when the capacity threshold would be reached for these areas;
- Identify areas, in landscape terms, unsuitable for wind energy developments;
- Provide clear siting and design guidance for landscape character areas that are identified as having some capacity for specific scales of development.

This study specifically assesses landscape sensitivity, value and capacity together with the impact of cumulative wind energy development in order to determine where significant protection from further development may be required. This study addresses these requirements through a staged assessment process detailed in sections 2.0 to 6.0.

1.3 National and Local Policy

National and local planning policies in Scotland are well disposed towards the development of onshore wind energy. However it is accepted that there are limitations imposed by environmental sensitivities and the capacity of areas to accept cumulative development. Therefore the acceptability of multiple windfarms and turbines and the cumulative landscape and visual impacts of development has to be considered in the light of national and development plan policy. **Appendix 1** reviews current national policy and guidance and Angus development plan policy and guidance.

Emerging Policy

Emerging Scottish Planning Policy (*SPP Consultation Draft 2013*) continues to strongly support onshore wind energy. It continues to support the undertaking of Spatial Frameworks and capacity studies. Key changes in emphasis are the recommendation for inclusion of all scales of wind energy development in spatial frameworks and the provision of a more detailed hierarchy and explanation of constraints to and opportunities for wind energy development.

1.4 Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impacts

SPP and Scottish Government guidance identifies cumulative impacts and landscape capacity as being critical to the identification of broad areas of search. This study has thus been prepared to inform the Council on the issues of landscape capacity and cumulative impact. Accordingly it comprises three main themes:

- A strategic landscape capacity study, investigating the underlying capacity of landscapes within Angus to accommodate wind energy development;
- A cumulative assessment examining the level of cumulative development of operating, consented and proposed wind turbines and wind farms in Angus.
- Guidance on the levels and types of wind turbine development throughout Angus that would be acceptable in landscape terms, taking into account the first two considerations.

It is emphasised that this is a strategic level landscape and visual study, providing a context for consideration of capacity for, and the cumulative effects of, existing and potential future wind turbine developments in Angus. No site specific conclusions should be drawn from it in relation to current, proposed or future wind turbines and windfarms.

As a strategic landscape and visual study this does not address specific localised impacts such as effects on individual residential receptors or other sensitive receptors. All wind energy proposals should be considered on their own unique locational and design characteristics as well as their strategic context. All proposals should be subject to landscape, visual and cumulative impact assessment including (if required) a full environmental assessment.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT AND CAPACITY METHODOLOGY 2.0

2.1 Purpose of Methodology

The purpose of the following assessment is to determine the capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate wind energy development and to determine the levels of cumulative development that would be acceptable across Angus. The assessment takes into account existing cumulative development within and around Angus and is based on the premise that current renewable energy policies will lead to a future level of landscape change within Angus that requires careful management.

The key objectives of the study are outlined in section 1.2 above. The methodology serves these objectives through a clear assessment of sensitivity and capacity of landscapes across Angus, together with an assessment of the cumulative effects of current consented wind energy development and the potential for accommodating further development in the future.

Nevertheless, it is recognised in published guidance that the assessment of landscape capacity and cumulative impacts is not a straightforward exercise. The background considerations and detailed methodology for this process are detailed in Appendix 2 of this report. The following is a summary of the methodology, key considerations and guide to the presentation of findings and recommendations.

2.2 Study Stages

The assessment is a staged process comprising:

- 1) Define study area and characterise landscape and visual baseline and scope of wind energy types to be included in the strategic study.
- 2) Assess landscape sensitivity based on landscape character types (LCTs) and landscape character areas (LCAs) in Angus. This assessment considers landscape character sensitivity, visual sensitivity and landscape value.
- 3) Assess the capacity of the Angus landscape to acceptably accommodate wind energy development of different types and scales based on the assessment of sensitivity and value of the LCAs and LCTs. This is an assessment of the underlying landscape without taking the effects of existing wind turbines into account.
- 4) Record the current type and extent of consented wind energy development in Angus and the surrounding local authorities.
- 5) Determine the extent to which cumulative consented development has occupied the underlying capacity of the landscape to accommodate wind energy developments.
- 6) Further to the assessment of landscape capacity and cumulative development, identify areas in which:
 - there is no underlying landscape capacity for wind energy development;

- consented cumulative development limits landscape capacity for further wind energy development.
- there is remaining landscape capacity for wind energy development.

The assessment process is summarised as a flow chart in Figure 2.1 below.

Figure 2.1. Cumulative Impact and Landscape Capacity Methodology Flowchart



The assessment and spatial strategy is followed by guidance on appropriate types and levels of wind energy development for the areas in which there is remaining capacity.

2.3 Scope of Assessment

2.3.1 Area Covered

The study focuses primarily on the local authority area of Angus. However, an area 30km beyond the boundary is considered in terms of the potential extended visual influence of wind energy developments on neighbouring landscape areas.

2.3.2 Wind Energy Development Types

The study considers all sizes of turbines and developments operating, consented or proposed, as well as potential future scenarios where appropriate. This extends the assessment in the Angus Windfarms Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impacts Study (Ironside Farrar 2008) which concentrated on commercial scale developments and turbines.

Turbines less than 15m to blade tip are not considered to have the same qualities of scale, prominence and widespread visibility that lead to the wider cumulative impacts that characterise larger turbines with a blade tip higher than 15m. Capacity assessment and guidance for turbines less than 15m to blade tip is limited to localised generic siting and design considerations.

2.3.2 Use of Geographical Information Systems

The study has used the GIS application; Arcview 10.2. It is emphasised that this application is used only as a tool to manage, map and illustrate spatial data. The assessment process does not use GIS and is described in the following sections.

2.4 Landscape and Visual Baseline

The landscape baseline assessment includes a description and classification of landscape character and record of designations and features that contribute to landscape value. The landscape character assessment is based on landscape character types (LCTs) and landscape character areas (LCAs) in Angus identified and described in the Tayside Landscape Character Assessment (SNH, 1999) - see section 3.2 and Table 3.1 below. Further landscape character types in neighbouring areas, primarily Aberdeenshire, are also identified. These are detailed in the above publication and others in the national series. Some refinements, for the purposes of this study, are made based on site observations. These include modifications to boundaries between LCAs and identification of sub-types or sub-areas based on subtle variations in character within LCAs (see 3.2.3).

Landscape value is determined partly through landscape designations. There are no local designations in Angus and the national designations are outside the study area, although they are adjacent to it. Related designations that can contribute to landscape value and character are recorded. These include natural and cultural heritage designations,

recreational/ visitor facilities and core paths. Other factors affecting perceptions of value include wildness and remoteness which have recently been assessed across Scotland.

The visual baseline assessment involves a computer-based intervisibility assessment based on different turbine heights and receptor types. Whilst a simplistic approach, this helps to identify the areas that are most likely to be sensitive and areas in which wind turbines might be least visible. Professional judgement was further informed by wireline visualisations for different turbine sizes from a range of viewpoints.

2.5 Method for Determining Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity

The method for determining landscape sensitivity and capacity is detailed in Appendix 2. This involves consideration of the two main elements discussed in 2.4 above:

- 1) The sensitivity of the landscape fabric and character to turbine development, which includes landscape features, elements and characteristics and its visual sensitivity, including intervisibility and receptor types.
- 2) The value of the landscape as determined by stakeholders. This may include national or local recognition by landscape designation or cultural association, or value to a community of interest such as local residents or an interest group.

Appendix 2 describes a breakdown of the physical and perceptual characteristics that contribute to landscape character, visual sensitivity and value. Each criterion is described and evaluated in terms of its sensitivity to wind energy development. An overall assessment of high, medium or low is derived from a composite of all the criteria. There is no consistent relative weighting of criteria as, in the case of each landscape type or area, different criteria are likely to be critical in the sensitivity assessment.

Following the above assessment, an overall professional judgement on capacity for developments of different types is made on the basis of sensitivity and value. Landscape capacity is rated according to the degree to which wind turbines may be accommodated without significant and/or adverse effects on sensitivity and value. The descriptive criteria below for high, medium and low describe the main thresholds on a continuum between no capacity and high capacity.

Low Capacity:	A landscape that is both sens has a high value, where on accommodated without signific criteria
Medium Capacity:	A landscape that has some s and has some aspects of valu can be accommodated which defining criteria
High Capacity:	A landscape that has low sens has low value, and can accommost of the key defining criteria

sitive to wind turbine development and nly a slight level of change can be cantly affecting any of the key defining

sensitivity to wind turbine development lue, where a moderate level of change h may significantly affect some of the

sitivity to wind turbine development and modate change that significantly affects

Broadly speaking there is an inverse relationship between landscape sensitivity/value and capacity. However, this is not a simple relationship that can be expressed in a matrix: a balance of judgement is made in each case as landscape value may be a more important factor than sensitivity in some cases; and vice versa in others.

Turbine height and the size and layout of types of turbine development may relate better to some LCTs than others and the geographical extent of LCAs within some otherwise suitable LCTs may limit capacity for development.

2.6 Defining Landscape Change and Cumulative Capacity

An understanding of cumulative impacts and change in the landscape is key to determining acceptable levels of development and whether or not areas have reached cumulative capacity. This is discussed below and in further detail in Appendix 2.

2.6.1 Cumulative Change

Appendix 2, section 2.7 discusses in detail the issues involved in determining cumulative change thresholds and the acceptability of these changes. It refers to Scottish Government web based Guidance (2013) and SNH siting and design guidance (2009) for onshore wind energy developments. Key factors that affect the perception of cumulative change include:

- the distance between individual windfarms and/or turbines;
- the distance over which they are visible;
- the overall character of the landscape and its sensitivity to windfarms;
- the siting and design of the windfarms themselves (particularly turbine height and windfarm size): and
- the way in which the landscape is experienced.

In determining an acceptable level of development, it is necessary to clearly define what differing levels of development actually entail. The methodology therefore sets out defined levels of change to the landscape and visual environment that might occur or be experienced depending on the size, number and location of turbines to be built within an area.

The descriptions in Table 2.1 set out a gradated landscape typology that defines increasing levels of cumulative landscape and visual impact of turbines by describing their effect on landscape character and the experience of those living in or travelling through the landscape. These descriptions are used without prejudice as a tool to illustrate cumulative landscape change to all parties involved in planning wind energy development.

Further generic illustration of the concept is provided in Part 1 section 5 of the SNH guidance (see guidance paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 and illustrative sketches, also shown below Table 2.1). The extent of current and potential future wind turbine landscape types in Angus is described in detail in chapter 6 and illustrated in Figures 6.2 and 6.3.

Table 2.1: Description of Levels of Cumulative Wind Turbine Development

Landscape Type	Landscape Character
Landscape with no Wind Turbines	A landscape type or area in which no, or a minimal number/size of wind turbines is present, or visible from neighbouring areas.
Landscape with Occasional Wind Turbines	A landscape type or area in which windfarms or wind turbines are located and/or are close to and visible. Turbines are not of such a size, number, extent or contrast in character that they become one of the defining characteristics of the landscape's character.
Landscape with Wind Turbines	A landscape type or area in which a windfarm, windfarms or wind turbines are located and/or visible to such an extent that they become <i>one</i> of the defining characteristics of the landscape character. However, they are clearly separated and not the single most dominant characteristic of the landscape.
Wind Turbine Landscape	A landscape type or area in which windfarms or wind turbines are extensive, frequent and nearly always visible. They become the dominant, defining characteristic of the landscape. Nevertheless there is a clearly defined separation between discrete developments.
Windfarm	Landscape fully developed as a windfarm with no clear separation between groups of turbines. Few if any areas where turbines not visible.



Figure 2.2: Illustrative Sketches of Wind Turbine Development (from SNH)

Visual Experience

There would be no, or negligible, effects on visual receptors.

Visual receptors would experience occasional close-quarters views of a windfarm or turbines and more frequent background views of windfarms or turbines. Some of the turbines would not be perceived as being located in the landscape character type or area. No overall perception of wind turbines being a defining feature of the landscape.

Visual receptors would experience frequent views of windfarms or wind turbines as foreground, mid-ground or background features, affecting their perception of the landscape character. However there would be sufficient separation between windfarms and turbines and sufficient areas from which wind turbines are not visible such that they would not be seen as dominating the landscape over all other landscape features.

Visual receptors would experience views of windfarms and wind turbines as foreground, mid-ground and background features, to the extent that they are seen as the most dominant aspect of landscape character. Few areas would be free of views of wind turbines, although groupings would appear separated.

Visual receptors would always be close to and nearly always in full view of wind turbines, with no clear separation between groups of turbines.

> characteristic of the area, creating a windfarm landscape

2.6.2 Determining Acceptable Levels of Change

The SNH siting and design guidance identifies three broad levels of cumulative change in the landscape that may be set by local authorities depending on landscape sensitivity and value and local policy objectives:

- Landscape Protection: Maintain existing landscape character.
- Landscape Accommodation: Accept a degree of change providing this does not fundamentally alter key landscape characteristics and visual resources.
- Landscape Change: Accept large amounts of change that may fundamentally alter key landscape characteristics and visual resources.

The descriptions in Table 2.1 provide a basis on which to understand and determine levels of change. However it is the collective decision of stakeholders including local authorities and their population that ultimately determines the levels of cumulative landscape change, that are acceptable across their area, and thereby the capacity.

2.7 Presentation of Assessment and Findings

The study assessment and findings are presented in the following chapters:

Chapter 3: Landscape Baseline

This chapter defines and describes the study area, including the geographical extent and landscape character of Angus and its surroundings. It also reviews other relevant information including landscape-related constraints, such as wildness, natural heritage and cultural heritage designations.

The assessment of landscape capacity and cumulative landscape change is based on the eleven Angus Landscape Character Types (LCTs) in the Tayside Landscape Character Assessment. These are divided into further Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) based on the published assessment. The figures incorporate slight modifications to the 1999 original resulting from observations by Angus Council, expansion of urban areas since 1999 and from our own on-site observations. Further subdivisions or Sub-Areas based on subtle variations are also identified. These changes are detailed in Appendix 3.

The information in chapter 3 informs the assessment of the sensitivity and value of each landscape character type and areas detailed in chapter 6.

Chapter 4: Visual Baseline

This chapter details the analysis carried out to establish the relative visibility and visual sensitivity of different parts of Angus. This involves a computer-based intervisibility assessment, carried by Envision 3D, based on different turbine heights and receptor types. The resulting maps are shown in Appendix 4.

The information in chapter 4 informs the assessment of landscape sensitivity as detailed in Chapter 6.

Chapter 5: Wind Turbines in the Study Area

This chapter describes the operating, consented and proposed wind turbine developments in the study area at May 2013. There is a detailed breakdown of numbers and sizes of turbines and windfarms in Angus and the surrounding study area. Locations of turbines are illustrated in Figures 5.1 and 5.2. There is also an analysis of turbine size ranges and distribution in relation to landscape character.

Appendix 5 reviews the factors involved in wind turbine location, size, design and distribution that affect landscape, visual and cumulative impacts.

Details of individual developments are given in Appendix 6

Chapter 6: Assessment of Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Change

This chapter analyses and assesses the information in the previous chapters to determine the landscape and visual impacts of, and capacity for, wind energy development across Angus. The assessment is summarised in Table 6.1a-i and Figures 6.1 to 6.3. The capacity assessment is informed by the detailed assessment of landscape sensitivity and value in Appendix 7. A desk and field based assessment was carried out, including the use in the field of 360[°] wirelines of existing, proposed and potential future wind energy developments. The assessment informs the subsequent spatial strategy and includes guidance on turbine size and distribution. Further details of how to use Table 6.1 together with the figures are given at the start of Chapter 6.

The assessment is carried out for each of the eleven LCTs in Angus. The capacity assessment and current cumulative change for each of the LCTs is then combined to come to an assessment of capacity and cumulative effects for the whole local authority area, and for the three main regional landscape areas of Angus, i.e.:

- 1) Highland;
- 2) Lowland and Hills;
- 3) Coast.

Further spatial and design guidance for locating wind turbines in areas with residual capacity for further development and areas with restricted capacity is given in Chapter 6.

Detailed Guidance 2.8

Chapter 6 also gives guidance on turbine sizes, cluster sizes and separation between groups of turbines for each landscape type and/or area that would limit cumulative development to the proposed acceptable level. This relates to turbines of small/medium and larger. As highlighted in 2.3.2, guidance on small turbines below 15m to blade tip applies at a local level and is generic.

Appendix 5 of this report contains detailed discussion of how turbine size, group size and group separation affects perceptions of wind energy and landscape character. Further

guidance is given in SNH's *Siting and Designing Windfarms* publication. Chapter 6 also briefly outlines the main considerations in developing the specific guidance.

2.9 Potential Opportunities and Constraints

The main spatial findings of the detailed assessment are summarised on a map in **Figure 6.4.** This shows the distribution of the following areas:

- Areas with significant underlying landscape capacity
- Areas with limited underlying landscape capacity
- Areas with no underlying landscape capacity
- Areas where capacity is limited by cumulative development (which would overlap with parts of some or all of the above areas)

Finally it is emphasised that this assessment is focused on landscape and visual issues. Areas which have been identified as suitable on this basis may be restricted by other unrelated factors such as protection of wildlife, proximity to dwellings, aviation restrictions or lack of grid connection. These issues are not the subject of this assessment and are covered by the Angus Implementation Guide.

3.0 LANDSCAPE BASELINE

The following section defines and describes the study area, including the geographical extent and landscape character of Angus and its surroundings. It also reviews other relevant information including landscape-related designations, natural and cultural heritage constraints. In the latter case it is the extent to which they may have a bearing on landscape character and value that is the primary consideration in this study.

3.1 Study Area

The study area for this assessment is shown in Figure 3.1. Angus lies on the east coast of Scotland, and is bounded by the Firth of Tay and City of Dundee to the south and the North Sea to the east. It has inland boundaries with Perth & Kinross to the west and Aberdeenshire to the north and east. Fife lies to the south of the Tay. The Cairngorms National Park includes part of the northern highland area of Angus, extending beyond into Perth & Kinross and Aberdeenshire. Angus has a total area of 2,181km² and a population of approximately 116,000.

The study focuses on the local authority area of Angus for the purposes of determining cumulative landscape and visual impact and landscape capacity. Nevertheless, there are a number of existing, consented and proposed windfarms and turbines in neighbouring local authority areas. Consideration has been given to these, due to the extensive visual influence exerted by most wind turbines. The study area therefore includes a 30km buffer around its boundary, including the North Sea.

3.2 Baseline Landscape Character Assessment

3.2.1 Landscape Context

The landscape of Angus comprises a transition from coastal landscapes by the Firth of Tay and North Sea in the southeast, progressing northwest to agricultural lowland and lowland hills, thence to highland landscapes of the Grampian Mountains in the north. Topography is shown in Figure 3.2. The bulk of the population lives in small towns and villages in the lowland area, through which the main transport routes pass. The landscape of Angus and of the more extensive Tayside area is described in detail in the TLCA (*Tayside Landscape Character Assessment, LUC, 1999*).

The Angus Local Plan Review (Adopted 2009) has adopted the TLCA as the base data informing its landscape character related policies. It identifies the landscape types in *Figure 3.2: Landscape Character Zones* as part of the justification for *Policy ER5: Conservation of Landscape Character*. In *Policy ER35 Wind Energy Development*, the zones are amalgamated into three main regional geographic areas shown in the *Local Plan Figure 3.4: Wind Energy Development: Geographical Areas*:

- Highland
- Lowland and Hills

Coast

These areas are shown in Figure 3.3. The highland area of Angus extends northwards into the Grampian Mountains and the Cairngorms National Park.

The broad division of landscape character continues to the north and east in Aberdeenshire where the Highland Boundary Fault divides moorlands to the north from lowland farmlands and the coast to the south. To the west in Perth and Kinross the Lowland/Highland division continues, although the coastal landscape is relatively limited.

3.2.2 Landscape Character

Table 3.1 overleaf and Figure 3.4a define the landscape in more detail. There are a total of eleven landscape character types from the Tayside assessment: 4 Highland; 4 Lowland and Hills and 3 Coast. These are further subdivided into a number of individual character areas depending on whether there is more than one example of the landscape type geographically separated or distinct from the other(s). Figure 3.4b shows landscape character in the wider study area.

The coastal area, although important to the character of Angus, covers little of its surface area, being a predominantly narrow strip, with the exception of Montrose Basin. In contrast the lowland and highland areas cover most of Angus. The dividing line between the two is the Highland Boundary Fault between Lintrathen in the west and Edzell to the east. To the north of the Highland Boundary Fault lie the extensive rolling uplands and mountains/plateau of the Mounth Highlands dissected by the Angus Glens. This area of Angus lies partially within the Cairngorms National Park, which extends northwards beyond Angus.

To the south of the Boundary Fault lie the Tayside Lowlands. In Angus the division between highland and lowland landscape types is approximately 50:50 in area. Most of the characteristics of the landscape including topography, vegetation cover, land use and settlement patterns are subservient to this major division. There is a very striking contrast between the hills north of the boundary fault and the broad open valley of Strathmore to the south of it.

The following section briefly describes the context and character of the landscape in each of these areas. More detailed description and analysis is given in the TLCA.

Highland

Within the Highland area there are four landscape character types divided into a total of 18 landscape character areas. This reflects the dissected plateau nature of the Mounth with deep glens penetrating the mountains.

The Highland Boundary fault along the southern edge is reflected in the transitional *Highland Foothills* Character type, comprising four areas of smaller scale complex topography and mixed arable and hill farming separated by the mouths of the Angus Glens. This character type extends west into Perth & Kinross.

The Angus Glen character areas comprise *Glen Isla, Glens Prosen & Clova, West Water Valley* and *Glen Esk.* They run from southeast to northwest, dividing the *Highland Summits*

and Plateaux into a series of broad, rolling ridges. The *Mid Highland Glens* are shallower and more settled with some agriculture on the flat valley floor, whereas the *Upper Highland Glens* are narrower, deeper and less settled or cultivated.

Table 3.1. Landscape Character Areas in Angus (SNH Tayside Landscape Character Assessment, 1999^{*})

Geographic Areas	Landscape Character Types	Landscape Character Areas
Highland	1a. Upper Highland Glens	Glen Isla
		Glen Prosen
		Glen Clova
		West Water Valley
		Glen Mark
	1b. Mid Highland Glens	Glen Isla
		Glen Prosen
		Glen Clova
		West Water Valley
		Glen Esk
	3. Highland Summits &	Forest of Alyth
	Plateaux	Caeniocnan Forest/ Giendoli Forest
		Muckie Caim/ Hill of Glansie/ Hill of Wirren
	E Highland Faathilla	Aluth Footbillo
	5. Fighland Footnins	Alyth Foothills Kirriomuir Eoothills
		Menmuir Foothills
		Edzell Footbills
I owland and Hills	8 Janoous Hills	Sidlows
		Sidiaws
	10. Broad Valley Lowland	Strathmore
		Lower South & North Esk Valleys
	12. Low Moorland Hills	Forfar Hills
	13. Dipslope Farmland	SE Angus Lowland
Coast	14a.Coast with Sand	Montrose
		Lunan bay
		Elliott
		Barry Links
	14b.Coast with Cliffs	Usan
		Auchmithie
		Carnoustie
	15. Lowland Loch Basins	Montrose Basin

^{*}The terminology used in the table headers differs from that used in the 1999 TLCA so as to be consistent with relevant publications and current terminology: the Geographic Areas are based on Angus Council Local Plan Review; the Landscape Types are called Landscape Character Types (LCTs) and individual landscape units are called Landscape Character Areas (LCAs).

