



A specialist energy consultancy

[Technical Appendix 8.1](#)

Operational Noise Report

Craig Watch Wind Farm

Craig Watch Wind Farm Ltd

15909-002
01 November 2024

COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE



tneigroup.com

.....

Quality Assurance

TNEI Services Ltd and TNEI Africa (PTY) Ltd operate an Integrated Management System and is registered with The British Assessment Bureau as being compliant with ISO 9001(Quality), ISO 14001 (Environmental) and ISO 45001 (Health and Safety).

Disclaimer

This document is issued for the sole use of the Customer as detailed on the front page of this document to whom the document is addressed and who entered into a written agreement with TNEI. All other use of this document is strictly prohibited and no other person or entity is permitted to use this report unless it has otherwise been agreed in writing by TNEI. This document must be read in its entirety and statements made within may be based on assumptions or the best information available at the time of producing the document and these may be subject to material change with either actual amounts differing substantially from those used in this document or other assumptions changing significantly. TNEI hereby expressly disclaims any and all liability for the consequences of any such changes. TNEI also accept no liability or responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon or being used for anything other than the specific purpose for which it is intended, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data used in the document that has been provided by a third party.

This document is protected by copyright and may only be reproduced and circulated in accordance with the Document Classification and associated conditions stipulated or referred to in this document and/or in TNEI's written agreement with the Customer. No part of this document may be disclosed in any public offering memorandum, prospectus or stock exchange listing, circular or announcement without the express and prior written consent of TNEI. A Document Classification permitting the Customer to redistribute this document shall not thereby

imply that TNEI has any liability to any recipient other than the Customer.

Any information provided by third parties that is included in this report has not been independently verified by TNEI and as such TNEI accept no responsibility for its accuracy and completeness. The Customer should take appropriate steps to verify this information before placing any reliance on it.



Document Control

Revision	Status	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by	Date
D0	DRAFT	GC	JM	JM	12/04/2022
D1	CLIENT COMMENTS	GC	JM	JM	26/04/2022
R0	FINAL ISSUE	GC	JM	JM	10/05/2022
R1	UPDATE TO CONSIDER NEW LAYOUT WITHOUT T9 & CANDIDATE AND NEARBY CLASHINDARROCH EXTENSION WIND FARM	MT	GC	GC	13/08/2024
R2	REVISION FOLLOWING COMMENTS	GC	JM	JM	12/09/2024
R3	FINAL ISSUE	MT	MT	MT	01/11/2024

TNEI Services Ltd

Company Registration Number: 03891836

VAT Registration Number: 239 0146 20

Registered Address

Bainbridge House
 86-90 London Road
 Manchester
 M1 2PW
 Tel: +44 (0)161 233 4800

7th Floor West One
 Forth Banks
 Newcastle upon Tyne
 NE1 3PA
 Tel: +44 (0)191 211 1400

7th Floor
 80 St. Vincent Street
 Glasgow
 G2 5UB
 Tel: +44 (0)141 428 3180

TNEI Ireland Ltd

Registered Address: 104 Lower Baggot Street, Dublin 2, DO2 Y940

Company Registration Number: 662195

VAT Registration Number: 3662952IH

Unit S12, Synergy Centre
 TU Dublin Tallaght Campus
 Tallaght
 D24 A386
 Tel: +353 (0)190 36445

TNEI Africa (Pty) Ltd

Registered: Mazars House, Rialto Rd, Grand Moorings Precinct, 7441 Century City, South Africa

Company Number: 2016/088929/07

Unit 514 Tyger Lake
 Niagara Rd & Tyger Falls Blvd
 Bellville, Cape Town
 South Africa, 7530

Executive Summary

[This document is an update of Technical Appendix 11.2: Operational Noise Report included as part of the 2022 EIA Report; original text is shown in black, and updated text is shown in blue.]

TNEI Services was commissioned by Statkraft UK Ltd on behalf of Craig Watch Wind Farm Limited ('the Applicant') to undertake predictions of the wind turbine noise that would be emitted by the operation of the proposed Craig Watch Wind Farm (hereinafter referred to as 'the Proposed Development'). **The Proposed Development considered is for 10 wind turbines and associated infrastructure.** The noise predictions were used to assess the potential impact of operational noise from the Proposed Development on the nearest noise sensitive receptors.

The Scottish Government's web based renewables advice on 'Onshore Wind Turbines' states: *'The Report, "The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms" (Final Report, Sept 1996, DTI), (ETSU-R-97), describes a framework for the measurement of wind farm noise, which should be followed by applicants and consultees, and used by planning authorities to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments, until such time as an update is available. This gives indicative noise levels thought to offer a reasonable degree of protection to wind farm neighbours, without placing unreasonable burdens on wind farm developers, and suggests appropriate noise conditions.'* The advice document then goes on to state: *'The Institute of Acoustics (IOA) has since published Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise [IOA GPG]. The document provides significant support on technical issues to all users of the ETSU-R-97 method for rating and assessing wind turbine noise, and should be used by all IOA members and those undertaking assessments to ETSU-R-97. The Scottish Government accepts that the guide represents current industry good practice.'* The guidance contained within ETSU-R-97 and current good practice has been used to assess the potential operational noise impact of the Proposed Development.

The operational noise assessment has been undertaken in three stages:

- 1) deriving the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits (which are applicable to noise from all wind turbines in the area operating concurrently) at noise sensitive receptors;
- 2) predicting the likely effects (undertaking a cumulative noise assessment where required) to determine whether noise immission at noise sensitive receptors will meet the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits; and
- 3) deriving Site Specific Noise Limits for the Proposed Development (taking account of the noise limit that has already been allocated / could realistically be used by other schemes) and undertaking predictions against those limits.

Background noise monitoring was undertaken at five noise sensitive receptors. The monitoring locations were considered to be representative of the noise sensitive receptors located closest to the Proposed Development.

A total of **24** noise sensitive receptors were chosen as Noise Assessment Locations (NALs). The NALs were chosen to represent the noise sensitive receptors located closest to the Proposed Development and additional receptors were included to consider cumulative noise impacts. For the assessment locations where no background noise measurements were undertaken, noise data collected at proxy locations deemed representative of the expected background noise environment was used to assess the wind turbine noise impact at those receptors.

Wind speed data was measured using a LIDAR unit. The wind data, measured at 104 m and 124 m height, was used to calculate wind speeds at 125 m. These wind speeds were then standardised to a height of 10 m in accordance with current good practice. Analysis of the measured data has been

undertaken in accordance with ETSU-R-97 and current good practice to determine the pre-existing background noise environment and to establish the daytime and night time noise limits at each of the NALs. [As such, limits are applicable for any proposed hub up to 125 m.](#)

Based on the guidance in ETSU-R-97 and to reflect the presence of existing wind turbines in the area, the daytime Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit was set at 40 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater. The night time Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit has been set at 43 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB whichever is the greater. The Site Specific daytime limit for noise associated with the Proposed Development has been set such that it never exceeds 35 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater. This represents the lower end of the daytime limits that can be applied under ETSU-R-97. The night time Site Specific Noise Limits have been set at 43 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater.

The exception to the setting of both the daytime and night time fixed minimum noise limits occurs when a property occupier has a financial involvement in the wind farm development, in which case the fixed minimum limit can be increased to 45 dB(A) or a higher permissible limit above background during the daytime and night time periods. For the purposes of this assessment it has been assumed that there are no financially involved properties.

Predictions of wind turbine noise for the Proposed Development were made, based upon the sound power level data for a candidate wind turbine, the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW with serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades and a hub height of 118.5 m](#). This wind turbine model has been chosen as it is considered to be representative of the type of turbine that could be installed at the Site. Whatever the final turbine choice is, the Proposed Development would have to meet the noise limits determined and contained within any condition applied as part of consent.

Modelling was undertaken using the ISO 9613: 1996 '*Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors Part 2: General method of calculation*' noise prediction model which accords with current good practice and is considered to provide a realistic impact assessment. For the other schemes, predictions have been undertaken using sound power level data for the installed turbines or a suitable candidate. The model of turbine was either identified through an online search, or through the use of the Moray and Aberdeenshire Council's Planning Application Portals.

