

Electricity Act 1989
Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997
DPEA Code of Conduct

Tealing to Kintore Upgrade: TRL-120-1

Landscape and Visual Hearing Session on RVAA by Lesley + Alan Joiner, Dunswood,
Menmuir, By Brechin DD9 6SF

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACTS HEARING: Brechin City Hall June 24th & 25th

My name is Lesley Joiner and my husband Alan and I own a small parcel of 140 acres of land on which we built our home in 1992. We have farmed this on a part time basis for the last 30 years.

In the Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note 2/19 for Residential Visual Amenity Assessment there is an extract from the GLVIA 3 that defines people's amenity as "*the overall pleasantness of the views they enjoy of their surroundings*". Residential Visual Amenity is noted as "*the overall quality, experience and nature of views and outlook available to occupants of residential properties from gardens and domestic curtilage*".

With this in mind, it is astonishing that Dunswood is "***not judged to be so overbearing and dominant that it breaches the residential visual amenity threshold***". This we strongly refute.

RVAA ANALYSIS

The proposed OHL will have *three* towers on the 140 acres of land we own.

The first Tower to impact us (**Tower 113**) actually stands on our neighbour's land approximately 300m to the SE of our home. This will be seen from all rooms facing south east, south and west, which include the principal rooms. The first of the three towers on Dunswood, (**Tower 114**) will stand at a height of 58m and will be approximately 205m from the Southwest corner of the house; not 232m as stated in the application. It commands the skyline and will be clearly visible from south and west facing rooms.

Obviously, the height is imposing and it will dominate the landscape, being located on a slight rise some 2 -3 m above the elevation of the property.

Tower 114 will unquestionably be overbearing and has the potential to cast shadows over our home in early Spring, late Autumn and through Winter. The LVIA report recognises the prominence of Tower 114 yet seems to simply **ignore** the facts, just as they have done with the **considerable constraints** that exist at Dunswood.

Tower 115 is approximately 500m due west of the property, and sits within the viewshed of two of our public rooms. This is essentially the outlook from these principal rooms including the conservatory, which sits on the Southern elevation and has views to the East, South and

West. It has been noted that the RVAA is silent on the conservatory. In terms of Guidance Note 2/19, this is considered a "*Principal Room*" The impact is inescapable and significant, dominating the amenity and enjoyment of our home, and not for the better.

The line continues to wrap across the front of our house on the oblique to **Tower 116** to the West, which at a height of 55m will be prominent above a line of mature Beech trees, some of which are to be felled for construction. The felling of these trees breaches NPF4 Policy 6(b) appendix (i). It's a grotesque solution.

OVERALL IMPACT OF TOWERS

In effect, we will be totally wrapped around by a construction which will be overwhelming, overbearing and out of proportion with our domestic circumstances and the landscape. At present, we are surrounded on three sides by woodland so in essence the line and towers will be enclosed within this woodland corridor. We will have no peripheral views. We will have no opportunity for respite as the line will be seen from all rooms in our home bar one and from all aspects of the garden. In the arid language of landscape, this is "significant adverse", but of course it is heartbreaking and lifechanging for us as our outlook, our home (we are both retired), our investment, really our whole domestic life in this landscape, as we know it, will be unrecognisable.

ROOMS IN DUNSWOOD

In terms of the conservatory, senior members of SSEN have all visited our home and are fully aware of its existence. The attitude, I am sorry to report, was "*someone has to live beside them*". This was said within my hearing. I believe there is gross unfairness (to put it no higher) in that statement, as SSEN have moved the line to accommodate other householders and communities as shown, for example in the Report on Consultation. SSEN have deliberately ignored the constraints here at Dunswood and other impacted households on Route 4a.

On p.28 of Volume 5- Appendix 9.3, the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment of the EIAR it states "*the magnitude of change is judged to be **High***" and SSEN acknowledge that stating "*The alignment would be seen extending along the southwestern horizon with Tower 114 standing as a large scale prominent feature in the view*". It seems that High Impact does not generate any mitigation or avoidance.

The understated classification of the proposal as "*a large scale prominent feature*" emphasises the severity of the visual intrusion. Also, the oblique positioning of the line does not diminish the impact, rather it reinforces the dominance of the structure within the residential setting. Our home will essentially be wrapped around. This seems to us to breach NPF4 Policy 11(e) Appendix(i).

OVERALL IMPACT AND CONCLUSION

The impact of the proposal for us at Dunswood is both significant and unacceptable. I consider SSEN's assessment to be fundamentally flawed, lacking both credibility and comprehensiveness in its evaluation of the proposed effects on our home and land. In particular, there are critical omissions in relation to the consideration of suitable alternatives and the absence of meaningful, site-specific assessments, which directly undermines the reliability of the conclusions presented in the EIAR specific to our property.

From the outset, we have offered and suggested considerably less constrained alternatives, however SSEN have not given these due diligence.

To conclude, Route 4a which impacts us at Dunswood is not the best route from a planning perspective, but has been adopted by SSEN. They must be made to explain themselves, and if their rationale lacks credibility, another way must be found. This is not just "one house in the way of progress" or "the least worst option". That's lazy thinking. This is a scattered community, and the damage to it, and to us will be terminal. These proposals are not a good enough reason to destroy our home and impact our lives in this way.

Really, I cannot say more. We are both retired, full of ambition for this time in our lives. We have invested energy, time and love over the last 30 years in this place. The callousness and brutality of SSEN leave me cold. I understand the massive forces against us, but I cannot reconcile my chosen lifestyle with what is now being brought forward. I cannot see why pursuit of this national project should be allowed to drive us to the undoubted misery which will follow.

Lesley + Alan Joiner

12 May 2026