The *Highland Summits and Plateaux* forms the most extensive Highland character type, separating the glens and merging into broader and higher mountain areas to the north of Angus. This character type continues west into Perth & Kinross and merges with other highland character types, including *Moorland Plateaux*, to the north and to the east in Aberdeenshire.

The northern parts of both the *Upper Highland Glens* and *Highland Summits and Plateaux* fall into the Cairngorms National Park although this designation does not extend into the lower hills northeast of Glen Esk.

Lowland and Hills

Within the lowland landscape area there are four landscape character types, further subdivided into five landscape character areas. The predominant lowland landscape types within Angus are the *Broad Valley Lowlands*, lying south of the Highland Boundary Fault, represented by Strathmore and the Lower South and North Esk Valleys and the large area of *Dipslope Farmland* between Dundee, Forfar and Montrose. Both of these areas are dominated by arable agriculture and are settled with towns, villages and networks of roads. Fields are medium to large in size with intermittent hedges and trees. There are areas of shelterbelts and small plantation woodlands. Three of the main settlements in Angus (Kirriemuir, Forfar and Brechin) and the main transport artery (the A90) lie in the *Broad Valley Lowlands*. The *Dipslope Farmland* is on higher undulating ground with smaller settlements on the periphery (eg. the villages of Letham and Friockheim) and more open aspects, although merging into the more densely populated coastal area in the south and east where Arbroath, the A92 and main railway are located.

The two main lowland areas are separated by ranges of lowland hills: To the west the *Igneous Hills* of the Sidlaws divide the *Dipslope Farmland* and Dundee from Strathmore, this pattern extending west into Perth & Kinross. To the east the smaller scale *Low Moorland Hills* around Forfar separate the *Dipslope Farmland* from the Lower Esk Valleys.

Northeast into Aberdeenshire the lowland landscape area is represented by the *Agricultural Heartlands* type (from the *South & Central Aberdeenshire Landscape Assessment, SNH 1996*) which merges with the *Broad Valley Lowlands*. Strathmore, in Perth and Kinross and Angus, including the North and South Esk and the Howe of the Mearns in Aberdeenshire forms a broad continuous valley of 65km length between the River Tay in the southwest and Glenbervie in the northeast.

Coast

There are three Coastal Types: *Coast with Sand* is divided into four landscape character areas and *Coast with Cliffs* divided into three. These form a narrow strip along the Firth of Tay and North Sea, with rocky headlands alternating with dunes and sandy beaches. Only the Barry Links area of dunes between Monifieth and Carnoustie has a width of more than a kilometre.

Four of the main towns of Angus: Monifieth, Carnoustie, Arbroath and Montrose punctuate these areas and there are main roads and the railway passing along or near the coast from Dundee to Arbroath, Montrose and eventually Aberdeen. There are small fishing villages and remains of castles on the rocky sections of coast. Otherwise there is little development







Figure 3.2

Topography



This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL100017966





Local Plan Review and Implementation Guide for Renewable Energy Proposals. Landscape Characters Areas are based on the Tayside Landscape Character Assessment. (LUC 1999)



Geographic Areas



This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL100017966





with arable land often extending close to cliff edges. There is little in the way of trees, the areas being open and windswept. There are links golf courses located in dunes along the sandy sections of coast and Barry Links has a military firing range.

Between the Forfar Hills and Montrose the landscape lowers in elevation forming the Lowland Loch Basin of Montrose Basin, which is part flat agricultural land and parkland and part inland tidal lagoon separated from the North Sea by the spit of land on which lies Montrose.

3.2.3 Further Analysis of Landscape Character

Some of the landscape character areas in Angus cover extensive areas and show clear variations in character relating particularly to scale, topography and vegetation cover. In the following areas we have identified Sub-Areas with consistent characteristics which may have a bearing on sensitivity and capacity. Further information and a figure showing the changes are given in Appendix 3.

Broad Valley Lowland (TAY 10)

The Broad Valley Lowland LCT is extensive and divided into two LCAs: Strathmore in the west and Lower South and North Esk Valley to the east. Within these areas a number of smaller sub-areas have been identified which vary sufficiently from the main type to be noted as potentially more or less sensitive to wind energy development:

- An area of complex fluvioglacial landforms comprising rolling hillocks and ridges with i. a more irregular field pattern contrasting with the flatter checkerboard pattern of valley floor and field boundaries in Strathmore.
- The corridor of the River South Esk between Glen Clova and Brechin is focused ii. around the meandering river. It is slightly more enclosed by shallow landform and trees than the more open arable land of Strathmore and has features such as former mills and large estate houses and policies.
- iii. A significant area lying between the A90 and the Menmuir Hills is topographically separated by a curved ridge of land from the area draining into the South Esk. This area of undulating arable land drains to the North Esk and not to Montrose Basin
- iv. An area of higher ground lies between the A90 and Montrose Basin to the east of Brechin. This area is elevated with slopes falling on all sides. Although included in the Broad Valley Lowland it has many of the more exposed characteristics of the Dipslope Farmland.

The sub-areas in this case do not cover all the area of the main LCAs. Remaining areas are considered as more representative of the 'standard' type.

Low Moorland Hills (TAY 12)

Further analysis of the lowland Low Moorland Hills landscape type south and east of Forfar indicates that, although clearly higher than the Lower Esk Valleys and Montrose Basin, much of it is of lower elevation than the adjacent Dipslope Farmland. On analysis it comprises two distinct sub-areas: the lower, flatter and mainly afforested Montreathmont Forest & Moor and surrounding farmland to the east of Turin Hill and north of Guthrie and the area of widely separated steep sided hills in rolling farmland to the west, surrounding the east and south sides of Forfar.

Dipslope Farmland (TAY 13)

The Dipslope Farmland covers a wide area and accommodates significant variation within this character type, varying from relatively small scale enclosed farmland in shallow valleys to large open arable fields or small areas of heather moorland on the highest ground. The LCA can be divided up into six geographical sub-areas based on elevation and exposure, tree cover and surrounding landscape context:

- Tealing Farmland: The sub-area lies in a bowl between the ridge enclosing Dundee i. in the south and the escarpment of the Sidlaw Hills to the north and west. Close proximity to the urban area means it is more populated with villages and roads and crossed by several electricity transmission lines converging on a major substation. The backdrop of the hills contains and shelters the area from the north and west
- Monikie Farmland: The features distinguishing this sub-area from other parts of the ii. Dipslope Farmland include a greater preponderance of woodland amongst areas of arable farmland. This is partly due to the presence of two country parks set around former reservoirs (Crombie and Monikie) and also the Panmure estate policies. It is well settled in the southern part. This gives the area a more enclosed, settled and smaller scale feeling, increasing the sensitivity to wind energy developments. An electricity transmission line crosses from west to east.
- Redford Farmland: This sub-area is higher and/or more open and exposed than iii. neighbouring sub-areas. The plateau-like landform of the highest northern part is gently rolling or undulating and has large arable fields in which boundaries have been removed or have become minimal, giving an open, simple character. Settlements are small and well separated. Farms and houses also appear well separated and farm buildings are often large. There are some areas of mature trees, most notably the very enclosed Guynd designed landscape. An electricity transmission line crosses the centre. Due to its openness, apparent larger scale and productive farmland character, the northern parts of this sub-area, separated from the coastal facing slopes by a low ridge or break in slope, would be less sensitive to wind energy developments.
- Letham, Lunan Water and Arbroath Valleys: This sub-area surrounds watercourses iv. that drain to the sea at Lunan Bay and Arbroath. It is generally lower and/or less open and exposed than neighbouring sub-areas and has more settlement, including the significant settlements of Arbroath, Letham and Friockheim as well as smaller hamlets, isolated houses and farms. A golf/housing resort is identified in the local plan at Letham Grange near Arbroath. The land is intensively farmed, including areas of polytunnels. There are significant areas of mature trees: within designed landscapes such as Guthrie and Pitmuies, along watercourses and around settlements. Roads follow the valley landforms. An electricity transmission line lies near Arbroath. Due to its more enclosed and settled character, the sub-area would be more sensitive to wind energy developments.

- v. Ethie Farmland: This sub-area is higher and/or more open and exposed than the surrounding valley sub-area, partly due to its coastal exposure. The landform is gently rolling or undulating and has large arable fields in which boundaries have been removed or have become minimal. There are no settlements, only isolated farms and houses. There are areas of mature trees inland but the higher ground close to the coast is open and exposed. A main road and railway crosses lower ground in the centre. Due to its openness and productive farmland character the sub-area would be less sensitive to wind energy developments, although it is limited in extent and due cognisance should be given to the coastal location which is more sensitive to wind energy development.
- vi. Rossie Moor: This sub-area is higher and more open and exposed than the valley sub-area to the south and Montrose Basin to the north. The landform is gently rolling or undulating and has large arable fields in which boundaries have been removed or have become minimal. There are no settlements, only isolated farms and houses. There are areas of mature trees inland but much of the land close to the coast is open and exposed. A main road crosses lower ground to the east. Due to its openness and productive farmland character the sub-area would be less sensitive to wind energy developments, although due cognisance should be given to the coastal location which is more sensitive to wind energy development.

Within all of these sub areas there are relatively minor variations in landform and landcover which lead to areas of localised sensitivity which should be taken into account in specific site assessments.

3.3 Landscape Designations

Landscape designations are an indication of landscape or scenic value recognised at national, regional or local levels. Landscape designations form part of the baseline for both the assessment of landscape capacity, and the preparation of a spatial framework. Landscape designations within the study area are noted below, and are shown in Figure 3.5, in relation to LCAs.

3.3.1 National Landscape Designations

The Cairngorms National Park includes the hills and upper glens in the north of Angus. This area is not included in the core Angus study area, but it is considered within the 30km buffer.

The Cairngorms National Park is a landscape-related national designation. It is located in the north of the area and extends beyond into Aberdeenshire and Perth & Kinross. The National Park area includes the northern parts of the *Highland Summits and Plateaux* and most *Upper Highland Glens* areas.

The only area of national landscape designation within Angus is the Deeside and Lochnagar National Scenic Area (NSA), the southern end of which lies in the northwestern part of Angus, including the highest mountains and Glen Doll at the head of Glen Clova.

Taking into account existing and emerging national policy, it is unlikely that commercial windfarm proposals would be considered acceptable within the NSA or the National Park. Whilst buffer areas are not encouraged by policy, the effects of windfarms near to the NSA or National Park could be a material consideration.

Other national designations are primarily related to sites of natural or cultural heritage value (e.g. SCAs, SPAs, SSSIs and Scheduled Ancient Monuments), which are not the subject of this study. Nevertheless some of these areas such as Montrose Basin and the numerous castles, churches, prehistoric monuments and hillforts in Angus are notable for their contribution to landscape character and are considered, where appropriate, in the assessment of landscape value and capacity. Furthermore, locations of cultural heritage importance often have a landscape setting well beyond their physical extent. These are discussed in 3.4 below.

3.3.2 Local Landscape Designations

There are no local landscape designations such as Special Landscape Areas or Areas of Great Landscape Value within Angus. The protection of landscape character outside the National Park is based on local plan policy which is informed by the TLCA. This is taken into account in the assessment of landscape capacity.

Aberdeenshire also has no local landscape designations. There are Areas of Great Landscape Value in Perth & Kinross, although none are contiguous with Angus.

3.3.3 Other Landscape Designations

There are thirteen inventory Historic Gardens and Designed Landscapes (HGDLs) wholly or partially within Angus. The majority are located within lowland areas, but also include one in Montrose Basin and four others fully or partly within the edges of the highland area. Several further listed areas lie in the wider study area including Camperdown Park in Dundee City which is immediately adjacent.

Whilst this is not a statutory designation it is a landscape factor that contributes to the assessment of landscape character and value. These are taken into account in the assessment.

There are also three country parks in the area between Dundee, Carnoustie and Forfar at Monkie, Crombie and Forfar Loch and two country parks on the edge of Dundee City.

3.4 Other Designations

There are a number of designations that, whilst not solely landscape related, clearly indicate landscape value and inform the assessment process. These are shown in Figure 3.6 and discussed below. Illustrative examples are referred to in the assessment and guidance





Figure 3.5

Landscape Designations & Landscape Character Areas

			Km
0	2.5	5	10
	2.0		10

This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthonsed reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL100017966







Natural and Cultural Designations



This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majestly's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014, Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL100017966

3.4.1 Historic and Cultural Designations

Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) are primarily a historic or archaeological designation. However they can be of landscape significance in their own right and contribute to the character and value of a landscape. Furthermore, effects on their setting should be a consideration for neighbouring development proposals.

Conservation Areas are primarily an urban designation. Nevertheless the appearance of a settlement can be a key feature contributing to the surrounding rural landscape and equally the setting of a Conservation Area can be affected by developments in the surrounding countryside. There are a total of nineteen conservation areas within Angus. The largest are within the main towns but there are a number within smaller settlements throughout Angus.

There are extensive numbers of SAMs throughout Angus. Most characteristic are the numerous hillforts concentrated in the Sidlaw and Forfar Hills and the Highland Foothills. There are extensive remains of settlements and field systems in the lowland areas and a number of ruined castles.

Listed Buildings feature throughout the urban and rural areas. The greatest concentrations are located in the older settlements, particularly, but also in the smaller historic settlements and throughout most of the lowland and upland fringe areas. Listed buildings contribute to landscape character and value and their setting is a consideration for neighbouring development proposals.

3.4.2 Nature Conservation Designations

Areas designated for their nature conservation interest and importance include SPAs SACs, Ramsar Sites, SSSIs and National Nature Reserves (NNRs). All are national or international designations and subject to the highest level of constraint in spatial frameworks. Whilst these constraints are primarily related to nature conservation interests (see 2.9 above), the designated area can contribute to the character and value of a landscape through its relatively undisturbed natural features and potential visitor interest.

In the Angus study area the most extensive areas are SSSI/Ramsar/SAC sites located along the coast: including Montrose Basin and Barry Links. A number of inland lochs are also SSSI's and/or Ramsar Sites. Several extensive SSSI's lie outside Angus, within the 30km buffer within the Cairngorms National Park and Aberdeenshire.

Ancient woodland inventory sites are distributed across Angus, most being located in the lowland areas and sheltered glens in the Highlands. The largest area is at Montreathmont Forest 10km to the east of Forfar.

3.5 Wildness Mapping

SNH's wild land policy (2002) recognises the importance both of wild land in Scotland's countryside and to perceptions of wildness to society. The policy also notes the potential for development to erode the extent of wild land and perceptions of wildness in other areas.

SNH has recently completed a mapping exercise in which the factors that contribute to wildness in a landscape have been combined and mapped to create a detailed picture of wildness on a relative scale (*Mapping Scotland's Wildness, Wildness Map January 2012*). Figure 3.7 of this report shows this in relation to the Angus landscape character areas. There is a sharp division in Angus between the Highlands and the Lowland and Coastal areas, with smaller areas of relative wildness appearing on the Sidlaw hills and Montreathmont Forest in the latter.

40 draft Core Areas of Wild Land have been identified across Scotland, based on the assessment of wildness. Area 16: Lochnagar and Mount Keen is partially located in Angus and fully within the Angus study area (*Core Areas of Wild Land in Scotland, April 2013*). This area is also shown on Figure 3.7: the greatest extent within Angus lies between Glen Clova, Glen Lethnot and Glen Esk, with smaller areas around Mount Keen to the north of Glen Esk and to the northeast of Glen Isla.

This information is used to identify areas with the highest wildness qualities in the study area and informs the assessment of landscape value of landscape character areas.

3.6 Other Relevant Matters

Other areas of interest which contribute to landscape value include walking and cycle routes such as the National Cycle Route, The Cateran Way and Angus Core Paths. Also included are viewpoints, parks and gardens, golf courses and access land. These areas are mapped on Figure 3.8 and taken into account in the assessment of value of landscape types and areas, as detailed in Appendix 7 and referred to in Chapter 6.









IronsideFarrar

22

4.0 VISUAL BASELINE

The following section details the analysis that was carried out to establish the relative visibility and visual sensitivity of different parts of Angus.

4.1 Visual Receptors

In a study of landscape capacity and cumulative landscape impacts, it is important to consider visibility, and the effects of cumulative impact on visual receptors. This not only feeds into the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity (see Section 2.2), but also builds up a picture of how wind turbines might be perceived from visual receptors in and around Angus.

The types of potentially sensitive visual receptors within Angus are broadly categorised into three groups, represented by the following locations:

- Settlements, representing concentrations of residential receptors;
- Routes, representing travelling receptors, and including the dual carriageway Trunk Road, A roads, railway, and long-distance footpaths and cycleways;
- Viewpoints, representing visitors, selected from popular walking destinations, visitor attractions, and viewpoints identified on OS maps, including several viewpoints outside Angus but within the study area. These viewpoints were selected with the agreement of the officers of Angus Council.

The locations of the settlements, routes, and viewpoints are illustrated on Figure 4.1a and b. The assessment includes receptors in the visibility study buffer area of 15km beyond the Angus boundary (see 4.2 below).

Individual residential properties are not included in the visibility mapping although notice is taken of the frequency and distribution of dwellings in the analysis of each landscape character type.

Whilst there are working receptors in Angus, these have not been included, as it is common practice in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that people at work are considered to be low sensitivity visual receptors.

4.2 Visibility Analysis

An assessment of visibility was made from the settlements, routes and viewpoints illustrated in Figures 4.1a and b (Angus and wider study area). This was carried out by Envision 3D, using a computer based technique in which the intervisibility between receptors and landforms, or objects of specific heights on the landforms, is determined. The more intervisibility, the greater the visual sensitivity is likely to be. The method is described in more detail in **Appendix 2**.

The extent of the visibility assessment was limited to a 15km radius from the receptors. In our experience, this is the distance within which the great majority of significant impacts from wind farms or large turbines are likely to occur. Whilst it is recognised that impacts occur beyond this distance, up to 35km and beyond, as recognised by EIA best practice, this is not an EIA assessment and the results are considered to adequately distinguish between locations of potentially greater or lesser sensitivity.

Results of the visibility analysis are illustrated in Figures 4.2 a-f to 4.4 a-f (in **Appendix 4**). The colours show the differences in visual sensitivity across Angus. Red colours indicate areas that are most visible from the greatest numbers of receptors, grading through orange, yellow and green to blue areas that are seen by fewest receptors and uncoloured areas that would not be seen at all.

4.2.1 Settlements

Figures 4.2 a-f show that the areas most seen from settlements within 15km are located in the southern, lowland part of Angus; particularly near to where the largest population lies in Dundee.

Most notably visible are the edges of the *Dipslope Farmland* and coastal areas to the north and east overlooking the city and the south facing escarpment of the Sidlaws which is visible above the farmland. However there are pockets with low visibility for smaller objects (up to 50m) directly to the north of the city.

Other areas of *Dipslope Farmland* further east are visible from the settlements of Carnoustie, Arbroath, Brechin and Montrose. Rossie Moor between Brechin, Montrose and Arbroath is particularly visible by comparison with most other areas. The *Low Moorland Hills* to the north and east of Forfar, including Montreathmont Forest, also have a higher visibility, although lower ground between the hills is relatively concealed. Within Strathmore the most visible areas are the higher ground to the east of Brechin which separates the North and South Esk and the wider strath to the southwest of Kirriemuir.

Within the lowlands, the areas less visible from settlements include lower ground on the north of the Sidlaw Hills and the *Dipslope Farmland*, including the lower ground between Letham and Lunan Bay, and land draining to the North Esk to the north of the A90 at Brechin. In the latter area objects up to 50m or 80m are much less visible than in surrounding areas. On the coast Lunan Bay, sheltered by higher ground, is the least visible area.

The areas with least visibility of settlements lie to the north, in the Highland area. Here extensive areas would not be visible from settlements, reflecting the low population within these areas. The *Highland Foothills* are slightly more visible, with the most visible area being to the north of Kirriemuir. The narrow glens to the north of them are particularly sheltered from visibility.

4.2.2 Routes

The pattern of visibility from transport and other routes (Figures 4.3 a-f) shows similarities to the pattern for settlements, but is less skewed towards Dundee. Whilst areas close to Dundee are still the most visible for higher objects in particular, other areas showing

relatively higher visibility include: Strathmore and the Kirriemuir Hills around Kirriemuir which would be visible from several A roads including the A90; the higher Forfar Hills; the higher ground between North and South Esk; the higher areas of Dipslope Farmland including Rossie Moor and the Highland Foothills.

The less visible areas within the lowlands are similar to those for the settlements. Notably the pockets north of Dundee and the A90 near Brechin continue to show low visibility for objects below 50m or even 80m. Coastal areas show a similar pattern to settlements, with Lunan Bay the least visible.

Again the Highland area is the least visible due to the low density of routes within 15km, although the southern edges of all the hills are relatively more visible than is the case from settlements.

4.2.3 Viewpoints

The viewpoints tell a different story (Figures 4.4 a-f). This is because they relate less to centres of population and more to available views.

On the basis of the viewpoints selected, by far the most visually sensitive area is in Strathmore, around Kirriemuir. Areas north and east of Dundee have a low visibility from viewpoints.

Other areas of greater visibility from viewpoints include the Low Moorland Hills east of Forfar including Montreathmont Forest; the area of Strathmore around Brechin; all of the Highland Foothills and some of the southern ridges and summits of the Highland Summits and Plateaux. The heightened sensitivity of these areas reflects the significant number of hilltop viewpoints.

The areas least visible from viewpoints lie along the coast, in the valleys of the Sidlaw Hills and lower areas of the Dipslope Farmlands and in some of the Highland Glens. This is due to the concealing effects of topography.

4.2.4 Analysis of Visibility

The visibility analysis confirms some empirical observations of visual sensitivity across Angus, i.e. that it is the areas of higher topography and close to population areas that have the highest visual sensitivity. However it gives a more refined and nuanced assessment, determining which geographical areas are the most and least visually sensitive.

Areas of higher visibility may have a bearing on their capacity for wind turbine development although the relationship may not be simple: high visibility could mean high visual sensitivity but may also indicate exposed large scale locations suitable for turbines. Based on the computer assessment and on observation, the following areas are of higher sensitivity:

- The Dipslope Farmland and coastal areas north and east of Dundee due to proximity to a high population and transport routes;
- The main south facing escarpment of the Sidlaw Hills due to high elevation and proximity to a high population and transport routes;
- The Forfar Hills and Montreathmont Forest, the higher parts of which have higher visibility from viewpoints, transport routes and settlements;
- Higher areas of Dipslope Farmland which are visible from surrounding settlements and transport routes, particularly Rossie Moor and areas northeast of Dundee;
- Strathmore west of Forfar and particularly around Kirriemuir due to visibility from routes and from viewpoints;
- Strathmore east of Brechin where a higher area separates the North and South Esk and is visible from settlements, transport routes and viewpoints;
- The Highland Foothills and southern summits and ridges of the Highland Summits and Plateaux, due to visibility from viewpoints and, to a lesser extent, routes.

The least visible areas may have capacity to conceal turbines or site them away from most receptors. However their lack of visibility may indicate landscape character sensitivities such as smaller scale and greater levels of settlement, or alternatively remoteness:

- Lower Dipslope Farmland areas such as the Lunan Valley and areas north of Greystones which are sheltered by higher ground;
- Lunan Bay hidden between areas of higher Dipslope Farmland;
- Small valleys in the north and west of the Sidlaw Hills and between the Forfar Hills;
- Much of the Highland Summits and Plateaux and Highland Glens are not highlighted due to distance from population centres and transport routes. However they form a backdrop to much of lowland Angus and are in the foreground of views from the National Park;
- There are a number of small pockets which have lower visibility for smaller structures due to screening by surrounding low ridges. This includes areas of Dipslope Farmland north of Dundee and Broad Valley Lowland north of the A90 near Brechin.