A cumulative assessment was undertaken at the NALs where predictions from the Proposed Development were found to be within 10 dB of the noise predictions from all other schemes. The likely cumulative assessment undertaken at all NALs shows that the Proposed Development can operate concurrently with the proposed, consented and operational wind farms in the area, whilst still meeting the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits at the receptors.

Site Specific Noise Limits have also been derived that take account (where required) of the other wind farm developments. Where wind turbine immission from the other wind turbines at a given receptor were found to be at least 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit, it is considered that they will be using a negligible proportion of the limit, as such it was considered appropriate to allocate the entire noise limit to the Proposed Development. For the receptors where turbine predictions were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit, apportionment of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits was undertaken in accordance with current good practice.

Predicted noise levels indicate that at all noise assessment locations wind turbine noise immission were below the Site Specific Noise Limits when considering [the Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW](#) as a candidate turbine. [An exceedance \(up to 1.4 dB\) of the Site Specific Noise Limit was predicted at a wind speed of 6-7 ms⁻¹ during the daytime period at NAL6 and NAL7, and also at NAL18, NAL19 and NAL20 \(up to 0.4 dB\) at 7 ms⁻¹, therefore some wind turbines would need to be operated in a lower noise mode, at these wind speeds for certain wind directions when modelling \[the Nordex N163 turbine\]\(#\). \[The predictions presented in this report incorporate the required low noise mode operation therefore the\]\(#\)](#)

assessment shows that Site Specific Noise Limits are met at all NALs and in all conditions. Depending on the final turbine selected for the Site and confirmation of final warranted levels from chosen, manufacturer mode management may or may not be required.

The use of Site Specific Noise Limits would ensure that the Proposed Development could operate concurrently with other proposed, consented or operational turbines in the area and would also ensure that the Proposed Development's individual contribution could be measured and enforced if required.

At this stage it has been assumed that there are no occupiers of properties which should be considered as Financially Involved with the Proposed Development or any of the existing consented developments, this represents a worst case scenario. It would be possible to update the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits and the Site Specific Noise Limits to reflect any financial involvement if details become available.

Should consent be granted for the Proposed Development it would be appropriate to include a set of noise related planning conditions, which detail the noise limits applicable to the Proposed Development.

There are a number of wind turbine makes and models that may be suitable for the Proposed Development. Should the Proposed Development receive consent the final choice of turbine would be subject to a competitive tendering process. As such, predictions of wind turbine noise are for information only. The final choice of turbine would, however, have to meet the noise limits determined and contained within any condition imposed.

Contents

Document Control.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Contents.....	7
1 Introduction	10
1.1 Brief	10
1.2 Background.....	10
2 Noise Planning Policy and Guidance.....	12
2.1 Overview of Noise Planning Policy and Guidance.....	12
2.2 National Planning Policy.....	12
2.3 Local Policy	14
2.4 ETSU-R-97 The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms	16
2.5 Current Good Practice.....	18
2.6 WSP BEIS Report.....	18
3 Potential Impacts	20
3.1 Operational Noise Sources	20
3.2 Infrasound, Low Frequency Noise and Vibration	20
3.3 Amplitude Modulation of Aerodynamic Noise (AM)	23
4 Methodology.....	26
4.1 Assessing Operational Noise Impact	26
4.2 Consultation	27
4.3 Setting the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits (Stage 1).....	29
4.4 Assessment of likely effects and the requirement for a cumulative assessment (Stage 2)..	30
4.5 Setting the Site Specific Noise Limits (Stage 3)	33
5 Baseline	35
5.1 Identification of Potential Noise Receptors	35
5.2 Background Noise Survey.....	35
5.3 Noise Monitoring Equipment.....	36
5.4 Meteorological Data.....	37
5.5 Influence of Existing Turbines on Background Measurements.....	37
5.6 Directional Filtering of Background Noise.....	38
5.7 Analysis of Measured Data.....	38
5.8 Prevailing Background Noise Level.....	38

6	Noise Assessment Results.....	41
6.1	Noise Assessment Locations	41
6.2	Noise Emission Characteristics of the Wind Turbines.....	43
6.3	Noise Propagation Parameters.....	43
6.4	Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits (Stage 1)	45
6.5	Predicting the requirement for a cumulative assessment and the likely effects (Stage 2)	47
6.6	Derivation of Site Specific Noise Limits (Stage 3).....	58
6.7	Choice of Daytime Fixed Minimum Noise Limit (35 – 40 dB).....	69
6.8	Micrositing.....	69
7	Summary and Conclusions.....	70
8	Glossary of Terms.....	72
9	References	74

TABLES

Table 1.1	Cumulative Wind Farm/ Turbine Development.....	11
Table 5.1	Noise Monitoring Locations	36
Table 5.2	Summary of Prevailing Background Noise Levels during Quiet Daytime Periods (dB(A))	39
Table 5.3	Summary of Prevailing Background Noise Levels during Night time Periods (dB(A)).....	39
Table 5.4	Analysis of Measured Datasets	40
Table 6.1	Noise Assessment Locations	41
Table 6.2	Wind Directivity Attenuation Factors used in Modelling.....	45
Table 6.3	Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits Daytime.....	45
Table 6.4	Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits Night Time.....	46
Table 6.5	Cumulative Assessment Requirement	48
Table 6.6	ETSU-R-97 Compliance Table – Likely Cumulative Noise - Daytime	50
Table 6.7	ETSU-R-97 Compliance Table – Likely Cumulative Noise – Night time	54
Table 6.8	Limit Derivation Strategy.....	58
Table 6.9	Site Specific Noise Limits Compliance Table – Daytime	61
Table 6.10	Site Specific Noise Limits Compliance Table – Night time	65

ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Figures

Annex 2 – Correspondence with the Environmental Health Department at the Councils

Annex 3 – Field Data Sheets / Installation Report

Annex 4 – Calibration/ Conformance Certificates for Sound Level Meters and Calibrator

Annex 5 – Time Series Graphs

Annex 6 – Topographical Corrections/ Turbine Coordinates/ Cumulative Noise Predictions

Annex 7 – Summary of Wind Turbine Noise Source Data

Annex 8 – Site Specific Noise Limits for Clashindarroch Extension Wind Farm

1 Introduction

1.1 Brief

1.1.1 TNEI was commissioned by Statkraft UK Ltd on behalf of Craig Watch Wind Farm Limited ('the Applicant') to undertake an operational noise assessment for the proposed Craig Watch Wind Farm (hereinafter referred to as the 'Proposed Development'). [The Proposed Development is for 10 wind turbines and associated infrastructure.](#) The following steps summarise the noise assessment process:

- Measure existing background noise levels, assess and present the noise data with reference to existing Government Guidance and the recommendations of the Department of Trade and Industry Noise Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines which are contained within ETSU-R-97 '*The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms*' (1) and '*A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise*' (2) (IOA GPG) which represents current good practice;
- Determine the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits applicable to all wind farms in the area;
- Assess and undertake a cumulative noise assessment, where required, to take account of other proposed, consented or operational schemes near to the Proposed Development;
- Derive Site Specific Noise Limits for the Proposed Development, suitable for inclusion in the noise related planning condition should Scottish Ministers be minded to grant consent for the Proposed Development;
- Undertake predictions of the operational wind turbine noise immission from the Proposed Development that will be incident at neighbouring noise sensitive receptors;
- Compare predictions of the operational wind turbine noise immission from the Proposed Development against the Site Specific Noise Limits that will be incident at neighbouring noise sensitive receptors; and
- Assess the impact of noise from the Proposed Development with reference to existing Government Guidance and the recommendations of the Department of Trade and Industry Noise Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines, which are contained within ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG (current good practice).

1.2 Background

1.2.1 The Proposed Development is located approximately 8 km south east of Dufftown in Moray. The approximate OS Grid Reference for the centre of the Site is 338952, 835270 and the proposed layout is shown on Figure A1.1 in Annex A.

1.2.2 In the absence of a confirmed turbine model, this noise assessment models a candidate turbine, [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW with serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades and a hub height of 118.5 m.](#) This turbine has been selected as it is representative of the turbine type which could be installed at the Site.

