

Electricity Act 1989

Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

DPEA Code of Practice

Tealing to Kintore OHL proposal TRL-120-1

CHS Statement – Methods of Construction

Good morning.

My name is Grant Alexander. I am a retired consulting civil engineer and a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. I live in Drumoak, Aberdeenshire, and I wish to speak about the engineering and construction concerns associated with the Tealing to Kintore Upgrade Project.

My principal concern is that the application lacks sufficient detail about how these works would actually be constructed on the ground, despite the very significant impacts construction will have on communities, farmland, roads, and the environment.

The first issue is foundations.

The application refers to several possible foundation types, including piled foundations, rock anchors, and pad-and-column foundations, but it does not specify which types will be used where.

That matters because foundations are likely to be one of the most disruptive parts of the project.

Piling operations are noisy and create vibration. Rock-anchor foundations require hydraulic rock breaking and potentially major excavation works. Traditional pad-and-column foundations may require excavations four to six metres deep, creating problems with groundwater, siltation, pumping, and spoil removal.

Yet there are no detailed foundation drawings showing the actual scale of these works for the proposed towers.

The second issue is the extent of temporary working areas and access roads.

The application describes working areas of up to 100 metres by 100 metres around corner towers.

In reality, these areas are likely to be substantially larger once earthworks, crane platforms, drainage, excavated material, and topsoil storage are taken into account.

Large cranes require engineered rock platforms, potentially involving hundreds of heavy lorry movements for every tower site.

The application significantly understates the likely scale of imported material and construction traffic.

This leads directly to my **third concern: damage to rural roads.**

Many of the roads affected are historic minor roads that were never designed for repeated movements by fully loaded heavy goods vehicles or large mobile cranes.

The engineering reality is that the damaging effect of a heavy lorry is exponentially greater than that of a normal car. Mobile cranes are even more destructive because of their axle loads.

After five years of construction traffic, I believe there is a serious risk of widespread deterioration to secondary roads throughout the route corridor.

The fourth issue is environmental management.

Construction sites of this scale generate significant mud, silt runoff, and pollution risk, particularly during winter conditions.

The application refers generally to settlement ponds and drainage measures, but there is insufficient detail about how pollution of ditches, burns, streams, and private water supplies will actually be prevented.

Private water supplies require careful monitoring before, during, and after construction to ensure aquifers are not contaminated or disrupted.

Another major concern is uncertainty over land take.

The application defines broad limits of deviation extending up to 100 metres either side of the line, and even wider around corner towers.

However, it is not clear whether contractors will be free to move access routes, store materials, or operate machinery anywhere within that corridor. [The 'boundaries of the site' are not defined in the application](#)

For farmers and rural residents, this creates uncertainty over how much land could effectively be sterilised during the construction period.

Finally, the programme itself is concerning.

Construction is expected to continue for around five years, with reinstatement not completed until late 2030.

For affected landowners and nearby residents, that represents a very long period of disruption, noise, traffic, dust, and loss of productive land.

In conclusion, my concern is not simply that construction impacts exist — major infrastructure projects always have impacts. My concern is that this application leaves too many important engineering and construction matters undefined, deferred, or dependent on future Principal Contractor decisions.

In my opinion, there is insufficient detail for the true scale of the impacts to be properly understood or assessed at this stage.

Grant Alexander

11 May 2026