The findings of the visibility assessment are incorporated in the analysis and assessment. Nevertheless, as discussed above, they require careful interpretation in relation to sensitivity of receptors, landscape character and the importance of some more distant views.




5.0 WIND TURBINES IN THE STUDY AREA

This section lists and describes the operating, consented and proposed wind turbine developments in the study area at May 2013. A brief explanation of turbine and windfarm size categories used in this study is given below.

5.1 Size of Wind Turbines and Windfarms

There are a number of overlapping and interacting factors which affect the potential landscape and visual effects of wind energy developments. The four main factors are:

- Size of turbine
- Turbine design (shape/ blades/ tower /colour)
- Numbers of turbines (within groups and/ or single turbines spread across an area)
- Distribution of turbine groupings (spacing between groups and/or single turbines) ٠

The effects of these factors will in turn differ depending on the character of the landscape in which the turbines are located. The factors and their effects are discussed in detail in Appendix 5 of this report. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 below provide a classification of wind turbine sizes and wind energy development sizes. These provide a basis on which turbine size and distribution is mapped and discussed in the following sections.

Table 5.1. Turbine Size Categories in This Study

Size Category	Blade Tip Height	Typical Use
Small	Turbines less than 15m in height	Typically used for domestic FiT schemes
Small-Medium	Turbines 15m to <30m in height	Typically used for domestic and farm FiT schemes
Medium	Turbines 30m to <50m in height	Typically used for farm and industrial FiT schemes
Medium/Large	Turbines 50m to <80m in height	Single turbine FiT schemes and smaller turbines used in commercial schemes
Large	Turbines 80m to <125m in height	Typical turbines used in commercial windfarms but also on some single turbine schemes
Very Large	Turbines 125m in height and greater.	Used in commercial onshore windfarms, as well as offshore (up to ca. 200m in the latter)

There is no current 'accepted' classification of commercial windfarm sizes in Scotland. Existing and proposed wind energy developments vary in turbine numbers and turbine sizes; from single small turbines to over 200 large turbines. Individual turbines vary in size from below 15m to more than 140m, with maximum outputs from a few kW to greater than 3MW.

To place Angus within context, it is worth considering the wider Scottish context. The table below refers to small, medium, large etc. size wind energy developments. For clarity the wind energy development size categories relate wherever possible to published guidance or planning application procedures. The 20MW size SPP currently refers is shown in the Table 5.2 below, although it should be noted that emerging Government policy is recommending the abandonment of this scale threshold.

Table 5.2. Wind Energy Development Size Categories

Size Category	Size Criteria	Planning Criteria/ Illustrative Examples
Small	A development of 3 or fewer turbines.	As defined by SNH guidance on assessment of small scale wind energy development (<i>SNH 2012</i>)
Small/Medium	A windfarm of more than 3 turbines up to 20MW output	Current SPP recommends windfarms above 20MW are to be covered by SPG. <i>E.g. Between 4 turbines over 50m and</i> <i>10x2MW turbines or 6x3MW turbines</i>
	SPP 2010 'Cutoff'	20MW
Medium	A windfarm between 20MW and 50MW output	Windfarms up to 50MW are dealt with as local planning authority applications. <i>E.g. Between 7x3MW and 16x3MW turbines</i>
Large	Windfarms greater than 50MW output	Windfarms over 50MW are section 36 Applications dealt with by Scottish Ministers. <i>E.g. A minimum size of 20x2.5MW or</i> <i>17x3MW turbines</i>

Size Category	Size Criteria	Planning Criteria/ Illustrative Examples
Small	A development of 3 or fewer turbines.	As defined by SNH guidance on assessment of small scale wind energy development (SNH 2012)
Small/Medium	A windfarm of more than 3 turbines up to 20MW output	Current SPP recommends windfarms above 20MW are to be covered by SPG. <i>E.g. Between 4 turbines over 50m and</i> <i>10x2MW turbines or 6x3MW turbines</i>
	SPP 2010 'Cutoff'	20MW
Medium	A windfarm between 20MW and 50MW output	Windfarms up to 50MW are dealt with as local planning authority applications.
		E.g. Between 7x3MW and 16x3MW turbines
Large	Windfarms greater than 50MW output	Windfarms over 50MW are section 36 Applications dealt with by Scottish Ministers.
		E.g. A minimum size of 20x2.5MW or 17x3MW turbines
Very Large	Windfarms greater than 100MW output	E.g. A minimum size of 50 turbines over 125m tall

5.2 Wind Turbine Distribution in the Study Area

Consented and proposed wind energy developments within the study area are listed, together with details (where available) of location, number and height of turbines etc, in Appendix 5. The locations are shown in Figures 5.1a (Angus) and 5.1b (whole study area).

At May 2013 there were within Angus a total of 116 turbines 15m and taller that are consented and 51 that are planned or S36 applications pending a decision. There are many further turbines consented and at planning stage in Perth & Kinross to the west, in Aberdeenshire to the east and in proposed offshore windfarms.

There are also a considerable number of turbines under 15m in height consented or pending approval. These are not included in the study.

5.2.1 Operating and Consented Wind Turbines within Angus

68 (59%) of the consented turbines are small/medium (15-<30m in height); another 30 are medium (30-<50m) and another 7 medium/large (50-<80m). Most of the turbines are single, with the remainder in groups of 3 or fewer. 8 of the 11 turbines over 80m are in Ark Hill windfarm in the Sidlaws. The other three are single turbine developments; with the tallest consented turbine at the former Tealing Airfield north of Dundee at 93.5m height.



The consented wind energy developments in Angus are all therefore at the smaller end of the size range. The only windfarm is Ark Hill with 8 x 81m turbines at 25MW. This is at the lower end of 'medium' in Table 5.2, and reflects the restrictions inherent in the Angus landscape.

5.2.2 Proposed Wind Turbines in Angus

The applications show a different distribution of sizes, with no turbines under 30m and the greatest proportion, 31 (59%), over 80m in height. These are mainly in windfarms.



Nathro, a S36 application with 17x135m turbines is the largest, located on the southern edge of the Highland area. At 61MW it would fall into the 'large' category in Table 5.2.

Two other small/medium windfarm proposals lie in the eastern Sidlaws: Frawney and Govals. The remaining proposals are predominantly single turbines.

5.2.3 Proposals That Have Been Refused

A number of windfarm proposals have been refused at planning application stage or dismissed at appeal over the past 5 years:

- Mountboy, Rossie Moor: 3x110m turbines (dismissed 2009)
- Montreathmont, Montreathmont Forest: 11x126.5m turbines (dismissed 2009)
- Dusty Drum, Carmyllie: 3x110 (refused 2009)
- East Skichen, Monikie: 3x91m (refused 2009)
- Hill of Finavon, near Forfar: 3x99.5m (dismissed 2012)
- Carrach on Mile Hill near Ascreavie: 9x84m (dismissed 2013) •
- Corse Hill, near Carnoustie: 7x126m (dismissed 2013)
- GSK Turbines, Montrose: 2x132m (dismissed 2013)

The majority of these have been refused/ dismissed on the basis of adverse landscape and visual impacts based on the size (and sometimes number) of the turbines. This record is relevant to the subsequent detailed analysis and guidance in Chapter 6.







Turbine Locations

Figure 5.3a

Existing, Consented & Proposed Wind Turbines in Angus

			INIII
0	2.5	5	10

This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on benaft of the Controller at Her Majesty's Stationary Office ® Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or avii proceedings. AL 100017966



	<u> </u>		IKm
0	5	10	20

5.2.4 Consented Wind Turbines in 30km buffer outside Angus

Within the 30km buffer area outside Angus there are over 400 consented turbines, many of which are situated in windfarms. The majority of these are situated in Perth & Kinross and Aberdeenshire. There are no consented turbines in the Cairngorms National Park area.

The turbines most relevant to the Angus landscape are:

- the windfarms at Drumderg and Welton of Creuchies northwest of Alyth in Perthshire, which lie within the Highland Summits and Plateaux and Highland Foothills a few kilometres west of the Angus boundary, the former being extensively visible across Angus
- the windfarm at Tullo Farm on Hill of Garvock above Laurencekirk in Aberdeenshire, which lies within 10km east of Angus and is extensively visible in views along Strathmore and from eastern Angus (this windfarm is consented to be extended from 7 to 17 turbines);
- the two 120m turbines at the Michelin Factory in Dundee, within 2km of the southern Angus border
- the windfarm at Midhill in Aberdeenshire, which lies in the Moorland and Plateaux north of the Howe of Mearns, some 15km north east of Angus.
- a number of single turbines of medium to large size located in and around the Howe of Mearns, which is the northern end of the extensive lowland valley of Strathmore.

There are a number of wind turbines in Fife but most of these are single turbines that would be hidden behind the hills of northern Fife. Other larger concentrations of turbines within the 30km study area are at the edge of the 30km offset and mainly hidden by intervening landforms; although could be experienced sequentially on a journey through the wider study area.

There were no consented offshore windfarms in May 2013.

5.2.5 Proposed Wind Turbines in 30km buffer outside Angus

Within the 30km buffer area there were applications for a further 112 turbines on land. The most significant of these are as follows:

- 7 large turbines at Tullymurdoch wind farm in Perth & Kinross, straddling the boundary between Highland Summits and Plateaux and Highland Foothills, on the boundary with Angus
- a significant number of single turbine / small windfarm applications in the Agricultural Heartlands of Aberdeenshire within 20km of Angus.

There are three very large developments proposed offshore, all at scoping: This includes

- Inchcape, over 200 turbines, 15km offshore from Angus;
- Neart na Gaoithe with 125 x 197m turbines, located at 30km south on the edge of the study area;

 The 150 turbine Firth of Forth & Tay windfarm with Alpha and Bravo arrays at 27km and 38km to the east, lies largely outside the study area.

Further applications are smaller scale and/or further removed from the Angus boundary.

Landscape Character of Turbine Locations 5.3

The trend in Angus is for locating single and smaller groups of turbines in the lowlands. This does not reflect the trend for larger windfarms and clusters prevalent in upland areas of Scotland, nor the proliferation of turbines in the Aberdeenshire farmlands. It does however show a trend towards locating single and smaller groups of turbines in lowland areas and shows the more scattered distribution of smaller turbines typical of FiT projects (although recent submissions for individual turbines include increasingly large turbine sizes).

The consented developments in highland areas have single or low numbers of turbines of a smaller size. There are very few consents in the coastal areas and none in the highest of the highland areas, although there are highland windfarms in close proximity in neighbouring Perth & Kinross.

Within Angus, most of the consented turbines and planning applications for wind turbines are within lowland landscapes. The only windfarm, at Ark Hill, is located in lowland hills There is one large development proposed in the Highland area. Table 5.3 below lists the turbine sizes relative to their locations. Appendix 6 gives more details of individual developments

Consented Turbine Location and Heights in Relation to Landscape Figure 5.4: Character (May 2013) (Turbine Height: grey=very large; red=large; orange=medium/large; yellow=medium; green=medium/small)





Figure 5.5: Application Turbine Location and Heights in Relation to Landscape Character (May 2013)

This tendency towards lowland landscapes can be explained by:

- the wide extent of lowland landscapes within Angus
- the potential sensitivity of the highland landscapes as a backdrop to Angus and proximity to the Cairngorms National Park
- Angus Council's existing locational guidance (*Renewable Energy Implementation Guide, 2012*) which supports appropriate locations for and scales of development across the local authority area

In landscape terms, upland areas offer a larger-scale landscape, which can accommodate larger turbines and it is rational to locate turbines in open, high and prominent areas to take advantage of higher wind speeds. Conversely, upland areas often represent "unspoiled" landscapes, with few overtly man-made features, and the construction of wind turbines and associated infrastructure (access tracks, electricity lines etc) could be seen as an unwelcome industrial addition. In Angus the largest scale upland types are seen as a prominently visible backdrop to the lowlands. This means that any significant wind energy development would have a very significant effect.

Coastal landscape areas are sensitive, being open, simple in character and visible inland and from the coastal settlements and areas outwith Angus. Over two thirds of Angus' population lives on the coast or immediate hinterland.

In lowland areas, the scale and pattern of the landscape is generally smaller, meaning that the largest windfarms and turbines can appear incongruous, particularly given the greater array of "reference features" such as trees and houses available with which to compare them. Together with the proximity of settlements and properties there are clear sensitivities

in such landscapes. Nevertheless, a location within the lowland area better reflects the relationship between energy production and the consumer, as well as generally being easier to service in terms of both access and connection to the electricity grid.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF LANDSCAPE CAPACITY AND CUMULATIVE CHANGE

6.1 Assessment Purpose and Process

The purpose of the following assessment is to determine the capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate wind turbine development and to determine what levels of cumulative development would be acceptable across Angus. The assessment involves four stages:

- 1) Firstly assessing the underlying capacity of the Angus landscape to accommodate wind turbine development;
- 2) Secondly, assessing the degree of cumulative change resulting from operating and consented wind turbines in the study area and in Angus;
- Thirdly, assessing the extent to which cumulative consented development has reached the limit of the landscape's capacity to acceptably accommodate wind energy developments.
- 4) Finally, assessing residual capacity and the level of further development that could acceptably be accommodated within areas of Angus.

An assessment methodology is given in **Chapter 2.0** and further detailed in **Appendix 2**. The assessment is summarised in **Table 6.1(a-i)** and **Figures 6.1 to 6.4** following. Table 6.1 is divided into several columns which summarise the assessment and guidance. The assessment works from left to right across the table. A blank table with an explanation of each column/section is shown overleaf.

Maps in Figure 6.1a-f show the capacity for turbines of each size category in each LCT, LCA or LCA sub-type as determined by the assessment in Table 6.1. The assessment gives a broad category of high, medium or low (see method in Chapter 2).

Figures 6.2 and 6.3 are maps showing the extent of existing and proposed wind turbine landscape types in Angus. The types are explained in Table 2.1.

- The extents shown in Figure 6.2 are an illustrative approximation based on size and distribution of consented turbines and the modulating effects of topography and landscape character.
- The extents shown in Figure 6.3 illustrate the proposed acceptable extent of future wind turbine development through its effect on the landscape.

The assessment was informed by desk and field based survey. This included the field use of 360[°] wirelines of consented, proposed and potential future wind energy developments as seen from the representative viewpoints (see Figures 4.1a and b for location of these). These were used by both consultant and client in joint fieldwork, to arrive at a consensus view on landscape capacity for turbines numbers and sizes.

The areas shown are approximate, based on landscape character and topography, and account for key constraints and opportunities. In all cases the figures should be interpreted through the further detailed descriptions and guidance given in this report.

The assessment is carried out for each of the eleven LCTs in Angus and Table 6.1 is divided into sections reflecting this (Table 6.1(a-i)). Each table section is preceded by a brief summary of the landscape character and a map highlighting the distribution of the relevant LCT/ LCAs. The map also shows the distribution of consented and proposed wind turbines (as at May 2013) for ease of reference. Where there are significant variations in sensitivity, capacity or consented levels of development within the LCTs across Angus the relevant LCAs are given a separate assessment. Where the LCAs are divided into sub-areas with subtly different sensitivity and capacity these are also separately assessed. Each table section where significant capacity has been identified is followed by more detailed illustrated guidance on turbine siting.

This is followed by a summary of capacity and cumulative effects for the whole local authority area, and for the three main regional landscape areas of Angus, i.e.:

- 1) Highland;
- 2) Lowland & Hills; and
- 3) Coast.

Further spatial guidance regarding areas with restricted capacity and areas with capacity for further development are given at the end of this chapter and illustrated in **Figure 6.4**.

6.2 Guidance

Table 6.1 summarises guidance on turbine sizes, group sizes and separation between groups of turbines for each LCT/LCA that would limit development to the remaining landscape capacity. The details relate to turbines of each size category (small/medium, medium, medium/large, large and very large). It is stressed that the group size and spacing details for an area envisage the capacity for accommodating turbines of a *single size category* in the area, *not* for accommodating all categories together. There may be potential for accommodating different turbine sizes in the same area, but this would depend on the characteristics of the area, and accommodating one size of turbine will affect the ability to accommodate further turbines of any other size.

Where appropriate, further detailed and illustrated guidance for LCT, LCAs and sub-areas is given following the analysis in Table 6.1. The relative positioning and group spacing of turbines is discussed in the detailed guidance for each area.

As highlighted in section 2.3 of this report, guidance on small turbines, below 15m blade tip height, applies at a local level and is generic.

Appendix 5 of this report contains detailed discussion of how turbine size, design, group size and group separation affects perceptions of wind energy and landscape character. Further guidance is given in SNH's *Siting and Designing Windfarms* publication. The following briefly outlines the main considerations in developing the specific guidance for this assessment given with Table 6.1. The development of detailed guidance was also informed through the use of 360° wirelines in the field, as described in the preceding section.

6.2.1 Turbine Size

The guidance on turbine sizes generally relates most clearly to the horizontal and vertical scale of the landscape; complexity of landscape pattern and the presence or absence of smaller scale features and elements such as trees and houses. Small/medium and medium size turbines (under 50m blade tip height) are most able to be accommodated in smaller scale landscapes with more complex patterns and smaller scale reference features. Large and very large turbines (80m+ and 125m+ blade tip respectively) are most successfully accommodated in larger scale landscapes with simpler landforms and fewer small scale references. Smaller turbine sizes may also be accommodated in such landscape types although their proximity to larger size turbines would need to be carefully controlled.

The largest scale upland landscapes in Angus are relatively restricted in their capacity due to their visual sensitivity and landscape value. However some of the lowland types are of medium to large scale with a simple landform and pattern and may be able to accommodate larger turbines.

6.2.2 Turbine Group Size

Turbine group sizes relate to scale and complexity of the landscape, particularly to landform and pattern. In general larger scale more simple landscapes with gentle landforms and simpler patterns can accommodate larger groups of turbines, subject to having the physical capacity (i.e. available area).

6.2.3 Separation between Turbine Groups

Turbine size and group size can be generically related to landscape character when applied to a single turbine or windfarm, or across a number of windfarms. However, separation between groups of turbines is the single most important factor in controlling cumulative effects. This is because of the high prominence and extensive visibility of most turbines leading to effects on landscape character well beyond the turbine, as discussed in detail in Appendix 5.

The guidance in Table 6.1 therefore gives approximate separation distances that should be applied between turbine groupings (including single turbines) in order to achieve the desired turbine landscape typology. The main factors controlling the proposed separation distance are:

- 1) Proposed Turbine Landscape Type: each proposed type detailed in Table 2.1 requires a different separation distance to achieve the landscape and visual criteria described.
- 2) Turbine Size: larger turbines require a greater separation than smaller turbines to achieve the same landscape type.
- 3) Group Size: larger groups of turbines require a greater separation distance to achieve the same landscape type.
- 4) Landscape Character Type: this has an effect on all the above factors. In terms of visibility, more open landscapes with modest landforms are likely to require greater separation distances, whereas landscapes with significant topography and woodland

cover give the potential to reduce visibility. Factors such as scale and pattern can have a more subjective effect. The presence of other tall objects (such as electricity pylons) and of development also affects the perception of turbine development.

The distances given in Table 6.1 are a minimum, relating primarily to (1) and (2) above as in this case large groups are not proposed. Landscape character including topography is also important: where landforms are capable of visually separating turbine groups the distance between landforms is a consideration in setting distances.

In the case of small LCAs the separation distances for larger turbines might mean that, in theory, only one grouping would be comfortably accommodated within the area.

Separation distances also apply between a development in one landscape type and another in an adjacent type, or between turbines of different size categories. In such situations an average of the two recommended distances would be most appropriate.

In all cases the distances are an approximate range intended for guidance. Separation distances between specific proposals should therefore be considered in more detail on a case by case basis. In areas where turbine groupings can be accommodated, promote coordination between developments in order to accommodate more turbines within the landscape capacity. This includes encouraging turbines of a similar size and clustering as a group in preference to separation.

6.2.4 Other Factors which Influence Guidance

The capacity assessment for some generic LCTs does not cover the variation found between or even within individual LCAs of that type. This is usually because of one or two key landscape factors which partially override the characteristics including:

- All or part of the LCA is much more prominent and visible than the bulk of the area covered by the LCT;
- A particularly small area is covered by the unit compared with the main areas of the LCT;
- Some or all of the LCA lies in an area designated to protect a landscape or setting of a town;
- Close proximity to other more sensitive neighbouring LCAs which would be significantly affected by wind energy proposals otherwise suitable for the LCT;
- Close proximity to other LCTs, settlements or industry which reduces the sensitivity of a unit or part of a unit compared with the bulk of the area covered by the LCT.

A combination of any of these factors might limit the ability of a specific LCA, or part thereof, to accommodate a level of development otherwise acceptable to the LCT. The main areas are identified in Table 6.1 and Figures 6.1 to 6.4 but any specific development should be considered in more detail and assessed against local factors where appropriate.

Finally it is emphasised that this assessment is focused on landscape and visual issues. Areas which have been identified as suitable on this basis may be restricted

by other unrelated factors such as protection of wildlife, proximity to dwellings, aviation restrictions or lack of grid connection. These potential constraints are not the subject of this assessment and are covered by Angus Council's Local Plan Policies and *Implementation Guide for Renewable Energy (2012)* and the emerging Local Development Plan.