1.2.3 The noise assessment has considered schemes which are operational, consented and proposed (planning application submitted) but not those in the pre-planning stage. The schemes considered in the assessment are summarised in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Cumulative Wind Farm/ Turbine Development

Wind Farm/ Wind Turbine	Number of Turbines	Status	Make and Model of Turbine considered in Modelling
Dorenell	59	Operational	Vestas V90, 3 MW, standard blade
Hill of Towie	21	Operational	Siemens SWT 2.3-82, 2.3 MW, standard blade
Hill of Towie II	16	Consented	Vestas V90, 3 MW, standard blade
Clashindarroch	18	Operational	Senvion MM82, 2.05 MW, standard blade
Cairnborrow	5	Operational	Senvion MM82, 2.05 MW, standard blade
Clashindarroch II	14	Consented (at Appeal)	Nordex N133, 4.8 MW, standard blade
Garbet	7	Consented (at Appeal)	Siemens Gamesa SG6.6-155, 6.6 MW, standard blade
Clashindarroch Extension	22	In Planning	9 x Siemens Gamesa SG-155, 6.6 MW, standard blade 13 x Siemens Gamesa SG-170, 6.6 MW, standard blade

1.2.4 Figure A1.1a in Annex 1 shows the location of the above developments relative to the Proposed Development.

1.2.5 The Site Specific Noise Limits presented in this report for the Proposed Development have taken account the noise limits that could potentially be used by the other schemes in the area.

1.2.6 For the purposes of assessing the above schemes in conjunction with the Proposed Development the following terms have been referred to throughout the assessment;

- ‘Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits’; defined as being the limit that should not be exceeded from the cumulative operation of all wind farm developments, including the Proposed Development; and
- ‘Site Specific Noise Limits’; defined as being the limit that is specific to the Proposed Development only, and derived through the apportionment (where required), of the ‘Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits’ in accordance with current good practice.

1.2.7 Note that in this report, the term ‘noise emission’ relates to the sound power level radiated from each wind turbine, whereas the term ‘noise immission’ relates to the sound pressure level (the received noise) at any receptor location due to the operation of the wind turbines. All references to dB are dB(A) unless otherwise stated. A full glossary of terms is provided in Section 8.

2 Noise Planning Policy and Guidance

2.1 Overview of Noise Planning Policy and Guidance

2.1.1 In assessing the potential noise impacts of the Proposed Development, the following guidance and policy documents have been considered:

- Local Policy;
- National Planning Policy Framework 4 (3);
- Web Based Renewables Advice: 'Onshore Wind Turbines' (4);
- Planning Advice Note PAN 1/2011: 'Planning and Noise' (5);
- ETSU-R-97 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms'; and
- Institute of Acoustics 'A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise' (IOA GPG) May 2013.

2.2 National Planning Policy

2.2.1 As the Proposed Development has capacity to generate over 50 MW, the Proposed Development requires consent from the Scottish Ministers Energy Consenting Unit (ECU) under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989. In such cases the Planning Authority is a statutory consultee in the development management process and procedures.

National Planning Policy Framework 4

2.2.2 In determining an application for Section 36 consent, the Scottish Ministers must first have regard to the extent to which the Applicant has met its duties in terms of Schedule 9 of the Electricity Act 1989. The Applicant must assess and, if required, mitigate the effects of the Proposed Development on environmental matters.

2.2.3 Furthermore, decision makers must also consider National Energy and Planning Policy, and, in the context of a Section 36 application, the statutory Development Plan. As of February 2023, National Planning Framework 4 ('NPF4') now forms part of the statutory Development Plan alongside the relevant Local Development Plan and any related Supplementary Guidance. Such plans will often contain policies tailored specifically to control certain kinds of development and such policies should carry more weight and be more dominant in the minds of decision makers.

2.2.4 National Planning Framework 4 ('NPF4') was adopted on 13 February 2023 and supersedes National Planning Framework 3 and Scottish Planning Policy. Policy 11 – Energy states that renewable energy projects must be able to demonstrate how any noise impacts on communities have been addressed through the project's design and any associated mitigation. Policy 23 – Health and Safety outline how 'development proposals that are likely to raise unacceptable noise issues will not be supported' and states that 'a Noise Impact Assessment may be required where the nature of the proposal or its location suggests that significant effects are likely.'

2.2.5 The Scottish Government's online Onshore Wind: Policy Statement 2022 (published on 21 December 2022) (6) states (in Section 3.7) that: 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from

Wind Farms' (Final Report, Sept 1996, DTI), (ETSU-R-97) provides the framework for the measurement of wind turbine noise, and all applicants are required to follow the framework and use it to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments.'

Planning Advice Note PAN 1/2011: Planning and Noise

- 2.2.6 PAN 1/2011 provides advice on the role of the planning system in helping to prevent and limit the adverse effects of noise. Paragraph 29 contains some specific information on noise from wind farms and states the following:

'There are two sources of noise from wind turbines - the mechanical noise from the turbines and the aerodynamic noise from the blades. Mechanical noise is related to engineering design. Aerodynamic noise varies with rotor design and wind speed, and is generally greatest at low speeds. Good acoustical design and siting of turbines is essential to minimise the potential to generate noise. Web based planning advice on renewable technologies for Onshore wind turbines provides advice on 'The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms' (ETSU-R-97) published by the former Department of Trade and Industry [DTI] and the findings of the Salford University report into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise.'

Web Based Planning Advice – Onshore Wind Turbines

- 2.2.7 The 'Onshore Wind Turbines' web-based document also describes the types of noise (mechanical and aerodynamic) that wind turbines generate. Mechanical noise is generated by the gearbox and generator and other parts of the drive train, which can be radiated as noise through the nacelle, gear box, tower and supporting structures, together with the aerodynamic noise generated by the action of the blades rotating through the air. The document states *'there has been significant reduction in the mechanical noise generated by wind turbines through improved turbine design'* and goes on to note:

'The Report, "The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms" (Final Report, Sept 1996, DTI), (ETSU-R-97), describes a framework for the measurement of wind farm noise, which should be followed by applicants and consultees, and used by planning authorities to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments, until such time as an update is available. This gives indicative noise levels thought to offer a reasonable degree of protection to wind farm neighbours, without placing unreasonable burdens on wind farm developers, and suggests appropriate noise conditions.'

- 2.2.8 The web-based document then refers to the IOA GPG as a source, which provides:

'significant support on technical issues to all users of the ETSU-R-97 method for rating and assessing wind turbine noise, and should be used by all IOA members and those undertaking assessments to ETSU-R-97. The Scottish Government accepts that the guide represents current industry good practice.'

- 2.2.9 The document also refers to the role of PAN1/2011 'Planning and Noise' to:

'provide advice on the role of the planning system in helping to prevent and limit the adverse effects of noise. The associated Technical Advice Note provides guidance which may assist in the technical evaluation of noise assessment.'

- 2.2.10 Examination of the Technical Advice Note (7) confirms that it provides advice on wind farms by referring to ETSU-R-97 and relevant parameters for modelling identified in the Institute of Acoustics Bulletin March 2009, on page 37. This has been superseded by the introduction of the IOA GPG in May 2013.

2.3 Local Policy

- 2.3.1 In determining an application for planning permission the 'starting point' for decision makers is to consider the compliance of a proposal against the proposed Development Plan taken as a whole. Plans often have policies tailored specifically to control certain kinds of proposed development and such policies should carry more weight and be more dominant in the minds of decision makers.

- 2.3.2 When considering planning applications, decision makers should have regard to any adopted Structure Plan Policies, Local Plan (or Local Development Plan) Policies and any accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance. In determining planning applications due regard should be had to all other material considerations, including National Planning Policy.

Moray Local Development Plan 2020

- 2.3.3 The adopted Development Plan for the area comprises of the Moray Local Development Plan (LDP) 2020 (8) which was formally adopted on 27th July 2020. This Plan sets out how the Council sees the Moray area developing over the next 10 years. The main objectives of the plan include:

'Encourage efficient use of land and promote low carbon and sustainable development.

Protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

Improve resilience of the natural and build environment to climate change.'

- 2.3.4 Policy DP 9: Renewable Energy covers the principal policy guidance in relation to renewable energy development. It states;

'All renewable energy proposals will be considered favourably where they meet the following criteria:

- i) They are compliant with policies to safeguard and enhance the built and natural environment;*
- ii) They do not result in the permanent loss or permanent damage of prime agricultural land;*
- iii) They avoid or address any unacceptable significant adverse impacts.'*

- 2.3.5 The LDP set outs a Spatial Framework for onshore wind energy development, identifying 'Areas of Significant Protection' where the Council applies significant protection, proposing siting, design and other mitigation measures to be adopted in circumstances where significant effects on the qualities of these areas may be impacted.

