

Electricity Act 1989
Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997
DPEA Code of Practice

TEALING TO KINTORE OHL reference TRL-120-1

Submission to Public Inquiry by Mrs Gloria Potter 2 Annamuick Cottages

Introduction

My name is Gloria Potter, I am 72 years old and I have lived happily in our home at 2 Annamuick Cottages for many years. During that time we have improved the property and the garden, putting a lot of time and love into our place. It is set in this rural area surrounded by nature which we love and have cherished for years encouraging wildlife, flora and fauna, and birds.

Objections

My concerns and objections to SSEN development of OHL are as follows. If the SSEN proposal goes ahead, our home will be surrounded by giant pylons extending from the proposed Fetteresso Substation development (which was denied by Aberdeenshire Council as it was out of keeping with the character of our countryside but appealed by SSEN). Our elected members were right in their decision. This sub-station and all its connected and related schemes, Kintore to Tealing OHL, Glen Dye Connection, East Coast Rail, two different offshore windfarm connection, AI connection, plus to date three storage facilities will all be going up past or round our home, turning our environment to an industrial estate.

ASSESSMENTS

Surveys on the effects to our home identify us as some of the worst affected in the whole area, with features of the schemes breaching our residential and visual amenity. All of the EIGHT giant pylons proceeding from Fetteresso will be close to our home, surrounding our home, so that from every window I will see a different pylon. This will turn the outlook to a wall of wire from the existing pylons running through to the new pylons effectively encircling our home. Three of the pylons are very close to and will tower over our home.

Connecting roads to pylons and huge concrete apron bases to pylons will leave hardly a blade of grass far from supporting any wildlife. No mitigation scheme or compensatory measure could cope with such a brutal and degraded outlook as we will suffer –though none has been offered by the applicant.

The future works proposed will lead to intrusion, disruption, lack of privacy, noise, dust, light pollution, traffic

Given our ages and health conditions these developments are very likely to promote in us ill health and lack of wellbeing. We are both aware that this could lead to us having to move. Having consulted local estate agents, they have told us that our property would be hard to sell if the industrialisation of our countryside goes ahead. We would, they advise, expect a lower house price than the property is worth, and we will lose money. It follows that any future home would be smaller with less amenity than what we enjoy now.

But why should we be forced to move from what we love? The financial outlook resulting from this situation for us is bleak. Looking to our older age, we had expected to pay for care or to be placed together in a care residence. This would be unaffordable if this scheme goes ahead. This scheme is eroding the quality of our lives and any potential future we face. Not a fair transition for us, our neighbours, friends and extended family, certainly not for the countryside.

Please, we request, recommend rejection of SSEN's OHL proposal.

Gloria Potter

13 May 2026