Explanation of Table 6.1

LANDSO	ANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE: (SNH Classification Code/Number) / NAME OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE																	
Key:	No Ca	apacity	Low	Capad	city	Me	dium	Capa	tity High Capacity	Turbine S	ize Key: Small/Mediu	m=15	5-<30n	n; Me	dium=	=30-<	50m; Medium/Large=50-	<80m; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+
UNDERLY taking acc	YING count	LAND	SCAPE ent wind	CAP ener	ACIT gy de	Y (i.e velop	. not ment))	CURRENT CONSEN DEVELOPMENT	TED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	'S TC) FUT	URE	DEV	ELOI	PMENT (i.e. proposed	acceptable level of wind energy
Landscape Wind Ener	e Ser ergy D	nsitivity vevelopm	to nent	Lan (Re	lated	pe Ca to turb	pacity bine si	y ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Ren Cap (Rel	nainin acity ated to	g Lan o turbi	idsca ine siz	pe :e)	Current Applications	Analysis & Guidelines (Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)
Landscape Character Sensitivity Visual	visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨٢				S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٨L		
Landscap	pe Cł	haracte	r Area:	Nam	e of l	Lands	scape	e Cha	racter Area/ Sub-Area									
Med/ Me High Hig	led/ igh	Med/ High	Med/ High			0	0	0	Brief description of consented wind energy developments (at time of report), including numbers size range, distribution, with key developments named.	Wind Turbine Landscape Type resulting from current consented levels of development (refer to Table 2.1 for description of type and map in Figure 6.2 for distribution of types across study area)	Proposed limits to future Wind Energy development expressed as a Wind Turbine Landscape Type (refer to Table 2.1 for description of type and Figure 6.3 for proposed distribution of types across the study area)	Resi for d turbi is de unde capa limit by c whic deve occu land	dual la levelopi ne size erived fi erlying l acity an s to futu onsider h curre elopment upies th scape of	ndscap ment of categ com the landsc d the p ure dev ing the ent wine nt alrea e unde capaci	De cap of differ ories. e ape oropos velopm e exter d energ ady erlying ty	acity rent This ed nent at to gy	Brief description of current applications (at time of report), highlighting the most significant proposals	 Landscape Analysis: Brief description of key qualities and characteristics of the landscape character area/ sub-area and its capacity for different types of wind turbine development. Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines: Brief comment on current developments and future proposals in relation to landscape capacity. Further detail is given in the guidance section following the table.
Assessment sensitivity ar landscape cl area (from d Appendix 5)	nt of lar and val charac detaile 5)	ndscape ue of the ter area o d assessr	or sub- ment in	Asse capa size: sens asse Figu repro- capa and acco effect wind	essme acity fo s deriv sitivity essme ures 6. esents acity of does bount th cts of e	nt of la or differ ved fror and va nt and 1a-e . ⁵ the 'u f the la not take le cum existing gy deve	andsca rent tur m the alue mappe This nderlyi ndsca e into ulative g/ cons elopme	pe rbine ed in ing' pe sented ent.			Max. Numbers in Group Suggested range/ maximum number of turbines in groupings to ensure capacity is not exceeded Min Group Separation Distances (km) Suggested separation distance between turbine groupings to ensure capacity is not exceeded	2-4	1-3					

ions	Analysis & Guidelines
	(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

TAY 1: HIGHLAND GLENS

The Highland Glens lie in the Highland northern part of Angus and are deeply incised into the Highland Summits and Plateaux, providing access into the mountain massif and the Cairngorms National Park, in which the upper parts of the glens lie. The Angus Glens form part of the ever present backdrop to lowland Angus which rises north of the Highland Boundary Fault above Strathmore. They are a well known, signposted destination. The Glens are divided into two LCTs:

1A UPPER HIGHLAND GLENS

Deeply incised glens with qualities of remoteness and wildness emphasised by a lack of development and only minor roads or tracks. The Upper Highland Glen areas outside the National Park have similar qualities to those within. However, being further removed from the highest mountains within the National Park they are generally of a lesser depth and wildness with more settled references on valley floors; such as enclosed fields, public roads and occasional houses or farms. (the exception being Glen Lethnot which lies within the Draft Lochnagar and Mount Keen Core Area of Wild Land).

1B MID HIGHLAND GLENS:

The Mid Highland Glens are further removed from the highest mountains and the National Park. They are generally of a lesser depth, with settled valley floors including enclosed fields, public roads, farms, houses and occasional villages.

There are five glens within the local authority area, each divided into the two types, although some of the upper glens are fully located in the National Park and therefore not included in this guidance.





1A Upper Highland Glen: Glen Tarf. Few signs of human settlement



1B Middle Highland Glen: G settlement

1B Middle Highland Glen: Glen Esk. Areas with fields, roads and scattered

Table 6.1(a): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Highland Glens

LAND	SCAP	E CH/	ARAC	ΓER	ТҮР	E T	AY 1	: HI	GHLAND GLENS								
Key:) No Ca	pacity	Low	Capac	ity	Me	dium	Capa	City High Capacity	Turbine S	ize: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	=30-<	:50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n
BASE accoun	LANDS t of curr	CAPE (CAPAC	ITY (i. y deve	.e. not elopm	t takir ent)	ng		CURRENT CONSEN	ſED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	S TO	FUT	URE	DEVI	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed
Landsc Wind E	ape Sen nergy D	sitivity evelopm	to nent	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	oe Caj o turb	pacity ine siz	ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	ainin acity lated t	Current Applications			
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	W	M/L	L	٨٢				S/M	Μ	M/L	Ļ	٨L	
1a Upp	oer High	land G	lens L	ands.	cape	Cha	racte	r Area	as: Glen Isla; Glen Le	thnot/ Westwater Va	alley; Upper Tarf Va	lley (Glen	Esk)			
Med/ High	Med	Med/ High	High	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0	No current wind energy development.	Upper Highland Glens with No Wind Turbines	Upper Highland Glens with No Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	No current applications within UHG type. Proposed 17x135m turbine windfarm at Nathro above Glen Lethnot in neighbouring
											Max. Numbers in Group	1					Highland Summits and Plateaux
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4					
1b Mid	Highla	nd Gler	ns Lan	Idsca	pe Cl	harac	cter A	reas	: Glen Isla; Glen Prose	en; Glen Clova; Wes	st Water Valley; Gle	n Esl	k				
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	0		0	0	0	A few single small/medium turbines in and adjacent to lower areas of Glen Isla, West Water and Glen Esk. One 45m turbine in <i>Highland</i> <i>Foothills</i> at Kilry above Glen Isla.	Mid Highland Glens with No Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines	Mid Highland Glens with No Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines	0	0	0	0	0	One windfarm application at Tullymurdoch in Perthshire above Glen Isla (7x120m turbines). One medium turbine above Glen Clova; Proposed 17x135m turbine windfarm at Nathra above Glen
											Max. Numbers in Group Min Group Separation Distances (km)	1-3 2-4	1 4-8				Lethnot in neighbouring Highland Summits and Plateaux. Two medium/large turbines at Witton above West Water.

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines (Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Deeply incised glens with qualities of wildness emphasised by a lack of development and only minor roads or tracks. The remote sparsely developed character is such that only single turbines up to 30m tall associated with buildings would be appropriate to this area, with no turbines in Glen Lethnot.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines: Current proposals for Nathro would have a significant visual influence on parts of Glen Lethnot

Landscape Analysis:

The Mid Highland Glens are further removed from the highest mountains and the National Park. Suitable for wind turbine development of a smaller scale associated with settlements, farms or tourist facilities.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Proposals above Glen Isla would have a significant effect on a narrow section of the glen. Nathro windfarm would have a significant visual influence on Glen Lethnot/ West Water. Medium/large turbines at Witton are larger than recommended for the scale of landscape in which they lie and for the Highland Glens.

GUIDANCE: TAY 1 HIGHLAND GLENS

1A UPPER HIGHLAND GLENS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Upper Highland Glens with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium)

Group Sizes: 1 (small/medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium)

1B MID HIGHLAND GLENS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Mid Highland Glens with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium); 1 (medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 4-8km (medium)

Detailed Guidance for Highland Glens

The Highland Glens have little capacity to accommodate wind turbines without adverse effects on their key characteristics of relative remoteness, wildness and low levels of built development.

Limit turbine development to single smaller size turbines located in the floor of the glen or the lower sideslopes, where enclosure or shelterbelt/ forestry planting already indicates human manipulation of the landscape. In the Upper Glens the remote largely undeveloped character is such that only single small/medium turbines up to 30m tall associated with buildings would be appropriate. All of Glen Lethnot above the public road end at Waterhead is located within the Lochanagar and Mount Keen Draft Core Area of Wild Land as it has no metalled road or dwellings. This area is not suitable for wind turbine development.

In the Middle Highland Glens it may be possible to accommodate medium size turbines up to 50m in association with larger clusters of development, although care should be taken not to dominate listed buildings, small cottages and houses or smaller scale scenic areas such as rivers, lochs, designed landscapes or prominent landforms.

Separate turbine groups sufficiently to ensure that there is minimal intervisibility between turbines, and/or ensure that turbines are sufficiently small to read as scattered, isolated features. Turbines in areas close to the electricity transmission line which crosses the lower part of most of the Middle Highland Glens should be carefully positioned so as to avoid visual clutter.

Currently there are no turbines located in the Upper Highland Glens. In the Middle Highland Glens there are very few, predominantly small/medium, turbines mainly in adjacent areas that have relatively little influence on the landscape. There is a concentration of small/medium and medium turbines near the bottom of Glen Isla, mainly in the adjacent Highland Foothills. Further turbine development in this area should be limited to avoid extending an area of Landscape with Wind Turbines fully into the glen.



Mid and Upper Highland Glens can only accommodate smaller turbines in the more settled lower sideslopes or valley floor where they are associated with scattered built development and other signs of human intervention

TAY 3: HIGHLAND SUMMITS AND PLATEAUX

This type covers a substantial area in the north and west of Angus. Much of the highest part surrounds the *Upper Highland Glens* lying within the Cairngorms National Park. The remaining areas, lying within the Angus study area form substantial ridges separating the glens from one another.

The hills are large in scale and predominantly of a rolling shape, generally with simple patterns of vegetation cover such as heather, grass or forestry. The broad ridges separating the Glens culminate in higher plateau areas with steep glaciated sides within the National Park. The hills also have a wild,

remote and windswept character. A substantial area within the study area, extending into the National Park is identified as a Draft Core Area of Wild Land (16. Lochnagar/ Mount Keen).

The *Highland Summits and Plateaux* form the foreground for views south from the National Park, the setting for the Angus Glens and an ever present backdrop to the north for much of the rest of Angus, emphasising the separation of lowland and highland landscapes north and south of the Highland Boundary Fault.





Highland Summits and Plateaux above Glen Clova form a backdrop to Kirriemuir Camera Obscura and the wider lowland area.



Site of the proposed Nathro Windfarm viewed from the south

Table 6.1(b): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Highland Summits and Plateaux

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE TAY 3: HIGHLAND SUMMITS AND PLATEAUX													
Key: No Capacity Low	Capacity Medium Capac	City High Capacity	Turbine S	Size: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	=30-<	: 50 m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n			
BASE LANDSCAPE CAPACI account of current wind energy	ITY (i.e. not taking y development)	CURRENT CONSEN DEVELOPMENT	TED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	'S TO	FUT	URE	DEVI	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed			
Landscape Sensitivity to Wind Energy Development	Landscape Capacity (Related to turbine size)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Capa (Rel	aining acity ated t	g Lan o turb	Current Applications					
Landscape Character Sensitivity Visual Sensitivity Landscape Sensitivity Landscape Value	S/M M M/L L VL				S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٨L				
Landscape Character Areas	: Forest of Alyth; Caenlo	chan/ Glen Doll Fores	ts; Muckle Cairn/ H	ill of Glansie/ Hill of	Wirre	en; H	ill of	Saug	ghs/ I	Nount Battock			
Med High Med/ High High		No turbines currently located within Angus <i>HSaP</i> . In Forest of Alyth within Perthshire, Drumderg (16x107m) lies within 2- 3km and Welton of Creuchies, (4x98m) lies 5km west of Angus. A scattering of single/ paired small/medium and medium turbines in neighbouring glens and foothills. One 45m turbine at Kilry above Glen Isla.	Highland Summits and Plateaux with No Wind Turbines/ Highland Summits and Plateaux with Wind Turbines (Forest of Alyth)	Highland Summits and Plateaux with No Wind Turbines/ Highland Summits and Plateaux with Wind Turbines (Forest of Alyth) Max. Numbers in Group Min Group Separation Distances (km)						One windfarm application at Tullymurdoch above Glen Isla (7x120m turbines); Proposed 17x135m turbines at Nathro windfarm above Glen Lethnot in neighbouring <i>Highland</i> <i>Summits and Plateaux</i> . Two medium/large (74m) turbines at Witton above the West Water.			

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

The Highland Summits and Plateaux form the foreground for views south from the National Park, the setting for the Angus Glens and an ever present backdrop, beyond the Highland Boundary Fault, to much of the rest of Angus.

Whilst large in scale and often of the rolling shape considered suitable for windfarm development, the hills also have a wild and remote character. A substantial area within the Study Area, extending into the National Park is identified as a Draft Core Area of Wild Land. The large scale may also be deceptive as the largest size turbines could reduce the perceived scale and grandeur of the hills.

Due to these reasons this LCT is not considered to be suitable for wind turbines.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Consented wind turbines have little effect on this type within Angus. The windfarm at Drumderg affects the southern ridge of the Forest of Alyth area, creating a HSaP with Wind Turbines, slightly reinforced by the consented turbine at Kilry.

The proposed turbines at Nathro would create a substantial area of HSaP with Wind Turbines extending well into the draft Core Area of Wild Land. It would dominate the nearby Menmuir Hills and would be a highly visible horizon feature across lowland Angus. Together with the two medium/large turbines at Witton this would affect the West Water valley.

TAY5: HIGHLAND FOOTHILLS

The Highland Foothills LCT lies on the Highland Boundary Fault. It is therefore a transitional landscape between the Broad Valley Lowland of Strathmore and the Highland Summits and Plateaux. It has an intermediate scale, complex landform and often small scale detail due to the complex pattern of steep hills, small settled valleys and pockets of more fertile sheltered ground. Within Angus it comprises four separate areas.

(i) ALYTH FOOTHILLS

Most of this LCA lies within Perth & Kinross. The northeastern slopes overlooking Glen Isla lie within Angus, containing the lower part of the glen and forming the southwestern skyline.

KIRRIEMUIR FOOTHILLS (ii)

An area of complex topography including hills, small glens, small settlements and a network of roads extending into Strathmore. A key feature is Mile Hill, which as highest landform at 409m is dominant locally and more widely visible across Strathmore and the lower end of Glen Clova. It is separated from the Highland Summits and Plateaux and the prominent summit of Cat Law to the north by the narrow glen of Quharty Burn The foothills also provide a setting to Balintore Castle, the Designed Landscape at Ascreavie and the Loch of Lintrathen. An electricity transmission line crosses the southern slopes.

(iii) MENMUIR FOOTHILLS

Simpler in topography than the western LCAs, lying between Glen Clova and West Water. Predominantly a long ridge of hills parallel to Strathmore, with parallel small glens on the Highland side. Two small glens (Glen Ogil and Cruick Water) penetrate the Highland Summits and Plateaux to the north. Some small settlements, but mainly isolated houses accessed by small roads. Two small lochs located at western end. There are a number of SAMs, including the hillforts at White and Brown Catherthun in the northeast, which are also key viewpoints overlooking Strathmore and the Highland Boundary Fault. An electricity transmission line passing from southwest to northeast crosses the ridge above Noranside to pass north of the hills.

(iv) EDZELL FOOTHILLS

This is much the smallest of the LCAs, lying between West water and Glen Esk. It predominantly comprises a single hill above Strathmore and the lower slopes of the Highland Summits and Plateaux to the north. It lies adjacent to the village of Edzell, but has mainly isolated houses accessed by small roads. Hill of Edzell is the main feature, which forms the backdrop to Edzell village and castle on the southern edge. An electricity transmission line passes north of the hill.







Turbines

Kirriemuir Foothills: Looking across Strathmore to Mile Hill

Menmuir Foothills: site of the consented and proposed Memus

Table 6.1(c): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Highland Foothills

LAND	DSCAP	E CHA		ſER	TYP	E T	AY 5	5: HI	GHLAND FOOTHI	LLS							
Key:) No Ca	pacity	Low	Сарас	ity	Med	dium	Capad	City High Capacity	Turbine S	ize: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	1=30-<	<50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n
BASE accour	LANDS	CAPE C	CAPACI	TY (i. / deve	e. no elopm	t takin ent)	g		CURRENT CONSENT	ſED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	'S TO	FUT	URE	DEV	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed
Landso Wind E	cape Ser inergy D	nsitivity f evelopm	to nent	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	be Car o turbi	bacity	ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	acity lated t	g Lan turb	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivitv	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٨L				S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٨L	
Lands	cape Cl	naractei	r Area:	(i) Al	yth F	oothi	lls (e	aster	n edge only in Angus)							
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High			0	0	0	Drumderg within P&K lies within 3km of this LCA in Angus. Another medium large turbine in P&K within 1km of the boundary near Balduff Hill. A scattering of single small/medium turbines and one medium (45m) turbine at Kilry all on slopes overlooking Glen Isla. 4x99.5m turbines at Wellton of Creuchies are in the LCA but 5km west of the border.	Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines	Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines	0	0	0		0	Proposed 7x120m windfarm at Tullymurdoch is located in P&K but adjacent to Angus boundary.
Lands	cape Cl	naractei	r Area:	(ii) Ki	irrien	nuir F	ooth	ills									
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	ightarrow	\bigcirc	0	0	0	Currently two small/medium and one medium turbine	Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	No further proposals
									consented.	wind Turbines	Max. Numbers in Group	1-3	1-3				
											<i>Min Group Separation Distances (km)</i>	2-4	3-6				

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Most of LCA lies within Perth & Kinross but the northeastern edge encloses Glen Clova, forming the skyline.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Wind farms and turbines in Perth& Kinross, together with scattered turbines in Angus create Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines over much of the area including the part in Angus. There is no further capacity for turbines of any size within Angus.

Further windfarm proposed at Tullymurdoch would extend Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines type and create an area of Wind Turbine Landscape across the boundary between Highland Summits and Plateaux and Highland Foothills above Glen Isla.

Landscape Analysis:

Only suitable for turbines below 50m due to modest scale and the complexity of the landscape and sensitive receptors. Avoid prominent summits and sensitive areas

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consented development remains well within capacity. A proposed development of 9 large turbines at Carrach below Mile Hill was recently dismissed at appeal on grounds of landscape and visual impact.

				ER	TYP		AY 5	: HI		LLS	ize: Small/Medium-1	5-~30	m: M	odium	<u>)-30-</u> 2	<50m·	Medium/Large-50-280m
BASE account	LANDS	CAPE C	CAPACI d energy	TY (i.	.e. not	takir ent)	ng	oapad	CURRENT CONSENT DEVELOPMENT	PROPOSED LIMIT	'S TC) FUT	URE	DEV	ELOF	MENT (i.e. proposed a	
Landsc Wind E	ape Sen nergy D	isitivity t evelopm	io ient	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	oe Caj	pacity ine siz	ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	nainin acity lated	ig Lar to turb	idsca	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	v	M/L		٧L		Type(3)	Type(3)	S/M	Σ	M/L		٧L	
Landso	cape Cł	naracter	Area:	(iii) N	_ Ienm	uir F	oothi	lls								-	
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High		\bigcirc	0	0	0	11 turbines consented within or close to this area. Largest is 86m at Memus on boundary with Strathmore. Other turbines are 4	Highland Foothills with no Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind Turbines	Highland Foothills with no Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind Turbines	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0	Proposed 17x135m turbine windfarm at Nathro above Glen Lethnot in neighbouring <i>Highland Summits and</i> <i>Plateaux</i> ; A further large
									small/medium and 5 medium further		Max. Numbers in Group	1-3	1-3				turbine proposed at Memus. One medium
									northeast, located on either side of the main ridge.		Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6				turbine at western end above Glen Clova and two in Strathmore at eastern end.
Landso	cape Cł	naracter	Area:	(iv) E	dzell	Foot	thills										
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	ightarrow	\bigcirc	0	0	0	Currently only two small/medium turbines consented in the north.	Highland Foothills with No Wind Turbines/	Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	0	Two medium/large (74m) turbines at Witton in the west above West Water.
										Turbines	Max. Numbers in Group	1-3	1-3				
											<i>Min Group Separation Distances (km)</i>	2-4	3-6				

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Simpler than western LCAs. Predominantly a long ridge of hills parallel to Strathmore with parallel small glens on the highland side. Only suitable for turbines below 50m. Turbines should not be sited on prominent ridgelines or affect the sensitive settings of the hillforts.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consented development remains mainly within capacity, although the Memus turbine is significantly larger than the recommended maximum 50m. Turbines located near the Caterthuns are small enough not to affect setting/view. Remaining capacity for siting further turbines restricted by current turbines.

The proposed turbines at Nathro would dominate the Menmuir LCA. The further large turbine at Memus would reinforce the effects of the consented turbine. Current proposals elsewhere may create peripheral areas of *Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines* at south and west edges of the LCA.

Landscape Analysis:

Smallest of the LCAs. Predominantly a single hill above Strathmore with lower slopes of *Highland Summits and Plateaux* to the north. Only suitable for turbines below 50m. Consideration should be given to the setting of and views from Edzell Castle, grounds and village.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consented development remains well within capacity.

The proposed turbines at Witton are significantly taller than the recommended 50m maximum for this LCA and *Middle Highland Glens* LCA, although would not affect the setting of Edzell castle and village.

GUIDANCE: TAY5 HIGHLAND FOOTHILLS

Detailed Guidance for Highland Foothills LCT

The Highland Foothills LCT is not suitable for larger turbines of 50m or greater height due to their modest scale and elevation and complexity of topography, landscape patterns and settled character in many parts. There is capacity for occasional small/medium and medium turbines within the LCAs. Locate turbines in the enclosed farmland or on lower slopes of the hills, avoiding skylines and reducing intervisibility between turbine groups. The height of turbines should relate to the scale of the landscape, with particular regard to the vertical scale of the hills. Locate larger turbines away from the smaller scale hills and valleys to avoid diminishing the apparent scale of the slopes or breaking the skyline. Proximity to residential properties or settlements may also limit opportunities for locating larger turbines and/or turbine groups. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

Position turbines to relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings. Separation between turbine groupings should ensure that clear intervisibility is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes, separation distances and/or through the intervention of landforms and tree groups. Place smaller turbines in locations where they are not close to, or readily intervisible with, larger turbines. Smaller turbines should be more closely associated with buildings. Care should be taken to avoid visual clutter when locating larger turbines in close proximity to the electricity transmission line that passes through all the LCAs excepting the Alyth Foothills.

Specific Guidance for Individual LCAs

ALYTH FOOTHILLS (i)

Due to windfarm development in Perth & Kinross in combination with consented turbines in the Angus area, no further turbine development is recommended.

KIRRIEMUIR FOOTHILLS (ii)

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium and medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

Only suitable for turbines below 50m, with the medium size turbines sited on lower ground towards Strathmore and small/medium turbines elsewhere. There should be no turbines in the more sensitive settings such as Balintore Castle, Ascreavie and Loch of Lintrathen. Turbines should not be located near the summit of Mile Hill due to its wide prominence. The currently consented three small/ medium and medium turbines are well within the capacity of the landscape.

(iii) MENMUIR FOOTHILLS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium and medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

The Menmuir Foothills are only suitable for turbines below 50m due to their limited scale. Do not site turbines on or close to the main ridgeline overlooking Strathmore, where they may break the horizon. Protect the views from and sensitive settings of the hillforts by limiting development to sensitively sited smaller turbines, or no turbines, within approximately 2km. Turbines should not be located north of the trees in Glen Ogil, which lies in the Draft Lochnagar and Mount Keen Core Area of Wild Land.

There are several consented small/medium and medium turbines located in this LCA, which will reduce the capacity for accommodating further turbines. The large (86m) turbine at Memus is significantly larger than the recommended limit of 50m. This will dominate its surroundings, restricting the scope for accommodating further turbines in its vicinity, both in the Highland Foothills and the adjacent Broad Valley Lowland.



Menmuir Foothills showing the transition in elevation between Strathmore and the Highland Summits and Plateaux and White Caterthun hillfort (right) Turbines should avoid the skyline and not affect the setting of the hillfort.

(iv) EDZELL FOOTHILLS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Highland Foothills with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium and medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

The Edzell Foothills are only suitable for turbines below 50m due to their limited scale. In this LCA consideration should be given to the setting of and views from Edzell Castle and Edzell village by not siting larger turbines on the southern or eastern side of Hill of Edzell.

TAY8: IGNEOUS HILLS

The Sidlaw Hills are a varied landscape of distinctive, predominantly steep open hills and enclosed valley farmland that extends through Perth & Kinross and Angus, where they merge into the Dipslope Farmland and Forfar Hills. The hills provide a northern backdrop to Dundee and define the southern edge of Strathmore to the north.

The hills are crossed at lower points by a number of roads, including the A90. The farmland associated with these lower passes divides the hills into at least four main groupings. The largest area uncrossed by roads, with the highest hills, lies between the A928 in the east and B954 in the west. Craigowl Hill rises to 455m AOD and is very prominent when seen from the A90, particularly due to the several transmission towers and infrastructure located on its summit and slopes.