- 2.3.6 In addition to the above considerations, Policy DP 9 further states that onshore wind turbine proposals will be required to address *'unacceptable significant adverse impact on*

communities and local amenity including the impacts of noise, shadow flicker, visual dominance and the potential for associated mitigation.'

- 2.3.7 Policy EP 14: Pollution, Contamination & Hazards states: *'Development proposals which may cause significant air, water, soil, light or noise pollution or exacerbate existing issues must be accompanied by a detailed assessment report on the levels, character and transmission of the potential pollution with measures to mitigate impacts. Where significant or unacceptable impacts cannot be mitigated, proposals will be refused.'* The aim of which is to ensure new developments do not create any form of pollution which could adversely impact the surrounding environment or local amenity.

Moray Onshore Wind Energy Non-statutory Guidance

- 2.3.8 Moray Onshore Wind Energy Policy Guidance (9) forms part of the new statutory Moray Local Development Plan 2020 and is therefore included within the new LDP. The document, adopted in October 2020, aims to provide additional guidance to that already provided within the LDP, with the guidance contained within it acting as a material consideration in assessing wind turbine proposals.
- 2.3.9 The document advises: *"If the applicant wishes to pursue an application where the predicted noise levels are greater than 35dB(A) they will be required to follow the guidance provided by ETSU-R-97, the "IOA GPG, May 2013" and the IOA Supplementary Guidance Notes that accompany these documents, in relation to assessing background noise levels"*

Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017

- 2.3.10 In April 2017, the Scottish Ministers provided written approval to formally adopt the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017 (10), therefore superseding the 2012 Plan and supplementary guidance accompanied with it. The local development plan set out the policies used to assess planning applications while setting out where development is expected to take place from 2017 to 2026.
- 2.3.11 Policy C2: Renewable Energy provides guidance on how renewable energy applications will be assessed by Aberdeenshire Council. The policy states that: *'All windfarms must be appropriately sited and designed and avoid unacceptable environmental effects taking into account the cumulative effects of existing and consented wind turbines.'*

Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2023

- 2.3.12 Aberdeenshire Council has since drafted the Proposed Local Development Plan (PLDP) (11) which, as of June 2021, commenced stage 3 of the LDP process to be examined by the Scottish Ministers from the Planning and Environmental Appeals Division (DPEA). A conclusion to this process is expected shortly with adoption anticipated for Summer 2022. The purpose of the PLDP will be to inform and advise developers and communities on the principles that built development should follow and where it should be located.
- 2.3.13 Due to the proposed LDP's stage within the local development plan process, the PLDP is a material consideration in determining planning applications submitted to Aberdeenshire Council. The level of weight applied to the PLDP should therefore not be significant, with the Aberdeenshire LDP 2017 remaining the up to date LDP and the primary document which planning applications should be determined until the PLDP is adopted.

- 2.3.14 Policy C2: Renewable energy within the PLDP provides the guidance for how renewable energy development proposals will be determined by Aberdeenshire Council, detailing the following; *“Unacceptable significant adverse effects on the amenity of dwellinghouses, such as from noise, or on tourism and recreation interests including core paths and other established routes used for public walking, riding or cycling, or to protected species should also be avoided.”*

2.4 ETSU-R-97 The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms

- 2.4.1 As wind farms started to be developed in the UK in the early 1990's, it became apparent that existing noise standards did not fully address the issues associated with the unique characteristics of wind farm developments and there was a need for an agreed methodology for defining acceptable noise limits for wind farm developments. This methodology was developed for the former Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) by the Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines (WGNWT).

- 2.4.2 The WGNWT comprised a number of interested parties including, amongst others, Environmental Health Officers, wind farm operators, independent acoustic consultants and legal experts who:

‘...between them have a breadth and depth of experience in assessing and controlling the environmental impact of noise from wind farms.’

- 2.4.3 In this way it represented the views of all the stakeholders that are involved in the assessment of noise impacts of wind farm developments. The recommendations of the WGNWT are presented in the DTI Report – ETSU-R-97 *‘The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (1996).’*

- 2.4.4 The basic aim of the WGNWT in arriving at the recommendations was the intention to provide:

‘Indicative noise levels thought to offer a reasonable degree of protection to wind farm neighbours, without placing unreasonable restrictions on wind farm development or adding to the costs and administrative burdens on wind farm developers or local authorities.’

- 2.4.5 ETSU-R-97 makes it clear from the outset that any noise restrictions placed on a wind farm must balance the environmental impact of the wind farm against the national and global benefits that would arise through the development of renewable energy sources:

‘The planning system must therefore seek to control the environmental impacts from a wind farm whilst at the same time recognising the national and global benefits that would arise through the development of renewable energy sources and not be so severe that wind farm development is unduly stifled.’

- 2.4.6 Where noise at the nearest noise sensitive receptors is limited to an $L_{A90,10min}$ of 35 dB(A) up to wind speeds of 10 ms^{-1} at a height of 10 m, then it does not need to be considered in the noise assessment, as protection of the amenity of these properties can be controlled through a simplified noise limit. In this regard ETSU-R-97 states that:

‘For single turbines or wind farms with very large separation distances between the turbines and the nearest properties, a simplified noise condition may be suitable. If the noise is limited

to an $L_{A90,10min}$ of 35 dB(A) up to wind speeds of 10 m/s at 10 m height, then this condition alone would offer sufficient protection of amenity, and background noise surveys would be unnecessary.'

- 2.4.7 The ETSU-R-97 assessment procedure specifies that where wind turbine noise is expected to be above the simplified limit of 35 dB L_{A90} noise limits should be set relative to existing background noise levels at the nearest receptors. These limits should reflect the variation in both turbine source noise and background noise with wind speed. Absolute lower limits, different for daytime and night time, are applied where low levels of background noise are measured. The wind speed range that should be considered ranges between the cut-in wind speed for the turbines (usually about 2 to 3 ms^{-1}) and up to 12 ms^{-1} , where all wind speeds are referenced to a 10 metre measurement height.
- 2.4.8 Separate noise limits apply for daytime and for night time. Daytime limits are chosen to protect a property's external amenity, and night time limits are chosen to prevent sleep disturbance indoors, with windows open.
- 2.4.9 The daytime noise limit is derived from background noise data measured during so-called 'quiet periods of the day', which comprise weekday evenings (18:00 to 23:00), Saturday afternoons and evenings (13:00 to 23:00) and all day and evening on Sundays (07:00 to 23:00). Multiple samples of 10 minute background noise levels using the $L_{A90,10min}$ measurement index are logged continuously over a range of wind speed conditions. These measured noise levels are then plotted against concurrent wind speed data and a 'best fit' curve is fitted to the data to establish the background noise level as a function of wind speed. The ETSU-R-97 daytime noise limit, sometimes referred to as a 'criterion curve', is then set at a level 5 dB(A) above the best fit curve over the desired wind speed range; subject to an appropriate daytime fixed minimum limit:
- 'For wind speeds where the best fit curve to the background noise data lies below a level of 30 - 35 dB(A) the criterion curve is set at a fixed level in the range 35 - 40 dB(A). The precise choice of criterion curve level within the range 35 - 40 dB(A) depends on a number of factors: the number of noise affected properties, the likely duration, the level of exposure and the potential impact on the power output of the wind farm. The quiet daytime limits have been set in ETSU-R-97 on the basis of protecting the amenity of residents whilst outside their dwellings in garden areas.'*
- 2.4.10 The night time noise limit is derived from background noise data measured during the night time periods (23:00 to 07:00), with no differentiation being made between weekdays and weekends. The 10 minute L_{A90} noise levels measured over the night time periods are plotted against concurrent wind speed data and a 'best fit' correlation is established. The night time noise limit is also based on a level 5 dB(A) above the best fit curve over the 0 - 12 ms^{-1} wind speed range, with a fixed minimum limit of 43 dB L_{A90} .
- 2.4.11 The exception to the setting of both the daytime and night-time fixed minimum limits occurs where a property occupier has a financial involvement in the wind farm development. Paragraph 24 of ETSU-R-97 states:
- 'The Noise Working Group recommends that both day and night time lower fixed limits can be increased to 45 dB(A) and that consideration should be given to increasing the permissible margin above background where the occupier of the property has some financial involvement in the wind farm.'*

- 2.4.12 ETSU-R-97 provides a robust basis for determining the noise limits for wind turbine(s) and since its introduction has become the accepted standard for such developments across the UK.

