Ms Debbie Flaherty
Energy Consents Unit
Scottish Government
4th Floor
5 Atlantic Quay
150 Broomielaw
Glasgow
G2 8LU

December 2018

Dear Ms Flaherty

I wish to register my objection to the following planning application, **Viking Wind Farm Variation ECU00000723**.

Firstly I would contend this is not a variation but rather a significant change to the proposed development. The increase in turbine size will make a concerning addition to the visual impact of the already consented 103 turbines, too large in the first instance for the Shetland landscape. This therefore requires further studies on the visual footprint areas affected and the level of increased noise and vibration. Potential elevated effects on health must also be investigated given the close proximity of many turbines to residential properties.

It would be useful to know in detail the required increase in foundation area and volume of concrete, perhaps this difference is covered and I have not picked it up? Also any increase in site access and public road requirements and lay down areas to accommodate larger turbine parts. Any increase in material required from the proposed borrow pits must also be quantified; again this is perhaps covered?

The developer makes a great deal of the socio-economic benefits of this proposal, so much so it would appear to carry more weight than any prospect that this industrial development, sited on peat moorland and blanket bog, would mitigate global warming; it is more likely to have a negative impact.

Indeed, shortly after the original consent was granted in April 2012, the overwhelming scientific view was that wind farms should never be built on peat habitat, due to their extremely important value as natural carbon sinks. Conservation and restoration of peat habitat is regarded as a low hanging fruit as a measure to combat global warming. Contrary to Viking Energy's oft quoted statements the vast majority of the area is in pristine condition.

I would also endorse the objection from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation regarding the level of unacceptable degradation to the operational integrity of the recently recommissioned early warning detection radar at Saxavord in Unst. The 'cold war' is once more a reality, instances of RAF Typhoon jets accompanied by refueling tankers intercepting Russian military aircraft approaching close to UK airspace are becoming more frequent. North of Scotland and Shetland being a particular testing ground for these exploratory excursions.

The Viking Wind Farm proposal is to connect to a 600MW subsea cable. If fully subscribed with the plated capacity of the development and any others which may come on stream and with Shetland wind expected to deliver at an energy efficiency of approximately 50%, this would mean average output of only 300MW/hour of variable electricity.

The UK's electricity demand is approximately 50GW/hour at peak and 31GW/hour average, therefore this subsea cable would only supply 0.6% at peak to 0.97% at average demand. This would of course be variable and unpredictable. Given this fractional input for such a destructive, extremely costly and short lived development, I would rather we maintain our national defence security at its most efficient, sleep as safely as possible in our beds and look for other ways to reduce our carbon footprint.

Finally, harking back to the original consent, legislation requires that the Commencement of Development should begin within a 3 year time scale. Scottish Government policy was changed by directive in this instance to 5 years due to the complexity of the project. This 5 year period ran out on the 4 April 2017, I would be obliged if you could remind me how this was overcome or if indeed this planning consent should now be null and void?

The original planning consent also came with fifty conditions attached many of which are questionably achievable; it was therefore a planning consent in name only. If regulated properly this development would most likely never be built. However, this appeared to be irrelevant at the time as this consent was cynically pushed through using political rhetoric with no regard for the environmental science and economics on which it fails miserably.

Yours sincerely