Typically there is a 150-250m height difference between ridges and the surrounding Dipslope Farmland and Broad Valley Lowland. This is less to the east of the A90 around Carrot Hill (259m) where the hills are lower, more rounded and merge with the Dipslope Farmland.

This landscape varies around a medium scale; from enclosed valley farmland to larger open heather/ grassland hillsides and ridges. Whilst the highest hills have an open, upland character, the majority of smaller hills have a more lowland character, particularly when compared with the highlands visible to the north across Strathmore. There are a number of hillforts and noted panoramic viewpoints within the Sidlaws, including Kinpurney Hill, Auchterhouse Hill and Carrot Hill. These have extensive views across the surrounding lowlands including Strathmore and the Dipslope Farmland.

There are four electricity transmission lines crossing the hills at various points. The only operational windfarm in Angus is located around Ark Hill, in the central part of the hills.



Table 6.1(d): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Igneous Hills

LAND	DSCAP	PE CH/		TER	TYI	PET	AY 8	B: IG	NEOUS HILLS								
BASE account	LANDS	CAPE C	CAPACI	Capac ITY (i. / deve	e. nc	ot takin nent)	ng	Capa	CURRENT CONSEN	Size: Small/Medium=1 PROPOSED LIMIT development)	5-<30 S TC	om; Mo	URE	DEV	c50m; ELOP	Medium/Large=50-<80m MENT (i.e. proposed a	
Landso Wind E	cape Ser Energy D	nsitivity f evelopm	to nent	Lan (Rel	dsca ated	i pe Ca to turb	pacity	y ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Ren Cap (Re	nainin acity lated	i g Lar to turk	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Μ	M/L	_	٨L			.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	S/M	Þ	M/L		٧L	
Lands	cape Cl	haracte	r Area:	Sidla	w Hi	ills											
Med	Med/ High	Med	Med				0	0	One windfarm with 8 large (81m) turbines at Ark Hill in central Sidlaws. One similar turbine 3km southwest at Scotston. Six other	Igneous Hills with Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Igneous Hills with Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines				0	0	Two windfarm proposals in the east: Frawney (5x100m turbines) and Govals (6x87m turbines) west of the A90.
									turbines at small/medium or medium mainly on		Max. Numbers in Group	1-3	1-3	1- 10			
									lower slopes		Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5- 10			

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

A varied landscape of distinctive steep hills and valley farmland. The hills provide a backdrop to Dundee to the south and define the southern edge of Strathmore to the north. Very visible from surrounding lowlands.

This landscape type is generally of a medium scale and suitable for turbines up to medium/large size. Large or very large turbines would be too tall for this scale of landform. Large groups of turbines would overwhelm other key elements of the character. Proposals should also keep clear of key skyline ridges and summits.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current developments occupy capacity in the centre of the hills but not east or west. At 81m the Ark Hill and Scotston turbines are at the upper end of acceptable height.

Current proposals at Govals and Frawney would exceed recommended turbine height, group numbers, and separation if both were consented.

A proposal for Dodd Hill (5x126.5m) east of A90 was recently refused due to adverse landscape and visual impacts relating to the size of the turbines.

GUIDANCE: TAY8 IGNEOUS HILLS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Igneous Hills with Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium; medium); 1-10 (medium/large)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

The Igneous Hills have the capacity to accommodate smaller windfarms of up to 10 medium/large turbines; clusters of smaller turbines and single turbines that are in well separated groupings; as an overall Landscape with Wind Turbines. Large or very large turbines would be out of scale with the medium size hill landform and larger groups of turbines would overwhelm the pattern of distinctively shaped and separated hill landforms and small valleys that characterise much of this LCA.

Windfarms should not be located close to key skyline ridges and summits, and particularly the escarpments facing south over Dundee and the Firth of Tay and north over Strathmore. These areas are highly visible to a large resident and travelling population. Make use of surrounding landforms in siting turbines to limit visibility and skylining.

Separate the turbine groupings sufficiently to ensure they do not dominate the Igneous Hills character of distinctive, separate hills and ridges. This should be achieved by respecting the pattern of ridges and valleys and avoiding close intervisibility between turbine groupings on nearby hilltops. Do not place larger developments in close proximity to key panoramic viewpoints such as Kinpurney or Auchterhouse Hills.

Small/medium and medium turbines should be clustered in smaller groups (3 or less), situated in valley areas associated with farms and enclosed land so that they are seen as a distinctly separate development type to the larger turbines in windfarms on open hillsides and ridges.



Turbines should be carefully positioned in relation to the numerous electricity transmission lines and transmission masts in these hills in order to avoid cumulative clutter.

The Sidlaw Hills accommodate the only currently consented windfarm in Angus, with 8x81m turbines at Ark Hill and a single 81m turbine 2km to the southwest at Scotston. Although falling into the 'large' category these are just over the proposed 80m height limit for further development.



Scotston Turbine



Ark Hill Windfarm



The Sidlaw Hills can accommodate small to medium size windfarms and single turbines up to ca. 80m tall if well separated and sited on the lower ridges of open hillside. Smaller turbines can be accommodated in the same view if sited in lower enclosed land nearer to houses and roads

TAY 10: BROAD VALLEY LOWLAND

The Broad Valley Lowland comprises two LCAs (Strathmore and the Lower South and North Esk Valleys) located in Strathmore; a broad, settled, lowland agricultural valley stretching over 60km from the River Tay in Perthshire in the southwest through Angus to Aberdeenshire in the northeast. Whilst the horizontal topographic scale and backdrop is large, this is a settled fertile landscape with many settlements and human scale features. The LCAs are similar but there are potentially significant variations across them relating to topography. These are identified as smaller numbered sub-areas within the main types.

STRATHMORE

This LCA is broader, more open and framed by higher hills to the south compared with the Lower South & North Esk.

Whilst appearing from a distance to have a flat or gently sloping floor, there are significant variations in topography in one part of the valley:

(i) A sub-area of complex rolling fluvioglacial landforms are concentrated at south and south east of Kirriemuir. Field sizes in this area are smaller and less regular. Sand and gravel extraction is taking place at Powmyre.



LOWER SOUTH AND NORTH ESK VALLEYS

Compared to the Strathmore LCA west of Forfar this LCA is narrower and less enclosed to the south by topography. It is similarly dominated by arable farmland but has two significant rivers, a greater level of tree cover and more topographic variation than the Strathmore LCA. Whilst the LCA as a whole conforms with the Broad Valley Lowland type, there are a number of smaller, distinct topographic subareas lying within it that have potentially differing capacities for wind energy development:

- (ii) The corridor of the South Esk between Glen Clova and Brechin is encompasses the meandering course of the river which is a focus to the landscape. It is generally characterised by a degree of topographic enclosure; more shelter and enclosure by mature trees, a number of large houses and designed landscapes. There are a number of bridges and place name references to water mills.
- (iii) A significant area lying between the A90 and the Menmuir Hills is topographically separated by a curved ridge of land from the area draining into the South Esk. This area of undulating arable land drains to the North Esk and not to Montrose Basin. The ridge screens the land to the north from the A90 corridor.
- (iv) An elevated area at Muir of Pert between Brechin, the A90 and Montrose, which separates the North Esk and Montrose Basin. Although included in the Broad Valley Lowland it rises to a plateau of over 100m AOD, has steep escarpments to the north and south, and has many of the more exposed characteristics of the Dipslope Farmland.



7933 / Final/ March 2014

Table 6.1(e): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Broad Valley Lowland

LAND	LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE TAY 10: BROAD VALLEY LOWLAND																
Key:) No Ca	pacity) Low (Capac	;ity	Me	dium	Capac	tity High Capacity	Turbine S	Size: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Mo	edium	1=30-<	<50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n
BASE LANDSCAPE CAPACITY (i.e. not taking account of current wind energy development)									CURRENT CONSENT	PROPOSED LIMITS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (i.e. proposed development)							
Landsc Wind E	to nent	Landscape Capacity (Related to turbine size)					Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	acity lated	g Lan to turb	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications		
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value						-) - (-)	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L			
Lands	cape Cł	e Character Area: Strathmore										<u>.</u>					
Med	Med/ High	Med	Med	•	•	0	0	0	4 small/medium turbines on southern side near Eassie and two medium near Westmuir on north side. Few similar within neighbouring P&K section of Strathmore.	Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	0	0	0	Currently no further proposals
											Max. Numbers in	1-5	1-3				
											Group Min Group Separation	2-4	4-8				
											Distances (km)						
Lands	cape Ch	naracte	r Area:	Lowe	er So	uth a	nd No	orth E	Esk Valleys								
Med	Med/ High	Med	Med			\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	A significant number (over 25) turbines throughout or adjacent to this LCA. All single or paired and predominantly	Broad Valley Lowland with No Wind Turbines Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind	Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	Further proposals include 6 individual/paired medium scale turbines in Angus and further similar across Aberdeenshire
									small/medium or medium. Although there	Turbines	Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-3	1			border in Howe of Mearns. Also in nearby <i>Highland Foothills</i> another large (86m) turbine at Memus, close to the consented turbine.
									are also three medium/large and one large (at Memus within the <i>Highland Foothills</i>). Most significant concentration is in the east on an area of higher ground between Brechin		Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5- 10			

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Broader, more open and framed by higher hills to the south compared with the Lower South & North Esk. Whilst appearing from a distance to have a flat or gently sloping floor, there are significant variations in topography in one part of the valley:

The scale of the landscape in the flatter areas would be capable of accommodating turbines up to medium/ large size. However the density of settlement and other smaller reference features and extent of the more complex topography in (i) would severely limit the opportunity for siting turbines of up to 80m height. Turbines should be limited to 50m height.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines: Current consented turbines are well within the capacity of this area.

Landscape Analysis:

Narrower, less enclosed to the south by topography and more tree-covered than Strathmore LCA to the west. There are a number of distinctive smaller subareas within the LCA having potentially differing capacities for wind energy development:

- (ii) The course of the South Esk between Glen Clova and Brechin is a more enclosed landscape focused around the meandering river. There is less capacity for wind turbine development in this area.
- (iii) A significant area lying between the A90 and the Menmuir Hills is topographically separated from the area draining into the South Esk by a curved

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE TAY 10: BROAD VALLEY LOWLAND

e Size: Small/Medium=15-<30m; Medium=30-<50m; Medium/Large=50-<80m; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125r	m+

BASE LANDSCAPE CAPACITY (i.e. not taking account of current wind energy development) CURRENT CONSENT DEVELOPMENT											TED	D PROPOSED LIMITS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (i.e. proposed acceptable development)									
Landscar Wind Ene	Landscape Capacity (Related to turbine size)						Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	acity lated	ig Lar to turk	idsca bine s	i pe ize)	Current Applications	Analysis & Guidelines (Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)					
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	S/M M		M M/L		M/L		٨L		Type(3)	i ype(s)	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L		
	Se			S/M	Σ		2	-		A90 and Montrose Basin. This pattern continues across the Aberdeenshire border into Howe of Mearns.							N I		 ridge of land. The ridge would be visual sensitive to turbine development but the north would be screened from the Acorridor. (iv) An elevated area around Muir of Pert be Brechin, the A90 and Montrose, which the North Esk and Montrose Basin. This many of the more exposed characterist <i>Dipslope Farmland</i> and is the sub-area suited for wind turbine development. Comments on Consented and Proposed The Current consented small/medium, medium a medium/large turbines are concentrated in a and (iv), creating a <i>Broad Valley Lowland win Turbines</i> north and east of Brechin. Further size turbines proposed would slightly extend intensify this landscape type towards the hig Elsewhere the density of development is clos <i>Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind</i> The nearby consented and proposed turbines 		

ally e area to ۹90

etween separates is has tics of the a most

Turbines:

nd reas (iii) ith Wind medium and nland area.

ser to l Turbines. s at LCT or

GUIDANCE: TAY10 BROAD VALLEY LOWLAND

STRATHMORE

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium); 1-3 (medium).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium) and 4-8km (medium).

Detailed Guidance

The scale of the landscape in the flatter areas of Strathmore would be capable of accommodating turbines up to medium/large size. However the density of settlement and other smaller reference features and extent of the more complex topography in the area of complex fluvioglacial landforms (i) limits the opportunity for accommodating turbines of up to 80m height. Turbines should therefore be limited to less than 50m height (medium or small/medium).



Typical open arable Strathmore landscape



Complex fluvioglacial landforms in sub-area (i) contrast with the flatter landform characteristic of most of Strathmore

Position turbines so that they clearly relate to landscape features such as field boundaries and larger farm buildings. Positioning in relation to the electricity transmission line in the west should also be carefully considered to avoid cumulative visual clutter.

Separate turbine groupings sufficiently to ensure that clear intervisibility between the groupings is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting belts of tree planting and landforms to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

In particular it will be possible to use tree belts and landforms to discretely accommodate small/medium turbines in area (i), whereas the siting of medium turbines would be more appropriate to the flatter landforms in the rest of the LCA. Care should be taken in the siting of medium size turbines close to sensitive locations such as the Glamis Designed Landscape, Kirriemuir Camera Obscura and Loch of Kinnordy.

LOWER SOUTH AND NORTH ESK VALLEYS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium); 1-3 (medium); 1 (medium/large).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

This LCA offers varied potential for accommodating wind turbines, due to the variations in topography, but overall should be Broad Valley Lowland with Occasional Wind Turbines.

Allow sufficient separation between turbine groupings to ensure that the LCA as a whole is not dominated and that clear intervisibility between turbine groupings is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting the extensive areas of tree planting and topographic variations to limit views and intervisibility. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

Sub-area (ii) along the course of the South Esk is less suited to wind turbine development. Turbine sizes should predominantly be small/medium with some medium in more open areas. There should be no medium/large turbines. Relate positioning of turbines clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, river terraces and larger farm buildings. Position turbines carefully to avoid cumulative clutter with the electricity transmission lines that cross the river at Cortachy and west of Brechin. Avoid positioning larger turbines near/within the Designed Landscapes at Cortachy and Brechin Castle and within the setting of listed buildings such as the two castles and the village of Tannadice. Currently only one small/medium turbine is located in this sub-area.

Sub-area (iii) between the A90 and the Menmuir Hills provides both opportunity and limitations for accommodating turbines. There is a sometimes sharp ridge of land forming the southern boundary, which lies above the Noran Water and South Esk between Noranside and the A90 at Brechin. This visually separates the river corridors from an extensive area of farmland which drains north-eastwards to the North Esk. Turbines should not be placed close to the crest of the ridge; small/medium turbines

would be suitable on the south side of the ridge above the A90 and medium turbines in the extensive undulating farmland to the north. There is sufficient separation from the base of the Menmuir Hills to the Caterthun hillforts for turbines in this LCA not to affect the setting of these monuments. There are two medium and one small/medium turbines in or adjacent to this area. One medium/large turbine (77m) is located at Milton of Balhall. This is larger than the recommended maximum limit of 50m, but is placed well back from the sensitive ridge to the south and the modestly scaled Menmuir Hills to the north. Nevertheless it reduces capacity for other wind turbines in the west of the sub area.



Sub-area (iii) between the A90 and the Menmuir Hills seen looking south from the foot of the Menmuir Hills The extensive area is partially enclosed by a ridge to the south

Muir of Pert (sub-area iv) has the highest capacity for wind turbines, being more elevated and open than other parts of the LCA and therefore more compatible in landscape character terms. The area is suitable for turbine sizes up to 80m. Medium/large turbines should be single and located towards the middle of the area rather than the modestly scaled escarpments above Strathmore and Montrose Basin, including the Designed Landscape of House of Dun, where they would be too dominant. Avoid proximity of larger turbines to the two electricity transmission lines skirting this area.



The elevated Muir of Pert sub-area (iv) (middle ground above the trees) is most suited in character for wind turbine development and already accommodates several turbines

There is a significant number of turbines already consented in this area, varying from small/medium to medium/large, and creating an area of *Broad Valley Lowland with Wind Turbines*. Further turbines should be limited in number and located at suitable separation distances from these to avoid creating areas of *Wind Turbine Landscape*.

Remaining areas of the LCA outside the three sub-areas currently have few consented small and medium turbines. These are within the proposed capacity, being of an appropriate size and separation. Nevertheless the large Memus turbine is located within 500m of the LCA and this will restrict the potential for locating turbines within close proximity. Potentially sensitive locations include the residential edges of the three main settlements within or bordering this LCA and the setting of Edzell castle which lies just north of the boundary. Limit turbine sizes and numbers in these locations.

There are potential cross boundary cumulative effects with Aberdeenshire at the north eastern boundary of this LCA. Within the *Agricultural Heartlands* in Aberdeenshire there are 8 medium turbines consented within ca. 5km of the boundary; Tullo windfarm within 10km and applications for several further medium and medium/large turbines within 5km.

Care should be taken to ensure that the *Landscape with Wind Turbines* in Aberdeenshire does not spread across the border and coalesce with concentrations of turbines in Angus. In particular, the North Esk river corridor currently forms a gap between the concentrations of turbines located in the higher areas of Muir of Pert (sub-area iv) and the Hill of Garvock in Aberdeenshire. Development here should be limited to occasional small/medium turbines.



Tullo windfarm viewed across the north eastern part of the Lower South and North Esk Valleys. A further ten turbines are to be added.

TAY12: LOW MOORLAND HILLS

The Low Moorland Hills LCA is situated to the east and south of Forfar and lies between Strathmore and the Dipslope Farmland, continuing a gradually diminishing line of hills from the Sidlaws in the west to near sea level farmland at the Montrose Basin in the east. The LCA has been divided into two subareas on the basis of differences in landscape character and sensitivity: the Forfar Hills in the south and west and Montreathmont Moor in the north and east.

(i) FORFAR HILLS

A varied landscape of small steep hills and ridges set within a wider area of medium scale rolling/undulating farmland. The hills provide a backdrop to Forfar and define the southern edge of the South Esk section of Strathmore. Most of the hills are very visible from the A90. There are a number of hillforts and viewpoints located on the hills and other points of interest such as the standing stones at Aberlemno. There are scattered small settlements throughout the farmland, connected by a network of

small lanes, sometimes twisting over the hills. The distinctive Rescobie Lochs and A932 lie in a valley separating the distinctly bald ridges north east of Forfar from the more tree covered hills to the east and south of the town. An electricity transmission line crosses the northern edge of the LCA at Hill of Finavon. This sub-area has higher visual sensitivity and complex, modest scale landforms compared with the sub-area further to the east.

(ii) MONTREATHMONT MOOR

This LCA, lying east of the Forfar Hills, is distinctly different in character. The landform is predominantly gently undulating and gradually slopes down to the lower Montrose Basin LCA to the east. There are no distinctive hill landforms, although the northern edge forms an escarpment of some 100m descending to the River South Esk. It is a medium to large scale farming and forestry landscape dominated by Montreathmont Forest which is a distinctively large mature lowland forest dominated by coniferous planting. It is well populated by scattered properties and farmhouses in the farmland areas outside the forest, with a network of small roads.



Table 6.1(f): Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Low Moorland Hills

LAND	LANDSCAPE CHARACTER TYPE TAY 12: LOW MOORLAND HILLS																	
Key:) No Ca	pacity	Low	Capac	ity	Me	dium	Capad	High Capacity	Turbine S	ize: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	=30-<	:50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n	
BASE LANDSCAPE CAPACITY (i.e. not taking account of current wind energy development)									CURRENT CONSENT	PROPOSED LIMITS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (i.e. proposed development)								
Landscape Sensitivity to Wind Energy DevelopmentLandscape Capacity (Related to turbine size)							p acity ine siz	ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	nainin acity lated 1	g Lan to turb	i dsca j	Current Applications		
Landscape Character Sensitivitv	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	Value								S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L		
Lands	cape Cł	naractei	Area:	Forfa	r Hill	s Su	b Are	ea: <i>(i)</i>	(i) Forfar Hills									
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med			0	0	0	5 medium size turbines scattered south of Forfar. One medium/ large (77m) turbine at Pickerton just outwith sub area boundary north of Guthrie.	Low Moorland Hills with Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Low Moorland Hills with Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	0	0	0	Two medium turbines either side of Turin Hill east of Forfar and one medium/large (66m) turbine on southern boundary with <i>Dipslope</i>	
											Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-3				<i>Farmland</i> at Letham.	
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6					
											South of Forfar	2-4	2-4					
Lands	cape Cł	naracter	· Area:	Forfa	r Hill	s Su	b Are	ea: <i>(ii</i>) Montreathmont Moo	r		1				<u> </u>		
Med/ Low	Med	Med	Med				0	\bigcirc	Currently one medium/large turbine in the S at Pickerton and one small/medium	Low Moorland Hills with Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Low Moorland Hills with Occasional Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	No current applications.	
									consented.		Max. Numbers in	1-5	1-3	1-3				
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5- 10				

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

A varied landscape of small steep hills and rolling/undulating farmland. Both the higher visual sensitivity and complex, modest scale landforms indicate that only small groups of turbines up to 50m would be appropriate to this area.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current medium turbines south of Forfar within capacity of this area although two turbines on Fotheringham Hill are high up the hillside.

Proposals for turbines at Turin Hill are within capacity and suitably located. Medium/large turbine N of Letham larger than recommended maximum size. Recent proposal for three large turbines at Finavon Hill dismissed at appeal due to adverse landscape/visual impacts relating to the size of the turbines.

Landscape analysis:

Medium to large scale farming and forestry landscape dominated by Montreathmont forest. Simple undulating landform with no distinctive hills. It is well populated agricultural land outside the forest. The landscape is able to accommodate larger turbine sizes.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

The current consented turbines fall well within capacity. Pickerton turbine is larger than maximum for adjacent sub-area, which it influences.

A proposal for 11 very large turbines in Montreathmont Forest was dismissed at appeal in 2009 due to adverse landscape and visual effects, particularly on the amenity of surrounding properties.

GUIDANCE: TAY12 LOW MOORLAND HILLS

(i) FORFAR HILLS

Proposed Limits to Future Development:

Low Moorland Hills with Occasional Wind Turbines (east of Forfar)

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium; medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

Low Moorland Hills with Wind Turbines (south of Forfar)

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium); 1-3 (medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium and medium)

Detailed Guidance

Locate turbines in the enclosed farmland or on lower slopes of the hills, avoiding skylines and reducing intervisibility between turbine groups. Relate the height of turbines to the scale of the landscape, with particular regard to the vertical scale of the hills. Larger turbines should be located away from the smaller scale hills and hill slopes to avoid diminishing the apparent scale of the slopes or breaking the skyline. Proximity to residential properties or settlements may also limit opportunities for locating larger turbines and/or turbine groups. Site turbines away from the electricity transmission line on Hill of Finavon to avoid cumulative clutter.

Position turbines so that they relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings. Separate turbine groupings sufficiently to ensure that clear intervisibility is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes, separation distances and/or the intervention of landforms and tree groups. Place smaller turbines in locations where they are not close to, or readily intervisible with, larger turbines and are more closely associated with built development. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.



Forfar Hills cannot accommodate larger turbines without adverse scale effects. Small/medium or medium turbines will not dominate the landforms. Turbine groups in the enclosed farmland can also be visually separated. Smaller turbines may be accommodated in the same view if closely associated with buildings

There is a higher proportion of enclosed farmland south of Forfar compared with the greater preponderance of open hills to the east. A number of medium size turbines are already consented in this area. Given the current pattern of development further medium size turbines could be located in this area to create a landscape with wind turbines between hills. Separation of turbines/groups by distance or landform should be sufficient to avoid loose clustering of turbines within or between groupings dominating an area. Turbines should be located to avoid breaking the skyline on Balmashanner Hill above Forfar.