2.5 Current Good Practice

A Good Practice Guide on the Application of ETSU-R-97

- 2.5.1 In May 2013, the Institute of Acoustics issued 'A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise' (IOA GPG). The document provides guidance on background data collection, data analysis and limit derivation, noise predictions, cumulative issues, reporting requirements and other matters such as noise related planning conditions.
- 2.5.2 The Authors of the IOA GPG sets out the scope of the document in Section 1.2:
- 'This guide presents current good practice in the application of the ETSU-R-97 assessment methodology for all wind turbine developments above 50 kW, reflecting the original principles within ETSU-R-97, and the results of research carried out and experience gained since ETSU-R-97 was published. The noise limits in ETSU-R-97 have not been examined as these are a matter for Government.'*
- 2.5.3 The guidance document was endorsed, on behalf of Scottish Government by the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth, Mr John Swinney MSP (12). The recommendations included in the IOA GPG have been considered and applied throughout this noise assessment for the Proposed Development.
- 2.5.4 The IOA GPG refers to six Supplementary Guidance Notes and where applicable these have also been considered in this report.
- 2.5.5 The guidance contained within ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG has therefore been used to assess and rate the operational noise emissions from the Proposed Development.

2.6 WSP BEIS Report

- 2.6.1 In February 2023, WSP published 'A review of noise guidance for onshore wind turbines' (13) ('WSP BEIS report'). The report, which was subsequently re-issued as version 4 in May 2023, was commissioned by (the former) UK Government Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS). The primary aim of the review was to make a recommendation on whether, in view of government policies on noise and Net Zero, and available evidence, the existing guidance requires updating.
- 2.6.2 The WSP BEIS report concluded that:
- 'the guidance would benefit from further review and updating of the aspects identified. This could be supported by currently available evidence, which is summarised in this report. However, the study has also highlighted gaps in the state of knowledge, which should be addressed by further research, to support any updates to the guidance.'*

- 2.6.3 A series of recommendations are made regarding further research whilst some additional suggestions are included regarding the development of new or updated guidance. The following recommendation is included on page 26 of the WSP BEIS report:
- ‘the separation of the ‘policy position’ (addressing the balance between controlling noise impact and enabling renewable energy development), ‘technical guidance’ (application of the assessment approach), and ‘technical justification’ (the supporting evidence) into discrete, linked documents’*
- 2.6.4 The WSP BEIS report notes at the outset that ‘Any views expressed within it do not necessarily represent the views of the UK government or the governments of any of the devolved administrations’. The report does state on page 25 that:
- ‘Consideration should be given to including a clear position statement in guidance confirming the intended policy balance between protection from noise impact, and enabling of renewable energy development (to achieve Net Zero), linked with the wider policies that underpin the government approach to noise management.’*
- 2.6.5 The UK Government Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) has recently issued a tender seeking support to update ETSU-R-97. At the present time there are no set timescales for such an update to be published or adopted.
- 2.6.6 In relation to the guidance that should be used to assess the Proposed Development, the Scottish Government Guidance is clear; the Onshore Wind Policy Statement 2022 states:
- ‘3.7.1. ‘The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms’ (Final Report, Sept 1996, DTI), (ETSU-R-97) provides the framework for the measurement of wind turbine noise, and all applicants are required to follow the framework and use it to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments.’*
- ‘3.7.4. Until such time as new guidance is produced, ETSU-R-97 should continue to be followed by applicants and used to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments.’*
- 2.6.7 The guidance contained within ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG has therefore been used to assess and rate the operational noise emissions from the Proposed Development.

3 Potential Impacts

3.1 Operational Noise Sources

3.1.1 Wind turbines may emit two types of noise. Firstly, aerodynamic noise is a more natural sounding 'broad band' noise, albeit with a characteristic modulation, or 'swish', which is produced by the movement of the rotating blades through the air. Secondly, mechanical noise may emanate from components within the nacelle of a wind turbine. Potential sources of mechanical noise include gearboxes or generators.

3.1.2 Aerodynamic noise is usually perceived when the wind speeds are fairly low although at very low wind speeds the blades do not rotate, or rotate very slowly, and so negligible aerodynamic noise is generated. In higher winds aerodynamic noise may be masked by the normal sound of wind blowing through the trees and around buildings. The level of this natural 'masking' noise relative to the level of wind turbine noise is one of the several factors that determine the subjective audibility of the wind turbines (14).

3.2 Infrasound, Low Frequency Noise and Vibration

3.2.1 The term infrasound can be defined as the frequency range below 20 Hz, while low frequency noise (LFN) is typically in the frequency range 20 – 200 Hz (15). An average young healthy adult has an audible range from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz, although the sensitivity of the ear varies with frequency and is most sensitive to sounds with frequencies between 500 Hz and 4,000 Hz. Wind turbines do produce low frequency sounds (16), but our threshold of hearing at such low frequencies is relatively high and they therefore go unnoticed. Infrasound from wind turbines is often at levels below that of the noise generated by wind around buildings and other obstacles.

3.2.2 In 2004, the former DTI commissioned The Hayes McKenzie Partnership to report on claims that infrasound or LFN emitted by wind turbine generators (WTGs) were causing health effects. Of the 126 wind farms operating in the UK, five had reported LFN problems, therefore, such complaints are an exception, rather than a general problem that exists for all wind farms. Hayes McKenzie investigated the effects of infrasound and LFN at three wind farms for which complaints had been received and the results were reported in May 2006 (17). The report concluded that:

- *'infrasound associated with modern wind turbines is not a source which will result in noise levels which may be injurious to the health of a wind farm neighbour;*
- *low frequency noise was measurable on a few occasions but below the existing permitted Night Time Noise Criterion. Wind turbine noise may result in internal noise levels within a dwelling that is just above the threshold of audibility, however at all sites it was always lower than that of local road traffic noise;*
- *that the common cause of complaint was not associated with LFN, but the occasional audible modulation of aerodynamic noise especially at night. Data collected showed that the internal noise levels were insufficient to wake up residents at these three sites. However once awoken, this noise can result in difficulties in returning to sleep.'*

- 3.2.3 The Applied and Environmental Geophysics Research Group at Keele University was commissioned by the Ministry of Defence (MOD), the DTI and the British Wind Energy Association (BWEA) to undertake microseismic and infrasound monitoring of LFN and vibrations from wind farms for the purposes of siting wind farms in the vicinity of Eskdalemuir in Scotland. Whilst the testing showed that vibration can be detected several kilometres away from wind turbines, the levels of vibration from wind turbines were so small that only the most sophisticated instrumentation can reveal their presence and they are almost impossible to detect. Nevertheless, the Renewable Energy Foundation alleged potential adverse health effects and when that story was picked up in the popular press, notably the Scotsman, the report's authors expressed concern over the way in which their work had been misinterpreted and issued a rebuttal statement (18) in August 2005:

'Vibrations at this level and in this frequency range will be available from all kinds of sources such as traffic and background noise – they are not confined to wind turbines. To put the level of vibration into context, they are ground vibrations with amplitudes of about one millionth of a millimetre. There is no possibility of humans sensing the vibration and absolutely no risk to human health.'

- 3.2.4 In response to concerns that wind turbines emit infrasound and cause associated health problems, Dr Geoff Leventhall, Consultant in Noise Vibration and Acoustics and author of the Defra Report on Low Frequency Noise and its Effects, said in the article in the Scotsman ('Wind farm noise rules 'dated'- James Reynolds, 5 August 2005'):

'I can state quite categorically that there is no significant infrasound from current designs of wind turbines.'

- 3.2.5 An article (19) published in the IOA Bulletin (March/April 2009) concluded that there is no robust evidence that either low frequency noise (including 'infrasound') or ground-borne vibration from wind farms, has an adverse effect on wind farm neighbours.

