

# Stronsay Development Trust

A Scottish Charity SC038888

Board Meeting on 5 March 2008 in the Community Centre at 20.00  
**Approved Minutes**

**Present:**

Mike Erdman (Chair)	Eoin Stevenson	John Steenton (minutes)
Julia Crocker	Malcolm Addison	William Caithness LDO
Brian Crowe	Ian Cooper	Garry Dennison
Colin McAlpine	Jennifer George	

**Apologies:** Cora Goodram, Leo Martini-Brown

The meeting commenced at 1800

**Welcome by Chair**

ME welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for attending this extra important meeting.

ME and LDO clarified the current information on the two available sites for the community wind turbine and suggested that as a board we discuss the pros and cons of each, bearing in mind that the application will need to be supported by justifications for the preferred site.

The chair felt that there were four actual options:

- Site A
- Site B
- Share a community turbine with another island
- Withdraw completely from the project.

ES declared an interest.

The board's attention was drawn to the letter from Scotrenewables explaining the concerns that had been expressed by SNH and RSPB to our chosen site (B) on the map, grid reference 362229E 1022263N.

It appears that the other site (A) might attract less opposition from RSPB and SNH at the planning permission stage, although there seems a general lack of understanding by these two bodies about the extent of made up road and subsequent infrastructure required.

The board considered the justifications for both sites under the headings

- Access and infrastructure
- Amount of generated power
- Potential income
- Environmental impact – especially to breeding birds

After discussion the board concluded that there were more positives and fewer negatives for site B, which is a higher site, nearer the grid connection requires a shorter access road and will cost less. Site A, while we are led to believe is more likely to meet planning approval, will necessitate a greater disturbance of heather and nesting sites and is likely to generate less power for a greater capital outlay.

JC proposed that we stay with site B as the preferred site. CM seconded the proposal. There was no counter proposal. The board voted 8 for the proposal.

The meeting closed at 19.00