(ii) MONTREATHMONT MOOR

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Low Moorland Hills with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large) Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium and medium); 1-3 (medium/large) Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

Turbines can be located in most parts of this undulating landscape; the farmland area or the forest, with the key determining issues being the need to avoid domination of the landscape character and of views from residential properties. The size of turbines should relate to the scale of the landscape, which is principally determined by the pattern of field boundaries and forestry but also by proximity to features such as buildings and small tree groups. To the north the escarpment above Strathmore forms a taller and steeper landform than elsewhere in the sub-area.

Locate larger turbines (medium/large) in areas further from residential properties, the forest being the most suitable area in terms of low population density and uniform landscape character. Smaller size turbines (small/medium, medium and potentially medium/large) are more suitably sited in farmland areas. Proximity to residential properties or settlements may limit opportunities for locating larger turbines and/or turbine groups.

Position turbines so that they relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, rolling ridges and farm buildings. Within the forest existing clearings would be most suitable and the most mature and diverse areas should be avoided. Separate turbine groupings sufficiently to ensure that the landscape is not dominated and that significant areas with clear intervisibility between developments is infrequent. This may be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting areas of trees and forestry to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

Avoid locating medium/large turbines close to the escarpment slope above Strathmore (typically rising 60m-100m from valley floor) and to the eastern Forfar Hills (ranging from 50m-140m higher than the farmland). The turbines would dominate the modest scale of these landforms.
TAY13: DIPSLOPE FARMLAND

The *Dipslope Farmland* LCA is an extensive area of lowland farmland extending from Dundee in the west to Montrose in the north. It slopes gradually from the Sidlaw and Forfar Hills in the north and west to near sea level in the south and east. At over 40km by a maximum of 15km the often open character is dominated by productive predominantly arable land use with simple geometric field patterns. Nevertheless there are subtle variations according to elevation, tree cover and surrounding landscape context. Generally medium scale, but with areas of medium-large scale, as well as more intimate settled areas. The LCA has been divided into six sub-areas on the basis of differences in landscape character and potential sensitivity to wind energy. There is a linear ridge which delineates the different relationship of *Dipslope Farmland* with the coast to the south and undulating plateau to the north, defining the scale of acceptable turbines. This is further developed in the detailed sub-area guidance.

(i) TEALING FARMLAND

The sub-area north of Dundee is characterised by the backdrop of the Sidlaw Hills and the influence of development including several electricity transmission lines converging on a major substation (proposed for expansion); the A90 and a higher density of settlement, although Dundee itself is substantially screened from areas north of the city by a rounded ridgeline. Nevertheless there are areas of less developed character in the east and north where the farmland merges into the lower slopes of the Sidlaw Hills.



Electricity lines, settlement and lines of trees characterise the Tealing Farmland

(ii) CROMBIE/ MONIKIE FARMLAND

The sub-area northeast of Dundee is less contained to the north than sub-area (i) and is characterised by farmland and extensive woodland and forestry planting. There is settlement over much of the area, two country parks and estate policies of the former Panmure house. This has a slightly smaller more enclosed scale than much of the surrounding *Dipslope Farmland*. It is visually sensitive due to its proximity to roads, settlements and nearby hills, although tree cover limits visibility in many areas. It is crossed by an electricity transmission line.

(iii) REDFORD FARMLAND

This centrally placed sub-area is the largest scale, highest and most open within the *Dipslope Farmland*. This is partly reflected in the scale of farms and field sizes. There are significant areas of large open fields with scattered settlement and roads, although it borders more populated areas. There are more sensitive areas including the Guynd designed landscape, and to the south of the linear ridge referred to above, proximity to the *Coast* LCA and settlements. An electricity transmission line crosses the southern part, descending to Arbroath.



Open panoramic views near Redford

(iv) LETHAM, LUNAN WATER AND ARBROATH VALLEYS

This sub-area, lying between three areas of higher *Dipslope Farmland* and the *Low Moorland Hills*, follows the Lunan Water and other more minor drainage lines flowing to Arbroath. In places there is a distinct valley landform. There is extensive settlement and road network through much of the area. This has a smaller more enclosed scale than the higher areas of *Dipslope Farmland* and is visually sensitive due to the higher resident population. There are designed landscapes and listed buildings at Guthrie and Pitmuies in the north.



More enclosed landscape in the Lunan Valley

(v) ETHIE FARMLAND

This small sub-area of higher farmland is adjacent to the coast and bordered on the inland sides by the Lunan Water and other drainage lines flowing to Arbroath. Settlement and the road network are relatively sparse. There are two large houses with policies that operate as country house hotels. The high exposed boundary with a *Coast with Cliffs* LCA is potentially sensitive.

(vi) ROSSIE MOOR

This sub-area of isolated higher ground at the north eastern end of the LCA is widely visible. It has coastal exposure, merging with the Usan *Coast with Cliffs* and Lunan Bay *Coast with Sand* LCAs to the east, and Montrose Basin to the north. It is also bordered by the Lunan Water to the south where it slopes into a distinctive valley. It forms a backdrop to Montrose Basin and town.

Settlement and the road network is relatively sparse and fields are often large scale.

A relatively extensive area of unimproved moorland popular with walkers lies on the higher ground. There is a designed landscape and listed buildings at Dunninald Castle.



Table 6.1(g) Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Dipslope Farmland

				red	TVP	ЕТ		3. D									
Kev:				Canac			dium	Canad	tity High Capacity	Turbine 9	Size: Small/Medium-1	5-<30	m: M	edium	-30	-50m-	Medium/Large-50-280n
ney.								oapat				0 < 00					
BASE	LANDS	CAPE C	CAPACI	TY (i. / deve	e. not elopm	t takir ent)	ng		CURRENT CONSENT DEVELOPMENT	TED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	STO) FUT	URE	DEVI	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed
Landso Wind E	cape Ser Energy D	nsitivity (evelopm	io ient	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	oe Ca o turb	pacity ine siz	/ ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	nainin acity lated	i g Lan to turb	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	¥	M/L	_	٨L) ()	S/M	Σ	M/L	_	۲L	
Lands	cape Cl	haractei	Area:	Sout	heast	t Ang	us Lo	owlar	nd Sub Area: (i)Tealin	g Farmland							
Med	Med	Med	Med			0	0	0	Currently a concentration of single and paired turbines ranging from small/medium to large between Dundee and the	Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	0	0	0	Currently no further applications within the area. Current application for windfarm with large
									Sidlaw Hills. Predominantly		Max. Numbers in	1-3	1-3				turbines in the southern edge of the Sidlaws at
									small/medium and medium, but Tealing		Group Min Group Separation	2-4	2-4				Frawney lies close to this area.
									turbine is over 90m		Distances (km)						
Lands	cape C	haractei	Area:	Sout	heast	t Ang	us Lo	owlar	nd Sub Area: (ii)Monil	kie/ Crombie Farmla	and						
Med	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High			\bigcirc	0	0	Currently one consented medium turbine in the north and one just east of boundary near Kirkbuddo	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional/ No Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind Turbines			\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	Currently applications for 2 medium turbines S of Kirkbuddo. Application for one medium/large turbine
											Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-3	1			N of A92 near Barry at New Downie.
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5- 10			

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape analysis:

This sub-area north of Dundee is characterised by the backdrop of the Sidlaw Hills and the influence of development. Limited opportunity for larger turbines due to potential scaling against hill backdrop and overbearing effects on residential amenity. Turbine development should follow established pattern of small/medium and medium turbines.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines: Current turbines are of varied sizes and lie in closely spaced clusters with potential capacity issues. The large Tealing turbine is significantly larger than other consented turbines.

Current applications for medium turbines would continue the established pattern of turbines. Current applications for windfarms in the southern Sidlaws would have strong visual influence on the east of this sub-area.

Landscape analysis:

This sub area has a slightly smaller more enclosed scale than the surrounding *Dipslope Farmland* and is visually sensitive due to its proximity to roads, settlements and nearby hills. Small/medium and medium turbines can be accommodated, but only limited opportunities for medium/large turbines in more open areas to the north.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consents and applications are within capacity

An application for 3 large turbines at East Skichen was turned down in 2009 due to visual impacts on the village and Country Park at Monikie.

Angus Council

LAND	SCAP	E CH/		ſER	ТҮР	'E T/	AY 1	3: D	IPSLOPE FARML	AND							
Key:) No Ca	pacity) Low (Capac	ity) Me	dium(Capac	tity High Capacity	Turbine S	Size: Small/Medium=1	5-<3	0m; M	edium	i=30-<	<50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80m
BASE accoun	LANDS [®]	CAPE C	CAPACI	ITY (i. y deve	e. not elopm	t takir ent)	ıg		CURRENT CONSENT	TED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	TS TO) FUT	URE	DEV	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed a
Landso Wind E	ape Sen nergy D	sitivity f evelopm	to nent	Land (Rel:	dscap ated t	oe Caj o turb	p acity ine siz	ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rer Cap (Re	mainir pacity elated	ng Lar	i dsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivitv	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨٢				S/M	Σ	M/L		٨٢	
Lands	cape Cł	naracte	r Area:	Sout	heast	t Ang	us Lo	owlar	nd Sub Area: (iii)Redf	ord Farmland							
Med	Med	Med	Med/ Low	•	•	ightarrow	0	0	Currently 1 medium/large turbine at Cononsyth on sub area boundary in the northeast; one medium	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional / No Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines	ightarrow			0	0	Current application for one medium turbine in the NE.
									east of Kirkbuddo and one near Hayhillock		Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-5	1-5			
											Group Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5-10			

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape analysis:

This sub-area is the largest scale, highest and most open within the *Dipslope Farmland* and this is partly reflected in the scale of farms and field sizes. There are areas with minimal settlement and roads although it borders the populated coastal area in the south. This has the highest capacity for wind energy in the *Dipslope Farmland* and can accommodate medium/large turbines, subject to local constraints. Groupings should remain relatively small and well separated to avoid overwhelming the underlying character. Turbines should not interfere with the ridge that marks the break of slope above the A92.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consented turbines and applications fall well within capacity.

A previous application for 3x110m turbines at Dusty Drum in the centre of this area was refused in 2009 due to aviation issues but also due to landscape and visual impacts. 7 very large turbines at Corse Hill between Carnoustie and Arbroath on the boundary with the Coast LCA were dismissed at appeal in 2013.

LANDS	CAP	E CHA		FER	ТҮР	PE T	AY 1	3: D	IPSLOPE FARML	ND							
Key:	No Ca	pacity) Low (Сарас	ity	Me	dium	Capac	High Capacity	Turbine S	ize: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	=30-<	< 50 m;	Medium/Large=50-<80m
BASE LA account o	ANDS(of curr	CAPE C ent winc	APACI	TY (i. / deve	e. not lopm	t takir ent)	ng		CURRENT CONSENT	ſED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	S TO	FUT	URE	DEV	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed a
Landscap Wind Ene	be Sen ergy De	sitivity t evelopm	o ent	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	oe Ca o turb	pacity ine siz	e)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Capa (Re	ainin acity ated t	g Lan to turb	dsca ine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	×	M/L	L	٧L				S/M	Μ	M/L	L	٨L	
Landsca	ipe Ch	aracter	Area:	Sout	heast	t Ang	jus Lo	owlan	d Sub Area: (iv)Letha	am, Lunan and Arbi	roath						
Med M	Med	Med	Med/ High			0	0	\bigcirc	Currently one small/medium consented turbine N of Friockheim and 2 to the south. One small/medium and one	Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines/ No Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ with wind Turbines	\bigcirc		\bigcirc	0	0	Currently scattered applications for 5 turbines (2 medium and 3 medium/ large) all lying on the sub area
									medium SE of Letham and 1 med/large on boundary with Redford sub area at Cononsyth.		Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-3				boundary.
											<i>Min Group Separation Distances (km)</i>	2-4	3-6				
Landsca	ipe Ch	aracter	Area:	Sout	heast	t Ang	jus Lo	owlan	d Sub Area: (v)Ethie	Farmland							
Med M	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med		\bigcirc	0	0	0	Currently one consented small/med turbine at Kinblethmont and two near the coast at Ethie.	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional/ No Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	0	0	0	One medium/large turbine near Lunan valley.
											Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-5				
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6				

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape analysis:

This sub-area, lying between three sub-areas of higher *Dipslope Farmland* and the *Low Moorland Hills*, follows the Lunan Water and other more minor drainage lines flowing to Arbroath. There is extensive settlement and road network throughout. This has a smaller more enclosed scale than much of the *Dipslope Farmland* and is visually sensitive. More suited to small/medium and medium turbines associated with settlement or intensive agriculture.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current turbines mainly within capacity. Three proposed medium/ large turbines along edge of Lunan valley and close to Letham are taller than recommended.

Landscape analysis:

This small sub-area of higher ground is adjacent to the coast, bordered by the Lunan Water and other drainage lines flowing to Arbroath. Settlement and road network is relatively sparse. There is capacity mainly for smaller turbines in small groupings. Max turbine size should be limited to 50m and should be set well back from the visually exposed coastal area.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current turbines within capacity but proposed medium/large turbine is taller than recommended.

LANI	DSCAP	E CHA		ſER	TYF	PE T	AY '	13: D	DIPSLOPE FARML	AND							
Key: BASE accourt	No Ca	CAPE C	CAPACI	Capao TY (i / devo	.e. no elopr	Me t takin ent)	ng	Capa	CURRENT CONSEN	Turbine S	PROPOSED LIMIT	5-<30 'S TO	m; M	URE	DEV	<50m; ELOF	Medium/Large=50-<80 MENT (i.e. proposed
Lands Wind E	cape Sen Energy D	isitivity f evelopm	to nent	Lan (Re	idsca lated t	be Ca to turb	pacity pine si	y ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape	Future Wind Energy Landscape	Rem Cap (Re	ainin acity lated	g Lan to turb	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	×	M/L	_	٨L			туре(з)	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L	
Lands	cape Ch	naracte	r Area:	Sout	heas	t Ang	gus L	owlai	nd Sub Area: (vi)Ross	sie Moor							
Med	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med	ightarrow		ightarrow	0	0	Currently 4 consented small/medium turbines in the northeast.	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional/ No Wind Turbines	Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines		\bigcirc	ightarrow	0	0	One application for a single medium/large turbine at Pamphry.
											Max. Numbers in Group	1-5	1-5	1-3			medium and medium/large turbine on edge of the sub area at
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-6	5- 10			Lunan Valley near Friockheim.

GUIDANCE: TAY13 DIPSLOPE FARMLAND

The Dipslope Farmland LCA is capable of accommodating wind energy development due to its scale, often open character and productive land use with simple geometric field patterns. The capacity varies according to subtle variations between the six sub-areas as described below. The sub-areas are identified on the basis of differences in landscape character and sensitivity to wind energy. There is a linear ridge which delineates the different relationship of *Dipslope Farmland* with the coast to the south and undulating plateau to the north, defining the scale of acceptable turbines. This theme is further developed in the relevant detailed sub-area guidance.

(i) TEALING FARMLAND

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium; medium).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium and medium)

Detailed Guidance

This sub-area has an establishing pattern of medium turbines at just under 50m, and small/medium turbines under 30m. One large (93m) turbine has been consented at the former Tealing airfield. Whilst medium/large turbines could theoretically be accommodated in this scale of landscape, continuation of the establishing development pattern is more appropriate. The medium turbines should primarily be located in central areas of the farmland, avoiding skyline effects on/ domination of Dundee suburbs and scale effects on the Sidlaw Hills to the north and west (slope heights varying from 100m-250m above adjacent farmland). Small/medium turbines can be accommodated closer to the Sidlaw escarpment. Proximity to residential properties may also limit opportunities for locating larger turbines and/or turbine groups.

m; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape analysis:

This sub-area of higher ground is adjacent to the coast, also bordered by the Lunan Water to the south and Montrose Basin to the north. Settlement and road network is relatively sparse and fields often large scale. There is capacity mainly for smaller turbines in small groupings. Medium/large turbines should be set well back from the coastal area.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Current consents and applications would not exceed capacity.

An application for 3x110m turbines at Mountboy near Rossie School was dismissed on appeal in 2009. Two very large (137m) turbines at GSK Montrose adjacent to this area were dismissed on appeal. Both due partly to landscape and visual impacts.

Relate turbines clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings. Carefully assess positioning in relation to the several electricity transmission lines and substation to avoid cumulative visual clutter.

Provide sufficient separation between turbine groupings to ensure that proximity and intervisibility is moderated and turbine groupings do not dominate the landscape or visually coalesce to create a Wind Turbine Landscape. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes, separation distances and/or the intervention of landforms and tree groups. Existing small/medium turbines are often screened from longer distance visibility by trees. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

(ii) CROMBIE/ MONIKIE FARMLAND

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium; medium); 1-3 (medium/large).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

The principal concern in this sub-area is to avoid locating larger turbines close to visually sensitive areas including settlements, country parks and listed buildings. An application for 3 large turbines at East Skichen was turned down in 2009 due to visual impacts on the village and Country Park at Monikie.

Medium/large turbines may be located in the limited more open larger scale areas to the north of Monikie and Crombie.

Position of turbines so as to relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings. Positioning in relation to the electricity transmission line should be carefully considered to avoid cumulative clutter.

Allow sufficient separation between turbine groupings to ensure that the landscape is not dominated and that clear intervisibility between turbine groupings is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting the extensive areas of trees and forestry in this sub-area to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation. Use tree belts to discretely accommodate small/medium turbines amongst larger turbines in this area.

(iii) REDFORD FARMLAND

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium; medium and medium/large); 1-3 (large).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium and medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

This sub-area has the highest underlying capacity for wind energy in the Dipslope Farmland and is capable of accommodating medium/large turbines, subject to local constraints. It is noted that a previous application for 3 large (110m) turbines at Dusty Drum in the centre of this area was recommended for refusal in 2009 due to aviation issues but also due to landscape and visual impacts. However a single 67m turbine is now operational at Cononsyth in the north.

The largest size turbines (medium/large) would be most suitable in the largest scale areas located in the centre and north of the sub area. Turbine groupings should remain relatively small and well separated to avoid overwhelming the underlying character. Proximity to residential properties may also limit opportunities for locating larger turbines and/or turbine groups in most other locations. The designed landscape at Guynd and areas towards the Coast LCA are more sensitive and medium/large turbines should not be used in close proximity to these. A recent application for 7x125m turbines at Corse Hill on the boundary with the Coast LCA was dismissed at appeal in 2013. Medium/large turbines should be located north of the break in slope above the A92, north of a line marked by the course of the Rottenraw Burn from the B9128 in the west and then north of Kellyfield and Cuthlie in the east.

Relate turbines clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, ridges and larger farm buildings. Where the flatness and featurelessness of the terrain in some locations gives no obvious local clues, group composition from key viewpoints and other environmental factors should guide positioning. Positioning in relation to the electricity transmission line should also be carefully considered to avoid cumulative visual clutter.

Separation between turbine groupings should ensure that intervisibility is moderated and that turbine groupings do not dominate the landscape or visually coalesce to create a Wind Turbine Landscape. This may be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes, separation distances and/or the intervention of landforms and tree groups.

Due to the openness of the landscape in the highest part of this sub-area, mixing of turbine sizes will be more difficult to achieve than in areas to the east or west. It is therefore recommended that, where a suitable development pattern becomes established, this is followed. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

(iv) LETHAM, LUNAN WATER AND ARBROATH VALLEYS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines/ with Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium); 1-3 (medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

Detailed Guidance

This sub-area has a smaller more enclosed scale than much of the Dipslope Farmland, is visually sensitive and is more suited to smaller turbines associated with settlement or intensive agriculture.

The principal concern in this sub area is to avoid dominating smaller scale and/or sensitive landscapes, settlements and modest valley side landforms. This includes the two Designed Landscapes and numerous listed buildings at Guthrie and Pitmuies as well as the smaller settlements of Letham, Friockheim, Arbilot and Inverkeilor. Medium turbines would be most appropriate in flatter, larger scale

areas around Friockheim, whereas small/medium turbines (15-<30m tall) would be more appropriate to the smaller scale landscapes of the Lunan Valley where larger turbines could exceed the height of the valley slopes in locations where these are clearly expressed (50m-100m from valley floor to crest). Views towards and from Lunan Bay along the valley should also be protected.

Positioning turbines to relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings, industrial or mineral extraction locations. Avoid excessive skylining.

Separate groups of turbines sufficiently to ensure that the landscape is not dominated and that clear intervisibility between turbines is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting landforms and areas of trees to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.



Lunan Water Valley: Small/medium (15-30m high) turbines do not dominate the modest valley slope and blade tips can be aligned with trees and buildings on the horizon

(v) ETHIE FARMLAND

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium; medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium)

Detailed Guidance

This small sub-area has capacity mainly for small/medium and medium turbines in small groupings. The principal concern is to avoid dominating sensitive landscape settings associated with large estate houses (now hotels) at Kinblethmont and Ethie Castle and the coastal strip. Medium size turbines should be sited west of the A82 due to the high exposed position of the boundary with the Coast with Cliffs LCAs on this headland.

Position turbines so that they relate clearly to landscape features such as field boundaries, breaks in slope and larger farm buildings. Avoided excessive skylining or domination.

Separation between turbine groupings should be sufficient to ensure that clear intervisibility is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting landforms and areas of trees and forestry to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

(vi) ROSSIE MOOR

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Dipslope Farmland with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium); 30-<50m (medium); 50-<80m (medium/large).

Group Sizes: 1-5 (small/medium; medium); 1-3 (medium/large).

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium); 3-6km (medium); 5-10km (medium/large)

Detailed Guidance

Further to the findings of an inquiry which dismissed an application for three large (110m) turbines at Mountboy, the largest recommended size of turbine is 50-<80m (medium/large). These would be most suitable in the largest scale areas located in the centre and south of the sub area.

The principal issues in this sub-area include the avoidance of skylining effects on Montrose Basin and the visual domination of sensitive landscape and visual receptors, including residential properties, Rossie Moor, Rossie School, Dunninald designed landscape and A listed buildings. Medium/large turbines should be located well to the west of the A92 and well north of the Lunan Water to avoid effects on the coastal landscapes, Lunan valley and Lunan Bay.

Position turbines to relate clearly to landscape features such as ridges, field boundaries and larger farm buildings. In some locations the removal of field boundaries gives no obvious local clues for positioning. In this case landform, composition from key views and other environmental factors should take precedence.

Separation turbine groupings sufficiently to ensure that the landscape is not dominated and that clear intervisibility between turbines is infrequent. This can be achieved through selecting appropriate turbine sizes and separation distances and through exploiting landforms and areas of trees and forestry to screen views. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation.

TAY14: COAST

The *Coast* LCAs are mainly narrow, usually 1km or less in width. They comprise areas of predominantly arable coastal farmland which merge into coastal grasslands and scrub, or end abruptly at a beach or cliff. They are defined by their general openness and exposure to coastal views and weather. Inland most of these LCAs merge with the *Dipslope Farmland* LCA. Most of the *Coast* LCAs are visually sensitive due to their proximity to a large resident population and as a recreational destination, as exemplified by a concentration of paths and cycle routes.