- 3.2.6 Work (20) by Dr Leventhall looked at infrasound levels within the ear compared to external sources and concluded:

'The conclusion is that the continuous inner ear infrasound levels due to internal sources, which are in the same frequency range as wind turbine rotational frequencies, are higher than the levels produced in the inner ear by wind turbines, making it unlikely that the wind turbine noise will affect the vestibular systems, contrary to suggestions made following the measurements at Shirley. The masking effect is similar to that in the abdomen (Leventhall 2009). The body, and vestibular systems, appear to be built to avoid disturbance from the high levels of infrasound which are produced internally from the heartbeat and other processes. In fact, the hearing mechanisms and the balance mechanisms, although in close proximity, have developed to minimise interaction (Carey and Amin 2006).'

- 3.2.7 More recently during a planning Appeal (PPA-310-2028, Clydeport Hunterston Terminal Facility, approximately 2.5 km south-west of Fairlie, 9 Jan 2018), the health impacts related to LFN associated with wind turbines were considered at length by the appointed Reporter (Mr M Croft). The Reporter considered evidence from Health Protection Scotland and the National Health Service. In addition, he also considered LFN surveys undertaken by the Appellant and the Local Authority, both of which demonstrated compliance with planning conditions and did not identify any problems attributable to the turbine operations; some

periods with highest levels of low frequency noise were in fact recorded when the turbines were not operating.

3.2.8 The Reporter concluded that:

- The literature reviews by bodies with very significant responsibilities for the health of local people found insufficient evidence to confirm a causal relationship between wind turbine noise and the type of health complaints cited by some local residents;
- The NHS's assessment is that concerns about health impact are not supported by good quality research; and
- Although given the opportunity, the Community Council failed to provide evidence that can properly be set against the general tenor of the scientific evidence.

3.2.9 The WSP BEIS Report notes on page 113 that:

'Several studies have investigated the claimed links between adverse health symptoms and infrasound emissions from wind turbines. Although some experimental studies have linked infrasonic signals with activation of physiological sensory processing, these have tended to be based on signals that are not representative of wind turbine infrasound. There remains no compelling evidence of adverse health effects associated with wind turbine infrasound exposure at sound frequencies and' levels expected to be present at noise-sensitive receptor locations in the vicinity of wind farms'

3.2.10 The WSP BEIS Report goes on to note on page 114 that:

'Overall, the findings from the existing evidence base indicate that infrasound from wind turbines at typical exposure levels has no direct adverse effects on physical or mental health, and reported symptoms of ill-health are more likely to be psychogenic in origin.'

3.2.11 It is noted that research into infrasound is ongoing but the WSP BEIS report concluded that:

'It is expected that further evidence from ongoing studies into wind turbine infrasound effects will emerge soon, in particular from the NHMRC studies in Australia. However, based on the existing scientific evidence, it does appear probable that the above findings will not be contradicted by newer evidence.'

3.2.12 Since the publication of the WSP BEIS report, the study that was granted funding by NHMRC (the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia) was published in the Environmental Health Perspectives (EHP) journal which is published by the United States National Institute of Environmental Health. The study (21) aimed to test the effect of exposure to 72 hours of infrasound (designed to simulate a wind turbine infrasound signature) exposure on human physiology, particularly sleep. The study concluded that:

'Our findings did not support the idea that infrasound causes WTS¹. High level, but inaudible, infrasound did not appear to perturb any physiological or psychological measure tested in these study participants.'

¹ WTS stands for Wind Turbine Syndrome which is a term for adverse human health effected related to the proximity of wind turbines.

- 3.2.13 It is therefore not considered necessary to carry out specific assessments of LFN and it has not been considered further in the noise assessment.

3.3 Amplitude Modulation of Aerodynamic Noise (AM)

- 3.3.1 In the context of wind turbine noise amplitude modulation describes a variation in noise level over time; for example, observers may describe a ‘whoosh whoosh’ sound, which can be heard close to a wind turbine as the blades sweep past. Amplitude Modulation of aerodynamic noise is an inherent characteristic of wind turbine noise and was noted in ETSU-R-97, on page 68:

‘The modulation or rhythmic swish emitted by wind turbines has been considered by some to have a characteristic that is irregular enough to attract attention. The level and depth of modulation of the blade noise is, to a degree, turbine-dependent and is dependent upon the position of the observer. Some wind turbines emit a greater level of modulation of the blade noise than others. Therefore, although some wind turbines might be considered to have a character that may attract one’s attention, others have noise characteristics which are considerably less intrusive and unlikely to attract one’s attention and be subject to any penalty.

This modulation of blade noise may result in a variation of the overall A-weighted noise level by as much as 3dBA (peak to trough) when measured close to a wind turbine. As distance from the wind turbine [or] wind farm increases, this depth of modulation would be expected to decrease as atmospheric absorption attenuates the high frequency energy radiated by the blade.’

- 3.3.2 In recent times the Acoustics community has sought to make a distinction between the AM discussed within ETSU-R-97, which is expected at most wind farms and as such may be considered as ‘Normal Amplitude Modulation’ (NAM), compared to the unusual AM that has sometimes been heard at some wind farms, hereinafter referred to as ‘Other Amplitude Modulation’ (OAM). The term OAM is used to describe an unusual feature of aerodynamic noise from wind turbines, where a greater than normal degree of regular fluctuation in sound level occurs at blade passing frequency, typically once per second. In some appeal decisions it may also be referred to as ‘Excess Amplitude Modulation’ (EAM). It should be noted that the noise assessment and rating procedure detailed in ETSU-R-97 fully takes into account the presence of the intrinsic level of NAM when setting acceptable noise limits for wind farms.
- 3.3.3 On 16 December 2013, RenewableUK (RUK) released six technical papers (22) on AM, which reflected the outcomes of research commissioned over the previous three years, together with a template planning condition. Whilst this research undoubtedly improved understanding of Other Amplitude Modulation (OAM) and its effects, it should be noted that at the time of writing it has not been endorsed by any relevant body such as the Institute of Acoustics (IOA).
- 3.3.4 On 22 January 2014, the IOA released a statement regarding the RUK research and the proposed planning condition to deal with the issue of amplitude modulation from a wind turbine and stated:

‘This research is a significant step forward in understanding what causes amplitude modulation from a wind turbine, and how people react to it. The proposed planning

condition, though, needs a period of testing and validation before it can be considered to be good practice. The IOA understands that RenewableUK will shortly be making the analysis tool publicly available on their website so that all interested parties can test the proposed condition, and the IOA will review the results later in the year. Until that time, the IOA cautions the use of the proposed planning condition.'

3.3.5 Research regarding amplitude modulation continued. In April 2015, the IOA issued a discussion document entitled '*Methods for Rating Amplitude Modulation in Wind Turbine Noise*'. The document presented three methods that can be used to quantify the level of AM at a given measurement location. After extensive consultation a preferred method of measuring OAM, which provides a framework for practitioners to measure and rate AM, was recommended by the IOA.

3.3.6 On 3 August 2015, the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC), now the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), commissioned independent consultants WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff to carry out a literature review on OAM (which they refer to simply as AM). The stated aims were as follows:

- *To review the available evidence on Amplitude Modulation (AM) in relation to wind turbines, including but not limited to the research commissioned and published by RenewableUK in December 2013;*
- *To work closely with the Institute of Acoustics' AM working group, who are expected to recommend a preferred metric and methodology for quantifying and assessing the level of AM in a sample of wind turbine noise data;*
- *To review the robustness of relevant dose response relationships, including the one developed by the University of Salford as part of the RenewableUK study, on which the correction (or penalty) for amplitude modulation proposed as part of its template planning condition is based;*
- *To consider how, in a policy context, the level(s) of AM in a sample of noise data should be interpreted, in particular determining at what point it causes a significant adverse impact;*
- *To recommend how excessive AM might be controlled through the use of an appropriate planning condition; and*
- *To consider the engineering/cost trade-offs of possible mitigation measures.*

3.3.7 Their report, which was released in October 2016, concluded that there is sufficient robust evidence that excessive AM leads to increased annoyance from wind turbine noise and recommended that excessive AM is controlled through a suitably worded planning condition, which will control it during periods of complaint. Those periods should be identified by measurement using the metric proposed by the work undertaken by the IOA, and enforcement action would rely upon professional judgement by Local Authority Environmental Health Officers based on the duration and frequency of occurrence.

