

Electricity Act 1989

Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

DPEA Code of Practice

Tealing to Kintore OHL proposal TRL-120-1

CHS Statement: Personal Talk – Tealing by Angela Taylor

My name is Angela Taylor. I live in Angus in a small local community of 6 scattered dwellings.

I would like to talk today about locality and community. We often hear the term “local” in reference to local shops, local pub, local school, etc. Estate agents sell properties with reference to amenities within the locality. Generally speaking, the term “local” tends to refer to places within our immediate vicinity.

Residents in rural areas do not necessarily have a local shop, or pub, but they have local assets – farmland, woods, walks and landscape.

Meanwhile, what is a community? The dictionary defines it as a group of folk who support each other, sharing common characteristics, and identities within a location often fostering social ties and a sense of belonging.

So, I believe that a **local community** is a group of residents who share common ties within a close geographical area. It may be a small village in rural areas, or a group of scattered dwellings, with neighbours supporting each other.

NPF4 of course details the need for **Local** Development Plans. NPF4 Policy 11c refers to the need to maximise **local** net economic impact as a condition of the policy. NPF4 Policy 29 echoes the need to contribute towards **local** living in respect to rural locations.

Standing here in Tealing Hall, I asked at a consultation event how the local community would benefit from the proposed development and was told about jobs and business for Dundee. Dundee is in a different county. I listened to the **silence** at an Angus Council meeting when the applicant was asked by councillors how many permanent jobs the proposed substation would bring and the answer was “none”. The applicant has since admitted that the construction workforce will be brought in from outwith the area.

When I read the applicant’s socio-economic report I was concerned that local tourist attractions had been identified by a Google search, with it identifying that Broughty Ferry Castle, 8 miles away from the southern end of the route would not be impacted. In addition, the V and A museum in Dundee, 6 miles away and an indoor attraction would not be impacted, well there is no reason why they would be affected. Meanwhile local attractions along the route, likely to be impacted, were omitted from the report. It transpired that the local area within the socio-economic report has been identified as Dundee City, the **whole** of Angus, the **whole** of Aberdeenshire **and** Aberdeen city.

The requirements to address local concerns are replicated within NPF4 Policy 3 regarding biodiversity. Whilst local communities see their local nature networks threatened by the Proposed

Development, any improvements to BNG are still to be identified and the application mentions exploring sites outwith the route.

To summarise, I see infrastructure being proposed impacting local communities negatively in terms of landscape, economy, noise, biodiversity and nature networks, contrary to local and National planning policies. Although NPF4 neglects to identify the term “local”, it must surely be recognised that the applicant’s definition is not only widely different from a generally recognised definition, but is used in a confusing fashion. A recognised definition of local is used when mentioning the negative impacts, but when identifying the potential benefits, the applicant needs to revert to a much larger geographical area to define locality. Potential benefits in terms of energy supply and economy are for what most would define as a more distant community, whilst the negative impacts are indeed felt by those within the immediate vicinity. I hope the Reporters will consider in their determination, the points I have raised.

Angela Taylor

11 May 2026