14A: COAST WITH SAND

These mainly narrow *Coast* LCAs are low, open and exposed, comprising areas of coastal farmland and links golf courses which merge into coastal grasslands and sandy shorelines. They alternate with stretches of coastline with low cliffs and rocks (see below) and with coastal settlements. There are a number of caravan parks between the settlements and the LCAs. The most southern area, at Barry Links, is considerably wider than the rest of the LCAs, forming a sandy headland of stabilised dunes and slacks at the mouth of the Firth of Tay. Inland, three of the LCAs merge with *Dipslope Farmland*. The most northern area, at Montrose, differs slightly in that it is predominantly a links area with little agriculture, bordering the flat farmlands of the Montrose Basin and the edge of the town. Lunan Bay forms a crescent of sand framed by higher bluffs and is located by a castle and other areas of archaeological interest.

14A: COAST WITH CLIFFS

These narrow *Coast* LCAs are open and exposed. They alternate with stretches of coastline with sandy beaches (see above) and with coastal settlements. These areas are generally more elevated and exposed than the sandy LCAs, as their landforms end on rocky headlands comprising cliffs, escarpments and rocky pavements. The areas are more predominantly agricultural and there are no golf courses or caravan parks. Most of the cliffs and headlands are nevertheless of modest scale (maximum at Red Head is 81m AOD but most such as Scurdie Ness and Boddin Point are much lower). In the case of the Carnoustie LCA, there are rocky pavements bordering the sea, rather than cliffs, and the farmland is of a similar elevation to the neighbouring sandy LCA. All of all these LCAs merge inland with the *Dipslope Farmland* LCA. A notable feature of the *Coast with Cliffs* LCAs is that the cultivated farmland tends to end abruptly with a sharp boundary at the edge of the cliffs or escarpments. There are also occasional small fishing stations associated with coves or inlets and ancient forts on some of the higher cliffs.



Table 6.1(h) Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Coast

LAND	SCAP	E CHA	RACI	ER	ТҮР	E T/	AY 1	4: C	OAST								
Key:) No Ca	pacity) Low (Capac	ity	Med	dium	Capac	High Capacity	Turbine S	ize: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; Me	edium	=30-<	:50m;	Medium/Large=50-<80n
BASE accoun	LANDS t of curr	CAPE C ent wind	CAPACI	TY (i. v deve	.e. no elopm	t takin ent)	ng		CURRENT CONSENT	ſED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	'S TO	FUT	URE	DEVI	ELOP	MENT (i.e. proposed
Landsc Wind E	ape Sen nergy De	sitivity t evelopm	o ient	Lan (Rel	dscap ated t	oe Caj o turbi	p acity ine siz	e)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	nainin acity lated t	g Lan o turb	dsca ine siz	p e ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٧L				S/M	Σ	M/L	L	٨L	
14a Co	ast with	n Sand	Lands	cape	Char	acter	Area	is: Ba	arry Links, Elliott, Lun	an Bay, Montrose							
Med	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	\bigcirc	0	0	0	\bigcirc	2 small/medium turbines on Ethie headland above Lunan Bay.	Coast with No Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind Turbines	Coast with Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	No current applications Scoping for offshore windfarm at Inchcape and 125x197m turbines at Neart na Gaoithe
											Max. Numbers in Group	1-3					Angus coast
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4					
14b Co	oast with	h Cliffs	Lands	cape	Chai	acter	r Area	as: Ca	arnoustie, Auchmithie	e, Usan							
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	\bigcirc	0	0	0	\bigcirc	2 small/medium turbines by Ethie Mains above Lunan Bay lie within	Coast with No Wind Turbines/ Occasional Wind	Coast with Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	No current applications Scoping for offshore windfarm at Inchcape
									200m.	Turbines	Max. Numbers in Group	1-3					and 125x197m turbines at Neart na Gaoithe
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4					15km and 30km SE from Angus coast

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Low open exposed areas of coastal farmland, links and sandy beaches. Whilst the open windswept character is suitable for wind energy, larger scale turbines would be highly intrusive, being highly visible against the sea and sky and out of scale with the landform, low buildings and wind pruned trees. Turbines should be no larger than 30m and associated with built development.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Two small/medium turbines and no current applications. Offshore windfarm at 30km distance will have a slight visual effect on this LCT. Proposed Inchcape windfarm at 15km would have a significant visual effect.

Two recent proposals located in or near this type have recently been dismissed on appeal due to landscape and visual impacts: 7 very large turbines at Corse Hill between Carnoustie and Arbroath and two very large turbines at GSK Montrose.

Landscape analysis:

Whilst more elevated than the surrounding *Coast with Sand* the cliffs are nevertheless of modest scale. Larger scale turbines would be highly intrusive, being highly visible against sea and sky and out of scale with the cliffs, low buildings and wind pruned trees. Turbines should be no larger than 30m, set back from clifflines to avoid scaling effects.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

No current consented turbines and no applications. See above for commentary on proposals within or close to this LCA.

GUIDANCE: TAY14 COAST

14A COAST WITH SAND

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Coast with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium)

Detailed Guidance

Whilst the open windswept character is suitable for wind energy, larger scale turbines would be highly intrusive, being highly visible against the sea and sky and out of scale with the landform, low buildings and wind pruned trees. Turbines should be no larger than 30m and associated with built development. Where there are two or three closely located applications for single turbines of the same size, exploit opportunities for clustering as a group in preference to separation. Consideration is given in the Dipslope Farmland guidance to ensuring larger turbines in the neighbouring LCAs do not dominate the coastal strip.

There are currently two small/medium turbines and no applications. A proposal for 7 very large turbines at Corse Hill between Carnoustie and Arbroath was partially located in this LCA. and has been dismissed on appeal due to adverse landscape and visual impacts resulting from the scale of the proposals.

A proposal for two very large turbines at GSK Montrose was also dismissed on appeal due to visual impacts on the setting of Montrose and on nearby residential properties. This was located within the urban area but would have had significant effects on views south from the Montrose LCA.

14B COAST WITH CLIFFS

Proposed Limits to Future Development: Coast with Occasional Wind Turbines

Turbine Sizes: 15-<30m (small/medium)

Group Sizes: 1-3 (small/medium)

Separation Distances: 2-4km (small/medium)

Detailed Guidance

Whilst the open windswept character is suitable for wind energy, larger scale turbines would be highly intrusive, being highly visible against the sea and sky and out of scale with the landform, low buildings and wind pruned trees. Turbines should be no larger than 30m, set back from the modest sized cliffs to avoid scaling effects and associated with built development. Consideration is given in the Dipslope Farmland guidance to ensuring larger turbines in these neighbouring LCAs also do not dominate the coastal strip.

The dismissed Corse Hill proposal (see above) was located mainly in the Carnoustie LCA. The GSK proposal at Montrose would have had significant effects on the northern edge of the Usan LCA.

Offshore Wind Energy Developments

The proposed offshore windfarm at Neart na Gaoithe lies some 30km south east of the Angus coastline. Although comprising 125 turbines at 197m height, at this distance it is not likely to have a significant effect on the coastal LCAs. Seaenergy Alpha and Bravo proposals 27-38km to the east would be similar. However the proposed Inchcape windfarm, with over 200 turbines at 15km distance, may have a significant landscape and visual effects on the closest coastal LCAs which are also the most scenic areas of cliffs and sand lying between Arbroath and Montrose.



Coastal landscapes and Dipslope Farmland often merge seamlessly. Large turbines should be set well back into the Dipslope Farmland with turbines under 30m associated with development near the coast.

TAY15: INLAND LOCH BASIN

Montrose Basin is an unusual landscape type: an enclosed tidal basin and area of low lying farmland set between slightly more elevated areas of farmland and forest. It provides a unique setting for the town of Montrose which lies between the basin and the sea: the town has a characteristic profile seen across the basin and silhouetted against the North Sea. There is wide visibility across the basin, although the enclosing landform, despite being of modest elevation, encloses views north and south. The farmland is less open due to hedgerow tree cover and extensive areas of woodland planting associated with the designed landscape around Kinnaird Castle, which covers much of the western end. Inland of this the land slowly rises to Montreathmont Moor.





Montrose Basin viewed from the Dipslope Farmland to the south. The steeple of the Old and St Andrew's Church in Montrose is silhouetted against the North Sea.



View towards the east slopes of Rossie Moor and the trees of Kinnaird Park from Bridge of Dun.

Guidance is provided below in Table 6.1(i)

Table 6.1(i) Summary of Landscape Capacity, Cumulative Effects and Guidance for Future Wind Energy Development: Lowland Loch Basin

LAND	SCAP	E CH		ΓER	TYP	PE T	AY 1	15: L	OWLAND LOCH B	ASIN							
Key:) No Ca	pacity	Low	Capad	city	Me	dium	Capa	City High Capacity	Turbine S	Size: Small/Medium=1	5-<30	m; M	edium	=30-<	< 50 m;	Medium/Large=50-<80r
BASE account	LANDS	CAPE C	CAPAC	ITY (i y deve	.e. no elopm	t taki nent)	ng		CURRENT CONSEN	TED	PROPOSED LIMIT development)	'S TO) FUT	URE	DEV	ELOF	PMENT (i.e. proposed
Landso Wind E	ape Ser nergy D	nsitivity f evelopm	to nent	Lan (Re	idscaj lated t	pe Ca to turb	pacity	/ ze)	Existing/ Consented Developments	Current Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Future Wind Energy Landscape Type(s)	Rem Cap (Re	acity lated	ig Lan to turb	idsca bine si	pe ze)	Current Applications
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Visual Sensitivity	Landscape Sensitivity	Landscape Value	S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L				S/M	Σ	M/L		٨L	
Lands	cape Cl	naracte	r Areas	: Moi	ntros	e Ba	sin										
Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	Med/ High	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0	3 small/medium and one medium turbine within the LCA. Several small/medium and medium turbine in close proximity, particularly on	Lowland Loch Basin with Occasional Wind Turbines/ no Wind Turbines	Lowland Loch Basin with Occasional Wind Turbines	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	0	No current applications
									higher ground to the north.		Max. Numbers in Group	1-3	1-3				
											Min Group Separation Distances (km)	2-4	3-5				

n; Large=80-<125m; Very Large=125m+

acceptable level of wind energy

Analysis & Guidelines

(Refer to Detailed Guidance for Further Information on Siting and Design)

Landscape Analysis:

Montrose Basin is an uncommon landscape type, set between slightly more elevated areas of farmland and providing a setting for the town of Montrose. Some turbines could be accommodated in the farmland area. However due to wide visibility across the basin, modest elevation of enclosing landform (ca. 100m) and extensive areas of designed landscape around Kinnaird Castle, turbines taller than 50m would not be appropriate.

Comments on Consented and Proposed Turbines:

Consented turbines are within the capacity of the landscape.

A proposal for two very large turbines at GSK Montrose was recently dismissed on appeal due to visual impacts on the setting of Montrose and on nearby residential properties. Although located within the urban area, this proposal would have affected views of the town seen across the basin.

6.3 Overall Assessment of Capacity and Cumulative Development

6.3.1 Summary of Landscape Character, Sensitivity and Underlying Capacity

(Refer to Figures 6.1a-f for details of landscape capacity for turbines of different sizes).

The landscape of Angus is characterised by a transition from coastal landscapes in the southeast progressing northwest through agricultural lowland and lowland hills, thence to highland landscapes in the north. The bulk of the population lives in small towns and villages in the lowland area, through which the main transport routes pass.

The transition between highland and lowland is particularly dramatically presented in the form of the Highland Boundary Fault separating the broad valley of Strathmore from the Grampian Mountains, and is key in determining the underlying capacity of the landscape to accommodate wind turbines.



The Highland Boundary fault provides a sharp transition between the fertile settled lowlands of Strathmore and the wild scenery of the Grampian Mountains in the north of Angus

The openness of Strathmore and the ever present backdrop of the Grampian Mountains and Angus Glens is more simply and dramatically expressed as the key landscape feature of Angus than in the more extensive neighbouring areas of Perthshire and Aberdeenshire. This makes the highland area including the transitional foothills very sensitive to wind turbine development due to elevated levels of visual sensitivity and landscape value.

The assessment has determined that there is no capacity for wind turbine development in the highest mountain areas of the highland area, the *Highland Summits and Plateaux*, and that the capacity elsewhere in the highlands is limited to single or small groups of smaller turbines. This conclusion is in contrast with the current upland predominance in the pattern of Scottish wind energy development. Whilst the landscape character type in Angus has some suitable characteristics of scale, simplicity of landform and lack of small scale development; their landscape importance, visual prominence and status as a popular recreational and visitor location severely limits capacity.

The limitation in the highlands notwithstanding, there is varied underlying capacity for wind energy development throughout much of the lowland and hills area. In areas suitable for development, the differing landscape characters could accommodate different turbine sizes, groupings and spacings.

In Angus the lowland landscape represents the best opportunity for wind energy development. Two LCTs (*Broad Valley Lowland* and *Dipslope Farmland*) cover very extensive areas, with a medium or medium/large scale simple landscape pattern of arable fields, roads and plantations. These lowland LCTs are the hinterland for most of the principal towns of Angus and are influenced in places by urban fringes, industry, mineral extraction and major transport routes. These areas therefore have many of the characteristics that are considered compatible with wind turbine development and have underlying capacity for larger turbines in some locations.



The higher more open areas of Dipslope Farmland can accommodate larger turbines

However they also have the sensitivities of a substantial local residential and travelling population and domestic scale landscape features such as houses and trees. There are also areas of more complex and smaller scale landform. This restricts the potential size and extent of development compared with other parts of Scotland that have, for example, extensive unpopulated moorland plateau areas developed with large windfarms and turbines.

Other lowland landscape types within Angus (*Igneous Hills* and *Low Moorland Hills*) are smaller in extent and higher in elevation, with generally more complex patterns of landform and landuse. However there are open ridges in the Sidlaw Hills which have capacity for a modest scale of windfarm development with turbines up to about 80m blade tip height, as exemplified by Ark Hill. The relatively flat Montreathmont Forest area has potential capacity for small groups of larger turbines. However the neighbouring Forfar Hills are more sensitive due to the prominent modestly scaled hills, often with hillforts or viewpoints, providing a setting for the town of Forfar and there is no capacity for larger turbines.

The main coastal types (*Coastal with Sand; Coast with Cliffs*) have some of the landscape characteristics considered suitable for wind turbine development. However these areas are limited in extent, being particularly narrow, and have very modest landforms and a low tree cover. They are visually sensitive, as turbines would stand out clearly against sea and sky and only smaller turbines can be accommodated. The *Lowland Loch Basin* of Montrose Basin has a slightly greater underlying capacity in its farmland, but the open basin is visually sensitive, limiting capacity.











Figure 6.1b

Underlying Landscape Capacity (30 to 50m Turbines)

			Km
0	2.5	5	10
•	2.0		10

This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Har Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL 100017966



Ironside Farrar





Underlying Landscape Capacity (50 to 80m Turbines)

			Km
0	2.5	5	10
	2.0		10

This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Har Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. AL 100017966





Figure 6.1d

Underlying Landscape Capacity (80 to 125m Turbines)

			IKm
0	2.5	5	10

This map is reproduced from Ordinance Survey material with the permission of Ordinance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Har Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2014. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings, AL 100017966







The offshore area of Angus comprises the Firth of Tay in the south, opening out to the North Sea east of Buddon Ness. Developments in this area have the potential to affect the coastal landscape types, potentially limiting capacity in areas closer to the coast.

6.3.2 Existing and Consented Wind Turbines in May 2013

At 116 turbines, mostly below 50m to blade tip, the level of operational and consented development on shore in May 2013 is very modest compared with many areas in Scotland. Whilst there is a large number of individual schemes, almost all are small scale, involving single or small clusters of small/medium to medium/large size turbines. There are nevertheless concentrations of consented turbines which are leading to significant cumulative change in some areas of Angus:

- 1) Drumderg and Welton of Creuchies windfarms and several smaller turbines in the Alyth Foothills on the border with Perthshire
- 2) Ark Hill windfarm and Scotston turbine in the central Sidlaw Hills.
- 3) A concentration of single and paired small/medium to large turbines in the Dipslope Farmland between the Sidlaw Hills and Dundee
- 4) A concentration of small/medium to medium/large turbines on an elevated area of Broad Valley Lowland to the east of Brechin

There are a few other areas in the lowlands and the Highland Foothills with single larger turbines or smaller concentrations of varied turbines. Elsewhere, locations throughout lowland Angus have scatterings of single predominantly small/medium or medium size turbines.

There are currently no, or minimal numbers, of wind turbines in the Highland Summits and Plateaux and the Highland Glens and the coastal LCTs. However, some limited areas of these are influenced by close proximity of turbines in other LCTs.

There are significant numbers of consented turbines in the 30km buffer area beyond Angus. Some of these developments (such as Drumderg in Perthshire and Tullo in Aberdeenshire) have an influence on the landscape character of, or views out of Angus. There is one consented offshore windfarm lying to the south east of Angus, just on the 30km edge of the study area.

6.3.3 Proposed Wind Turbines in May 2013

At May 2013 there were 51 further proposed turbines within Angus and many more beyond in Perth, Aberdeenshire and offshore, some of which may have significant effects on the Angus landscape:

- 1) A large windfarm at Nathro in the Highland Summits and Plateaux above Glen Lethnot
- 2) Seven further large turbines in Tullymurdoch windfarm on the Perthshire side of the Alyth Foothills.
- 3) Two offshore windfarms at 15km and 50km from the Angus coast.

- 4) Two closely spaced small/medium windfarms of large turbines in the eastern Sidlaw Hills.
- 5) A further large turbine adjacent to a consented large turbine in the Menmuir Foothills.

There are no or minimal numbers of proposed turbines in the rest of the Highland Summits and Plateaux and the Highland Glens and the coastal LCTs. However, some limited areas of these would be influenced by the close proximity of turbines in other LCTs and local authority areas.

Applications for turbines continue to be submitted and there is no indication of a diminution of wind related activity. Proposed turbines are generally of a larger size distribution than the consented turbines, with the majority of the single turbines in the medium or medium/ large categories rather than small/medium (see chapter 5 for details).

There are two proposed offshore windfarms lying to the south east of Angus, one at Inchcape15km offshore and the other at Neart na Goaithe just on the 30km edge of the study area.

6.4 Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Landscape Effects

> Refer to Figure 6.2 for a map of current cumulative wind turbine landscape types and Figure 6.3 for a map illustrating the proposed future limit to wind turbine landscape types, as described in Table 6.1 and summarised in the sections below.

6.4.1 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Highlands

The Highland area in Angus comprises four LCTs: Upper Highland Glens; Mid Highland Glens; Highland Summits and Plateaux and Highland Foothills.

The assessment of Highland LCTs has determined that this area of Angus mostly has a low or no underlying capacity for wind turbine development despite extensive areas of large scale open landscapes. This is primarily due to the highland area's high landscape value, both as a backdrop to the lowland area of Angus and as an extensive area of scenic and dramatic landscape with areas of remote and wild land gualities. The latter is underlined by the draft Core Area of Wild Land designation that covers a significant part of this area in Angus. The highland area is an important recreational and visitor destination and a substantial proportion of it lies within the Cairngorms National Park and a National Scenic Area that overlaps with Angus and extends further north into a wider area of higher mountains and wilderness.

It is recommended that no turbines are located in the high hills of the Highland Summits and Plateaux. Within the Highland Glens and Highland Foothills there would be only limited opportunities for smaller scale developments, with single turbines under 30m in the Upper Highland Glens and single or small groups of turbines under 50m height elsewhere. Turbines should preferably be located in suitable areas screened by topography or trees and away from sensitive receptors such as the Caterthun hillforts and Airlie Monument.

Restricting development in upland areas is counter to the development pattern that has taken place elsewhere in many other areas of Scotland. Nevertheless it reflects the sensitivity and value of all the LCTs within this area; their particular contribution to the

overall landscape character of Angus and their continuity with the Cairngorms National Park.

In May 2013 there were no operational or consented developments within the *Highland Summits and Plateaux* of Angus, although the 16 turbines of Drumderg in Perth & Kinross are within 3km to the west. Mid Hill in upland Aberdeenshire is over 15km to the northeast. As Drumderg lies within a *Highland Summits and Plateaux* landscape area crossing the local authority boundary a small part of the Angus highland area is effectively a *Highland Summits and Plateaux with Wind Turbines* landscape. *Highland Foothills* nearby would similarly be affected. Most of the rest of the highland area is remote enough from windfarms or screened to remain virtually unaffected. There are a few small/medium and medium turbines consented in the *Highland Foothills* and one or two in the *Mid Highland Glens*, creating areas of *Occasional Wind Turbine*, with one large turbine in the Menmuir Hills creating a small area of *Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines*.

Most of the proposed wind turbines are located in or near the *Highland Foothills* and would not lead to a significant change on the current situation. However the proposed seventeen 134m tall turbines at Nathro in the *Highland Summits and Plateaux* would lead to a *Wind Turbine Landscape* in the surrounding area including parts of the West Water Valley, Glen Lethnot and the Menmuir Hills; as well as significant effects on views of the Highland Boundary Fault seen from the Lower South and North Esk Valley and the Forfar Hills further to the south.

6.4.2 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Lowland and Hills

The Lowland and Hills area comprises four LCTs: *Igneous Hills; Broad Valley Lowland; Low Moorland Hills* and *Dipslope Farmland*.

The assessment has determined that the lowland landscape of Angus has overall a medium underlying capacity for wind turbines of up to 50m tall, with medium or low underlying capacity for medium/large turbines in more limited locations such as the Sidlaw Hills; parts of the *Dipslope Farmland* and *Broad Valley Lowland* and Montreathmont Moor. Conversely some smaller scale areas of more complex landform and enclosed character in the *Broad Valley Lowland* and the hilltops of the *Low Moorland Hills* have relatively little or no capacity.

The landscape is generally of a medium scale and visually sensitive due to widespread settlement (including a number of towns and villages) and transport routes (including the A90 trunk route); together with openness of much of the landscape. Nevertheless, unlike the highland area, this is a mainly a settled, working agricultural landscape, with some medium scale hills. There are significant areas of sufficient scale and simplicity in landform and landcover pattern to accommodate some degree of wind turbine development.

The overall character means that smaller scale developments including single turbines are appropriate, with relatively little capacity for medium windfarms and no capacity for large scale windfarms such as may be found in many upland areas of Scotland. Developments should be sufficiently separated to ensure the landscape does not exceed a *Landscape with Occasional Wind Turbines* over most of the lowland LCAs, with some areas of *Landscape with Wind Turbines* in the largest scale most open and least populated areas. It is worth noting that a number of proposed developments in the lowlands with large or

very large turbines have been refused consent and/or dismissed at appeal. This suggests a turbine height limit of ca. 80m (i.e. up to medium/large) can be acceptably accommodated in the areas with the largest scale and simplest landforms, subject to detailed assessment.

Currently the only consented windfarm development in Angus is for eight 81m turbines (borderline large in size) at Ark Hill within the Sidlaw Hills, within the lowland area. Other developments within the lowlands are predominantly for single turbines, which are scattered across the lowlands with the greatest concentrations in the northeast of Strathmore and the *Dipslope Farmland* to the north of Dundee. Outside Angus there are two large operational turbines in Dundee close to the *Dipslope Farmland*; a number of single turbines in the Howe of Mearns in Aberdeenshire at the northeastern end of Strathmore, and a windfarm at Tullo 10km to the NE of the lowland area. Extensive areas of the lowlands are a *Landscape with No Wind Turbines*. Areas mainly in the northeast and southwest are a *Landscape with Wind Turbines* or *Landscape with Occasional Wind Turbines* or *With Wind Turbines* are scattered across the lowlands between the main areas.

The current extent of development lies mainly within the capacity of the landscape to accommodate wind turbines. Nevertheless cumulative development in some areas is beginning to significantly reduce residual capacity for further wind turbines. This is discussed further in section 6.5 below.