3.3.8 It is not clear within the body of the report which evidence the authors relied upon to arrive at their conclusions, although the Executive Summary states (page 4);

"It is noted that none of the Category 1 or 2 papers have been designed to answer the main aim of the current review in its entirety. The Category 1 studies have limited representativeness due to sample constraints and the artificiality of laboratory

environments, whereas the Category 2 studies generally do not directly address the issue of AM WTN exposure-response. A meta - analysis of the identified studies was not possible due to the incompatibility of the various methodologies employed. Notwithstanding the limitations in the evidence, it was agreed with DECC that the factors to be included in a planning condition should be recommended based on the available evidence, and supplemented with professional experience”.

3.3.9 The report (23) states that any planning condition must accord with existing planning guidance, and should be subject to legal advice on a case by case basis. Existing guidance would include compliance with the six tests of a planning condition embodied in Circular 4/98. The report’s authors did not dictate a particular condition to be used but did suggest that any condition should include the following elements (page 5):

- *“The AM condition should cover periods of complaints (due to unacceptable AM);*
- *The IoA-recommended metric should be used to quantify AM (being the most robust available objective metric);*
- *Analysis should be made using individual 10-minute periods, applying the appropriate decibel ‘penalty’ to each period, with subsequent analysis;*
- *The AM decibel penalty should be additional to any decibel penalty for tonality; and*
- *An additional decibel penalty is proposed during the night time period to account for the current difference between the night and day limits on many sites to ensure the control method works during the most sensitive period of the day.”*

3.3.10 AM was considered in the WSP BEIS report. The report notes that the IOA Method provides a suitable approach to measure and quantify AM (whilst noting that work is ongoing to refine the approach) but also highlights that further work is required to develop a robust mechanism for controlling AM that could be incorporated into a planning condition. In relation to the potential adoption of a penalty scheme to control AM the WSP BEIS report notes on page 208 that:

‘In practice, the details of applying such a penalty scheme are complicated by the complexities of wind turbine sound measurements. These often involve a considerable amount of data filtering and data aggregation to address the practical difficulties of measuring a highly variable source, which is often also at a level that is relatively low compared with other, fluctuating residual sounds present in the acoustic environment. Such details will need to be carefully considered in further study, and the example planning condition proposed by a group of IOA members in 2017⁵⁰⁵ should be considered as a starting point.’

3.3.11 Until such a ‘further study’ is completed, and additional guidance is published, the approach set out in the IOA GPG remains valid, the document states (paragraph 7.2.10):

‘7.2.1 The evidence in relation to “Excess” or “Other” Amplitude Modulation (AM) is still developing. At the time of writing, current practice is not to assign a planning condition to deal with AM.’

3.3.12 On that basis Amplitude Modulation has not been considered further in this assessment.

4 Methodology

4.1 Assessing Operational Noise Impact

4.1.1 To undertake an assessment of the operational noise impact in accordance with the requirements of ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG, the following steps are required:

- Specify the location of the wind turbines for the Proposed Development;
- Measure the background noise levels as a function of on-site wind speed at a selection of representative Noise Monitoring Locations (NML);
- Establish for each NML the 'Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits' on analysis of the measured background noise levels;
- Identify the locations of all nearby noise sensitive receptors and select a sample of relevant Noise Assessment Locations (NAL). For each NAL, identify the most representative measured background noise data;
- Specify the likely noise emission characteristics of the wind turbines for the Proposed Development and all nearby cumulative wind turbines;
- Calculate the likely noise immission levels due to the cumulative operation of all relevant wind turbines and compare it to the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits;
- Determine the 'Site Specific Noise Limits' which take account of the noise limit already allocated to/ could theoretically be used by other schemes in the area; and
- Calculate the likely noise immission levels due to the operation of the Proposed Development on its own and compare it to the Proposed Development's 'Site Specific Noise Limits'.

4.1.2 In order to consider the steps outlined above the assessment has been split into three separate stages:

- Stage 1 – determine existing Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits, which are already set for other wind farms within the vicinity of the Proposed Development at each NAL or establish the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits for each NAL (where noise limits are not already set) based on the measured background noise levels;
- Stage 2 – undertake cumulative noise predictions to determine whether noise predictions from the Proposed Development are within 10 dB of the total noise predictions from the other wind farms/turbines within the area. Where turbine predictions are within 10 dB then a cumulative noise assessment will be undertaken; and
- Stage 3 – establish the Proposed Development's Site Specific Noise Limits (at levels below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits, where limit apportionment is required) and compare the noise predictions from the Proposed Development on its own against the proposed 'Site Specific Noise Limits'.

4.1.3 There are a range of turbine makes and models that may be appropriate for the Proposed Development. In the absence of a confirmed turbine model, this noise assessment models a candidate turbine, the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW with serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades and](#)

a hub height of 118.5 m. The final selection of turbine will follow a competitive tendering process and thus the final make and model of turbine may differ from those on which this assessment has been based. However, the final choice of turbine will be required to comply with the noise limits which have been established for the Site.

4.2 Consultation

Scoping Opinion (dated March 2021)

- 4.2.1 The Scottish Government's Energy Consents Unit requested that the noise assessment be undertaken in accordance with the legislation and standard detailed in Section 3.8 of the scoping report which referred to ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG.
- 4.2.2 The scoping opinion included a specific consultation response from Aberdeenshire Council (AC). AC stated that the noise assessment should be undertaken in accordance with ETSU-R-97, the IOA GPG and Aberdeenshire Councils 'Wind Turbine Development: Submission Guidance Note.'
- 4.2.3 ACs Submission Guidance Note refers to a reduced noise limit during the night time period of 38 dB or background plus 5 dB whichever is the greater. The noise assessment for the Proposed Development has been undertaken in accordance with ETSU-R-97 which recommends that the night time limit should be based on 43 dB or background plus 5 dB whichever is the greater.

Consultation with Moray Council EHO (2022)

- 4.2.4 Prior to the commencement of the noise impact assessment for the Proposed Development, direct consultation was undertaken with the Environmental Health Department at Moray Council (MC) in order to agree the approach to the noise assessment and the noise monitoring locations. In addition, a representative from the Environmental Health Department was also invited to attend the installation of the noise monitoring equipment.
- 4.2.5 An EHO from MC responded to the email agreeing with the proposed geographic spread of the monitoring locations. The EHO also attended the installation of the equipment.
- 4.2.6 As part of the consultation process, the Councils EHO also provided a response in relation to the potential use of the headroom available and also the choice of fixed minimum noise limits. The EHO stated the following:

'I would see no objection or concern in relation to approach being suggested here with +2 dB above predicted levels, where significant headroom has been identified.

In relation to point 6 on limits then our approach is to look at, for daytime, the greater of L_{A90} of 35dB of background sound level + 5, and a night-time limit at the greater of L_{A90} 40 dB or background sound level +5. I understand from Aberdeenshire's perspective a lower night time fixed limit of L_{A90} 38 dB is expected.

I think in these circumstances, when considered in the context of the adjacent Garbet Hill, and other developments in the planning system at Clashindarroch, the limits suggested in 2 when considered cumulatively with these other developments, would give rise to a daytime cumulative value heading towards 40 dB, which is the maximum desirable.'

- 4.2.7 For the assessment the Site Specific Noise Limits have been derived using a FML of 35 dB daytime and 43 dB night time or background plus 5d B whichever is the greater, whilst taking account of the noise limit that could theoretically be used by other schemes. The night time noise limits have been derived based on Government Guidance which refers to ETSU-R-97 and the use of 43 dB or background +5 dB.
- 4.2.8 The Total Noise limit (for all schemes to operate within) has been derived based on a fixed minimum noise of 40 dB daytime and 43 dB night time or background plus 5 dB whichever is the higher. The night time noise limits have been derived based on Government Guidance which refers to ETSU-R-97 and the use of 43 dB or background +5 dB.
- 4.2.9 As part of the process undertaken to identify nearby noise sensitive receptors, additional consultation was undertaken with the EHO regarding the status of a number of buildings (Greens of Glenbeg, Newton of Glenmarkie and Glenmarkie). The EHO visited the buildings and confirmed that they did not need to be considered as noise sensitive receptors.
- 4.2.10 A copy of the original consultation letter and subsequent email correspondence is included in Annex 2.