The currently proposed developments comprise mainly single or paired turbines scattered across or close to the lowland areas. These would not in general lead to a significant adverse level of development. Currently proposed turbines and/or windfarms in the *Igneous Hills* may lead to an significant adverse level of cumulative impact due to the number and size of turbines and juxtaposition of differing layouts.

6.4.3 Summary of Capacity and Cumulative Development in the Coast

The Coastal Landscapes comprise three LCTs: Coast with Sand; Coast with Cliffs and Lowland Loch Basin.

The Coastal LCTs in Angus have a low capacity for wind turbine development due to their open character, relatively small extent and scenic coastal character of cliffs and sand together with the unique tidal basin at Montrose. The predominantly narrow strips of *Coast with Sand* and *Coast with Cliffs* can accommodate single turbines up to 30m as a *Coast with Occasional Wind Turbines* and the *Lowland Loch Basin* around Montrose can accommodate occasional turbines below 50m tall.

Currently there are two small/medium wind turbines in the coast areas and six small/ medium and one medium consented within the Montrose Basin LCA, making small areas of coastal landscapes *Landscape with Occasional Wind Turbines*.

There are no current proposals within the coastal area. Two proposed 137m turbines at GSK in Montrose that would have adversely affected the landscape of adjacent areas, exceeding proposed acceptable capacity, have recently been dismissed at appeal.



	25	5	IKm 10
U	2.5	5	10



nd Study Area Scottish Loca Cairngorms N Landscape C Boundary (se LCA Sub Are Ygy	al Author National Characte Se Table	ity Bound Park	7933 ANC 13 aries
nd Study Area Scottish Loca Cairngorms N _andscape C Boundary (se _CA Sub Are >gy	al Author National Characte de Table	ity Bound Park r Type / Al	aries
Study Area Scottish Loca Cairngorms N Landscape C Boundary (se _CA Sub Are > 99	al Author National Characte Se Table	ity Bound Park	aries
Scottish Loca Cairngorms N Landscape C Boundary (se _CA Sub Are > Qy	al Author National Character Se Table	ity Bound Park r Type / Ai	aries
Cairngorms N Landscape C Boundary (se _CA Sub Are > gy	National Characte e Table	Park	
Landscape C Boundary (se LCA Sub Are >gy	haracter e Table	r Type / Ai	
LCA Sub Are	as (Pof	3.1 for list	rea t)
ogy	as (incl.	Table 6.1)
andecane			
_andscape w	ith no W	/ind Turbin	nes
_andscape w	vith Occa	asional Wi	nd Turbines
_andscape w	ith Winc	Turbines	
Wind Turbine	Landsc	ape	
nted Turb	ines:		
t Category	and N	o. of Tu	rbines)
Jnknown He	ignt		
30 to < 50 m			
50 to <80m			
80 to <125m			
125m+			
ation Turl	oines:		
t Category	and N	o. of Tu	rbines)
Jnknown He	ight		
15 to <30m			
30 to <50m			
50 to <80m			
30 to <125m			
125m+			
Turbine Loca	tions		
Fi	gure	6.3	
	ented Turbine ented Turbine t Category Unknown He 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ eation Turl t Category Unknown He 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ Turbine Loca Fig sed Limine 1 Energ	ented Turbine Lands ented Turbines: t Category and N Unknown Height 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ eation Turbines: t Category and N Unknown Height 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ Turbine Locations Figure sed Limits to 1 Energy Lar	ented Turbines: t Category and No. of Tur Unknown Height 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ eation Turbines: t Category and No. of Tur Unknown Height 15 to <30m 30 to <50m 50 to <80m 80 to <125m 125m+ Turbine Locations Figure 6.3 sed Limits to Deve 1 Energy Landsca

6.5 **Residual Capacity for Further Development**

This assessment has demonstrated that the landscape of Angus has the underlying capacity to accommodate wind energy development of an appropriate type and extent. Appropriate development relates to the varied characteristics of the landscape; the visual sensitivities of the population spread across lowland Angus and the higher value or sensitive context of some areas of landscape, in particular the extensive large scale, open, unpopulated upland areas north of the Highland Boundary Fault and contiguous with the Cairngorms National Park. The particular characteristics of Angus means there is no scope for the larger scale of windfarm development seen elsewhere in Scotland.

The main underlying capacity for development lies within some of the larger scale more extensive lowland areas which can accommodate larger turbines sizes, but not the largest sizes and not in large groupings. Other areas have a more limited underlying capacity, which would not be appropriate for larger turbines sizes, and some areas have very limited or no capacity for wind energy development.

At current levels of development there is residual capacity in Angus for further appropriate wind energy development in most areas that have underlying capacity. Future development in each landscape type or area should follow the guidance given in Table 6.1 and following in order to remain within the proposed wind turbine landscape types set out in Figure 6.3. The aim of the guidance is to ensure that the acceptable capacity for development in terms of turbines sizes, group sizes and spacing between turbines and groups is not exceeded, and that other issues guiding or limiting development are taken into account.

Some of the residual capacity would be fully used and could be exceeded if all current proposals were implemented. The main opportunities and limitations on capacity are discussed below and the areas concerned illustrated in schematic form in Figure 6.4.

6.5.1 Areas with Highest Underlying Capacity

Figure 6.4 identifies in dark green four areas which have the highest underlying capacity in Angus for wind energy development. By this it is meant that they have the capacity to accommodate larger sizes of turbine and/or greater numbers and concentrations relative to other areas of landscape in Angus. This is based on a combination of one or more factors including suitable larger scale simple landforms and landscape patterns; existing development/ land use affecting character; lower visual sensitivity and lower landscape value. Not all of these factors are present in every area identified and the analysis and guidance in Table 6.1 and following should be followed.

The main areas are:

- 1) Careston Broad Valley Lowland to the north west of Brechin.
- 2) Muir of Pert Broad Valley Lowland to the east of Brechin.
- 3) Montreathmont Forest and farmland to the south of Brechin.
- 4) The Sidlaw Hills with contiguous areas of Dipslope Farmland to the south and east and Low Moorland Hills south of Forfar.

Wind turbines are already located in some of these areas, utilising some of the underlying capacity and therefore reducing residual capacity. The limitations resulting from this are discussed in 6.5.4 below.

6.5.2 Areas with Limited Underlying Capacity

Most of the remaining lowland and coastal areas of Angus have some underlying capacity for wind energy development but are generally not suited to larger turbines, large groupings or extensive concentrations of wind turbine development. The areas are shown in light green in figure 6.4. Capacity varies from the ability to accommodate only very occasional small/medium wind turbines in some of the Upper Highland Glens to more frequent medium turbines across much of the Highland Foothills, Broad Valley Lowlands and Dipslope Farmland. Some areas of the Dipslope Farmland may be able to accommodate occasional single medium/large turbines subject to detailed assessment of local characteristics.

Currently there are limited numbers of existing, consented and proposed smaller scale developments (mainly single small/medium and medium size turbines). Guidance in Table 6.1 is intended to steer future development in these areas to an acceptable level.

6.5.3 Areas with No Underlying Capacity

Significant areas of Angus have no underlying capacity for wind turbine development. These are left uncoloured in Figure 6.4:

- 1) All of the Highland Summits and Plateaux LCAs, due to their importance to the Angus landscape, connectivity with the Cairngorms National Park, high visual prominence, high relative wildness and recreational value;
- 2) Some upper parts of Highland Glens and Highland Foothills which extend into the Lochanagar and Mount Keen draft Core Area of Wild Land and are contiguous with the Highland Summits and Plateaux.
- 3) Some prominent summits, viewpoints and hillforts in the Sidlaw Hills, Highland Foothills and Low Moorland Hills.

It is recommended that these landscape types and areas remain undeveloped with turbines to protect their character, avoid widespread visibility, protect key viewpoints and features and particularly to protect the key feature of the Highland Boundary Fault and its backdrop of the Grampian Mountains.

When assessing the acceptability of larger turbine proposals in neighbouring landscape character areas, proximity to the sensitive areas described above should be taken into account.

6.5.4 Areas Where Cumulative Impact Limits Further Development

As described above, a number of landscape types and areas in Angus have an underlying capacity to accommodate wind energy development. However, existing and consented development in or nearby some of these areas means that further significant development may exceed the acceptable cumulative capacity of the landscape. The areas where current

cumulative impact limits capacity for further development are shown as hatched areas in Figure 6.4.

- 1) Alyth Foothills / Glen Clova
- 2) Menmuir / Hill of Ogil
- 3) Brechin and Muir of Pert
- 4) Letham to Firth Muir of Boysack
- 5) Central Sidlaws and Tealing

The areas are defined by the following criteria:

- 1) The developed areas of windfarms and turbines (operational and consented) and the cumulative extent of their impacts on the surrounding landscape;
- 2) The underlying landscape capacity within the LCAs and for those surrounding them;
- 3) The extent of area within which further significant development should be limited to avoid extending cumulative landscape and visual impacts between the groups of turbines within the cumulative area and other turbines outside the area.

The boundaries shown in Figure 6.4 are indicative. They are described in more detail for each area in Table 6.2 below, together with the main objectives for limiting further development. In the case of specific development proposals there should be an assessment relating to the detailed criteria.

6.5.5 Development within Built up Areas

Whilst it is recognised that some parts of built up areas and settlements may be able to accommodate wind turbines, and indeed do, they have not been included in this landscape character based capacity assessment. Factors specific to townscape and urban planning are likely to guide location. Consequently urban areas have been left out of the constraints and opportunities map in 6.4, Table 6.1 and the guidance.

Nevertheless it is noted in this study that the setting of settlements and the presence of settlements within a wider landscape type has a bearing on landscape character and on capacity for development.

Guidance for Small Turbines 6.6

This cumulative assessment and capacity study has detailed the current distribution of all sizes of wind turbines of 15m or greater blade tip height. The strategic guidance above therefore applies to turbines 15m and greater in height when determining capacity for further development. This is because the smallest turbines below 15m have a similar scale to built structures and trees found commonly throughout the landscape and do not have the same eye-catching prominence and extensive visibility of larger turbines. They do not therefore have the same issues of wide scale cumulative effects across extensive landscape areas.

The issues relating to design and siting of small turbines concern mainly their localised effects on the area in which they are sited rather than wider cumulative effects on landscape character. Small wind turbines should be judged on their own merits, assessed against the criteria that apply to most other domestic or farm scale built structures. Landscape and visual considerations may include the following:

- Effects on designations including landscape guality designations, SAMs, listed buildings, conservation areas;
- Location in relation to scenic viewpoints;
- Relationship to skylines and seascapes;
- Relationship to other structures and buildings;
- Location in relation to approaches to and setting of settlements;
- Type and appearance of towers, rotors and nacelles;
- Proximity to residential properties;
- Localised cumulative effects including potential for visual confusion or cluttering areas with significant numbers of small turbines and/or close proximity to other similar larger structures including taller wind turbines and electricity pylons.

Larger wind turbines are more often than not seen against the sky. The approach to colouring has been to adopt a neutral light grey colour relating to the sky colour most likely to be encountered as a backdrop. Small wind turbines are often fully or partially backclothed against landforms and/or trees, giving a closer relationship to the ground than the larger structures. It may therefore be appropriate to consider colouring small wind turbines a darker grey, green or brown to reduce their visibility when seen against backdrops, or close to buildings.



			Km
0	2.5	5	10

Table 6.2: Areas Where Cumulative Impact Limits Further Development: Description and Key Objectives (see Figure 6.4 for Map)

1. Alyth Foothills and Glen Clova				
Description	Development Situation and Key Objectives			
The boundaries of this area include:	The Alyth Hills on the boundary with Perthshire are <i>Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines</i> due to the presence of Drumderg Windfarm in Perthshire and several small/medium to medium/large turbines along the border within the Alyth Hills LCA and Glen Isla. Several further large turbines are proposed at Tullymurdoch in Perthshire on the border with Angus. The objectives governing the area are:			
• The Angus/ Perthshire boundary between Black Hill in the north and Airlie Castle to the south;				
The crest of Black Hill and Hill of Fernyhirst though Little Kilry to the River Isla at Bridge of Craigisla; The course of the River Isla to Airlie Castle	1) Retaining sufficient spacing between individual windfarms and turbines to maintain the Landscape with Wind Turbines character and avoid a Wind Turbine Landscape character in the Highland Foothills;			
	2) To prevent further extension of the Landscape with Wind Turbines onto the floor of Glen Isla;			
	3) To protect the skyline ridge to the southwest of Glen Isla from over-development with turbines;			
	4) To protect the setting of and views from visually sensitive locations including Reekie Linn, Airlie Castle and Designed Landscape and small settlements in Glen Isla.			
2. Memus and Hill of Ogil				
Description	Development Situation and Key Objectives			
The boundaries of this area include:	Currently this area has a single large turbine consented at Memus and a small/medium turbine near Cortachy. The visual influence of the large			
• the <i>Highland Foothills</i> LCA between the Noran Water and Glen Clova, including Hill of Ogil and Den of Ogil;	turbine creates an area of <i>Highland Foothills with Wind Turbines</i> on the south side of Hill of Ogil, extending south into the <i>Broad Valley Lowlan</i> A further medium size turbine is proposed near Cortachy. The objectives governing the area are:			
The Broad Valley Lowland south of Hill of Ogil east of the Cortachy policies and the River South Esk to Shielbill Bridge and thence	1) Avoiding further extension of the Landscape with Wind Turbines character into the Highland Foothills, Broad Valley Lowland and Mid Highland Glens			
northeast across farmland to Meikle Couil and the Noran Water at Milton of Ogil;	2) Retaining sufficient spacing between turbines so as not to exceed the Landscape with Wind Turbines character and avoid areas of Wind Turbine Landscape character in the Highland Foothills and Broad Valley Lowland;			
	3) To prevent development of or influence of large turbines on the north side of Hill of Ogil and into Den of Ogil;			
	4) To protect the setting of and views from Cortachy designed landscape;			
	5) To support an organised pattern of development by maintaining sufficient spacing/ screening between groups of larger and smaller turbines.			
	6) To prevent potential cumulative visual clutter by proximity of turbines to the electricity transmission line crossing the hills in this location.			
3. Broad Valley Lowland: Brechin and Muir of Pert				
Description	Development Situation and Key Objectives			
The boundaries of this area include:	Currently this area has consents for eleven small turbines, three medium turbines and two medium/large turbines, creating an extensive area of			
The A90 between Brechin and the North Esk	Broad Valley Lowland with Wind Turbines. There is a proposal for a further medium turbine. The objectives governing the area are:			
The North Esk east to Hillside Village	1) Avoiding coalescence with the Landscape with Wind Turbines in Aberdeenshire by minimising development in the North Esk corridor;			
• The edge of Hillside, the House of Dun and the A935 from Mains of Dun to Brechin	2) Retaining sufficient spacing between individual turbines to maintain a <i>Landscape with Wind Turbines</i> and avoid a <i>Wind Turbine Landscape</i> character;			
The northeastern edge of Brechin 3)	 Avoiding excessive skylining of larger wind turbines to the crests of the escarpments which important but modestly scaled backdrops to the A90, Brechin and Montrose Basin; 			
	4) To support an organised pattern of development by maintaining sufficient spacing/ screening between groups of larger and smaller turbines;			
	5) To prevent unacceptable proximity of larger turbines to settlements and other visually sensitive locations including Brechin, Hillside, Craigo, House of Dun and the Caledonian Railway.			

4.	4. Dipslope Farmland Between Letham and Firth Muir of Boysack				
Description		Development Situation and Key Objectives			
The b • 1 • 7	 boundaries of this area include: The village of Letham to the northwest and the small settlement of Firth Muir of Boysack to the southeast The course of the Lunan Water between Letham and Friokheim The A933 between Friockheim and Colliston A line south of the hill crests between Hillhead, Boath Hill and West Grange of Conon. 	Cur <i>Win</i> 1) 2) 3)	rrently this area has one medium/large turbine, three small turbines and one medium turbine creating and Turbines, with proposals for a further medium size turbine. The objectives governing the area are: Retaining sufficient spacing between individual turbines to maintain a <i>Landscape with Wind Turbin</i> character; Avoiding excessive skylining of larger wind turbines to the crest of the farmland either side of modestly scaled backdrop to lower ground in the north and east; To support an organised pattern of development by maintaining sufficient spacing/ screening between		
		4)	To prevent unacceptable proximity of larger turbines to settlements and other visually sensitive le the smaller scale more settled landscape surrounding the Lunan Water.		
5.	Central Sidlaw Hills and Tealing Farmland				
Description		Dev	velopment Situation and Key Objectives		
The •	boundaries of this area include: The <i>Igneous Hills</i> between the B954, Newtyle to Glamis; A928 to Milton of Ogihio and Gallow Hill Bidge descending to Tooling:	Ark turb prop	Hill Windfarm and Scotston with large size turbines creates a <i>Landscape with Wind Turbines</i> in the bines consented in the <i>Dipslope Farmland</i> between Tealing and Auchterhouse including a large turb posals for two other medium/large turbines in the central Sidlaw Hills. The objectives governing the a		
•	The <i>Dipslope Farmland</i> south of the Igneous Hills between Auchterhouse, Dronley, Bridgefoot and the A90 north to Tealing;	 1) 2) 3) 4) 5) 	Retaining sufficient spacing between individual windfarms and turbines to maintain the <i>Landscape</i> areas of <i>Wind Turbine Landscape</i> character in the <i>Igneous Hills</i> and <i>Dipslope Farmland</i> ; To prevent development of turbines on the southern escarpment and skyline of the Sidlaw Hills whof Dundee; To protect the setting of and views from the prominent hillforts and hilltop viewpoints of Kinpurne Hill; To support an organised pattern of development by maintaining sufficient spacing/ screening between To provent unacceptable provinity of larger turbines to softlements and other viewally constitive larger		
		5) 6)	To prevent unacceptable proximity of larger turbines to settlements and other visually sensitive location prevent potential cumulative visual clutter by proximity of turbines to other structures prevalent electricity transmission lines and the Tealing substation.		

ng a small area of *Dipslope Farmland with*

ines and avoid a Wind Turbine Landscape

Boath Hill which forms an important but

veen groups of larger and smaller turbines; locations including Letham, Colliston and

he central Sidlaw Hills. There are several bine at former Tealing Airfield. There are area are:

e with Wind Turbines character and avoid

which is prominent from areas to the south

ey Hill, Auchterhouse Hill and Balluderon

een groups of larger and smaller turbines; cations.

nt in this area including transmitter masts,

GLOSSARY

The likely acceptability of a proposed level of development determined by Acceptability considering it against the underlying capacity of the landscape and other policy criteria and objectives.

Cumulative Impacts Additional changes caused by a proposed development in conjunction with other similar developments, or as the combined effect of a set of developments, taken together.

Cumulative Wind Turbine Development Typology A gradated landscape typology that defines terms of reference for increasing levels of development with turbines; describing their effect on landscape character and the experience of those living in or travelling through the landscape.

Designated Landscape Areas of landscape identified as being of importance at international, national or local levels, either defined by statute or identified in development plans or other documents.

Key Characteristics Those combinations of elements which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape and help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place.

Landscape An area, as perceived by people, the character of which is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.

Landscape Accommodation A degree of change that does not fundamentally alter key landscape characteristics and visual resources.

Landscape Capacity The degree to which a particular landscape character type or area is able to accommodate change without significant effects on its key characteristics, or overall change of landscape character type. Capacity is likely to vary according to the character of the landscape and nature of change being proposed.

Landscape Change Large amounts of change that may fundamentally alter key landscape characteristics and visual resources.

Landscape Character A distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of elements in the landscape that makes one landscape different from another, rather than better or worse.

Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) These are single unique areas which are the discrete geographical areas of a particular landscape type.

Landscape Character Types (LCTs) These are distinct types of landscape that are relatively homogenous in character. They are generic in nature in that they may occur in different areas in different parts of the country, but wherever they occur they share broadly similar combinations of geology, topography, drainage patterns, vegetation and historical land use and settlement pattern, and perceptual and aesthetic attributes.

Landscape Protection Maintaining existing landscape character.

Landscape Quality (Condition) A measure of the physical state of the landscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in individual areas, the intactness of the landscape and the condition of individual elements.

Landscape Value The relative value that is attached to different landscape by society. A landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons.

Perception Combines the sensory (that we receive through our senses) with the cognitive (our knowledge and understanding gained from many sources and experiences).

Residual Landscape Capacity The remaining landscape capacity of an area for a specific type of development, determined by considering the extent to which current levels of this development already occupies the underlying landscape capacity. This can vary according to the amount of underlying capacity and extent of consented development.

Sensitivity A term applied to specific receptors (eg. landscape or visual), combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change or development proposed and the value related to that source.

Susceptibility The ability of a defined landscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific proposed development without undue negative consequences.

Underlying Landscape Capacity The inherent capacity of a landscape to accommodate a type of change (eg. wind energy developments) without significant effects on its key characteristics; specifically not accounting for levels of the same type of change that have already taken place in that landscape.

Visual Effects Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people

Visual Receptors Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal

Visibility Analysis An assessment of the potential visibility of a development or area of land from an identified viewpoint or viewpoints. It is often accompanied by an analysis of the number of people of different types who are likely to see it and the scope to modify visual impacts of the specified development by appropriate mitigation.

Wild Land An area which has physical attributes which evoke a range of perceptual responses (such as a sense of solitude, risk and of fulfilment from physical challenge), which people experience as a 'sense of wildness', namely:

- A high degree of perceived naturalness in the setting and in the natural processes i. affecting the land, as well as little evidence of contemporary human uses of the land;
- ii. The lack of any modern artefacts or structures:
- iii. Landform which is rugged or otherwise physically challenging; and
- iv. Remoteness and/or inaccessibility.

REFERENCES

Angus Council (2012) Renewable Energy Implementation Guide

Angus Local Plan Review (Adopted 2009)

ERM (1998) South and Central Aberdeenshire Landscape Character Assessment. SNH Review No. 102

Glasgow Caledonian University and others (March 2008). The Economic Impact of Wind Farms on Scottish Tourism. A report for the Scottish Government

Ironside Farrar (2008) Angus Windfarms Landscape Capacity and Cumulative Impacts Study.

Land Use Consultants (1999) Tayside Landscape Character Assessment. SNH Review No. 122

Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (2002) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Second Edition)

SNH (2002) Policy Statement No 02/03: Wildness in Scotland's Countryside

SNH (2004). Commissioned Report No.042 Landscape capacity study for onshore wind energy development in the Western Isles (ROAME No. F02LC04)

SNH (2008). Natural Heritage assessment of small scale wind energy projects which do not require formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).SNH Guidance.

SNH (2009). Siting and Designing Windfarms in the Landscape

SNH (2012) Assessing the cumulative impact of onshore wind energy developments: March 2012

SNH (March 2012) Siting and Design of Small Scale Wind Turbines of between 15 and 50 metres in height

SNH (January 2012) Mapping Scotland's Wildness, Wildness Map

SNH (April 2013) Core Areas of Wild Land in Scotland

SNH and The Countryside Agency (2002). Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland Topic paper 6: Techniques and Criteria for Judging Capacity and Sensitivity.

TAYplan Strategic Development Plan (Approved 2012);

The Scottish Government (2010). Scottish Planning Policy

The Scottish Government (Aug 2012).Process for preparing spatial frameworks for wind farms (Web Guidance)

The Scottish Government (July 2013). Onshore Wind Turbines (Web Guidance)

The Scottish Government (2013). Scottish Planning Policy Consultation Draft