Consultation with Aberdeenshire Council EHO (2022)

- 4.2.11 Prior to the commencement of the noise impact assessment for the Proposed Development, direct consultation was undertaken with the Environmental Health Department at AC in order to agree the approach to the noise assessment and the noise monitoring locations. In addition, a representative from the Environmental Health Department was also invited to attend the installation of the noise monitoring equipment.
- 4.2.12 An EHO from AC responded to the email agreeing with the proposed noise monitoring locations. With regards to using the available headroom the EHO stated that they agreed with the principle to use available headroom, normally AC accept *'a 'rounding up' or 'rounding up plus 1dB' margin above predicted noise levels.'*
- 4.2.13 As part of the process undertaken to identify nearby noise sensitive receptors, additional consultation was undertaken with the EHO regarding the status of a number of buildings within AC which appeared abandoned/ derelict. The Planning Department reviewed the information provided and concluded that a building known as 'Timberford' is derelict and therefore did not need to be considered as a noise sensitive receptor. Additional information was requested regarding Chapel Hill and two unknown buildings located nearby.
- 4.2.14 The buildings Chapel Hill and a couple of unknown buildings nearby appear to be abandoned but it has not been possible to ascertain the owners intentions for their future use therefore for the purposes of the assessment they have been included as potential noise sensitive receptors. They are shown as NALs 18 -20 on Figure A1.1.
- 4.2.15 A copy of the full consultation response is included within Annex 2.

Consultation with Moray Council and Aberdeenshire Council EHO (2024)

- 4.2.16 Due to a small change in candidate turbine and layout and the fact the nearby Clashindarroch Extension wind farm is now in planning, additional consultation was undertaken in March 2024 with the Environmental Health Departments at each Council in order to agree an

approach to cumulative noise with Clashindarroch Extension Wind Farm (copies of the consultation correspondence are included in Annex 2). The proposed approach to noise limit apportionment is described in full in Section 4.5.

- 4.2.17 To date, no response has been received from Moray Council EHO or from Aberdeenshire Council EHO.

4.3 Setting the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits (Stage 1)

Identify Existing Noise Limits

- 4.3.1 Noise limits have already been established at some receptors closer to Clashindarroch Wind Farm as part of the planning conditions set for the wind farm. Noise conditions have also been set for Clashindarroch II ([consented 2023 at Appeal](#)) and Garbet ([consented 2022 at Appeal](#)) as part of their proposed planning conditions.

Concurrent Wind Farm Applications

- 4.3.2 In 2023, a Section 36 application was submitted for Clashindarroch Extension Wind Farm (CEWF), located approximately 3.5 km to the southeast of the Proposed Development. The CEWF noise assessment considered a number of noise sensitive receptors located between CEWF and the Proposed Development. This assessment considers these same receptors between CEWF and the Proposed Development, as well as a number of additional receptors also located between CEWF and the Proposed Development.

- 4.3.3 Section 5.4.2 of the IOA GPG discusses a method of apportioning ETSU-R-97 noise limits between concurrent wind farm applications in order to- allow multiple developments to coexist. TNEI understand that the Applicant for the Proposed Development engaged with the applicant of CEWF and discussed the limit apportionment process with them. Following these discussions, the approach to limit apportionment was agreed in principle between both parties. Accordingly, suitable noise limits allowing both CEWF and the Proposed Development to coexist have been calculated by TNEI in line with the IOA GPG recommendations and a methodology outlined in Section 4.5 below.

Wind Shear

- 4.3.4 Wind shear can be defined as *'the change in the relationship between wind speed at different heights'*. Due to wind shear, wind speeds recorded on one meteorological mast at different heights are usually different, generally the higher the anemometer the higher the wind speed recorded. For example, if a wind speed of 4 ms⁻¹ is recorded at 80 m height, 3.5 ms⁻¹ may be recorded at 40 m and 2.5 ms⁻¹ may be recorded at 10 m.
- 4.3.5 Hub height wind speed is the key wind speed for a wind farm noise assessment, as it is the wind speed at hub height which will determine the noise emitted by the wind turbines and informs the turbine control system. Ideally, both wind turbine noise predictions and background noise level measurements should refer to hub height wind speed (or a representation thereof), ensuring that there is no discrepancy between the wind speed at which the noise is emitted and the wind speed at which the corresponding background noise is measured.

- 4.3.6 The IOA GPG states that one of three methods of wind speed measurement may be adopted. For this assessment wind speeds were recorded by two different heights, one at a height of more than 60% of the hub height and another located at least 15 m below it. These were then used to calculate hub height wind speeds in line with 'Method B' of Section 2.6.3 of the IOA GPG to fully take account of wind shear.

Noise Impact Criteria in ETSU-R-97

- 4.3.7 Analysis of the measured data has been undertaken in accordance with ETSU-R-97 and current good practice to determine the pre-existing background noise environment and to establish, for each NAL, the daytime and night time Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits, which would apply for the cumulative operation of all wind turbines in the area. The Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits for the daytime has been set at 40 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater, and the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits at night time has been set at 43 dB(A) or background plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater. This 'Total' limit relates to noise from all wind farm developments in the area. The limit was chosen with due regard to the guidance in ETSU-R-97 and following a review of the predicted levels for existing wind turbines in the area (and the noise limit that has effectively been allocated already to those consented developments).
- 4.3.8 As detailed in Section 2.4.9 above, ETSU-R-97 suggests that the daytime fixed minimum limit should be set somewhere in the range between 35 and 40 dB. The precise choice of criterion level within the range 35 - 40 dB(A) depends on a number of factors, including the number of dwellings in the neighbourhood of the wind farm, the effect of noise limits on the number of kWh generated and the duration and level of exposure to any noise. Site Specific Noise Limits have been derived such that they are always at or below the limit established using the lower fixed minimum limit.
- 4.3.9 The acceptable limits for wind turbine operational noise are clearly defined for all time periods by the application of the ETSU-R-97 methodology. Consequently, the test applied to operational noise is whether or not the predicted wind turbine noise immission levels at nearby noise sensitive properties lie below the ETSU-R-97 noise limits. Depending on the levels of background noise, the satisfaction of the ETSU-R-97 derived limits can lead to a situation whereby, at some locations under some wind conditions and for a certain proportion of the time, the wind turbine noise would be audible.

4.4 Assessment of likely effects and the requirement for a cumulative assessment (Stage 2)

- 4.4.1 The IOA GPG (2013) includes a detailed section on cumulative noise and provides guidance on where a cumulative assessment is required. Section 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 of the GPG state:

'During scoping of a new wind farm development consideration should be given to cumulative noise impacts from any other wind farms in the locality. If the proposed wind farm produces noise levels within 10 dB of any existing wind farm/s at the same receptor location, then a cumulative noise impact assessment is necessary.'

'Equally, in such cases where noise from the proposed wind farm is predicted to be 10 dB greater than that from the existing wind farm (but compliant with ETSU-R-97 in its own right), then a cumulative noise impact assessment would not be necessary.'

- 4.4.2 An assessment was undertaken at each of the noise sensitive receptors proximate to the Proposed Development and other nearby operational and proposed wind farm developments to determine whether the wind turbine noise immission from the Proposed Development were within 10 dB of the wind turbine noise immission from the other schemes. Where predictions were found to be within 10 dB of each other, then a cumulative noise assessment was undertaken to determine the likely impacts of the Proposed Development, however, if wind turbine immission were greater than 10 dB apart then a cumulative noise assessment was not required.

Noise Prediction / Propagation Model

- 4.4.3 The ISO 9613-2: 1996 'Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors Part 2: General method of calculation' (24) model algorithm provides a robust prediction method for calculating the noise immission levels at the nearest receptors. A European Commission (EC) research project into wind farm noise propagation over large distances, published as 'Development of a Wind Farm Noise Prediction Model,' JOULE project JOR3-CT95-0051 in 1998, identified a simplified version of ISO 9613-2 as the most suitable at that time, but the full method has been used for this assessment.

- 4.4.4 The use of ISO 9613-2 is discussed in the IOA GPG which states, in Section 4.1.4:

'ISO 9613-2 standard in particular, which is widely used in the UK, can be applied to obtain realistic predictions of noise from on-shore wind turbines during worst case propagation conditions (i.e. sound speed gradients due to downwind conditions or temperature inversions), but only provided that the appropriate choice of input parameters and correction factors are made.'

- 4.4.5 There is currently no standard approach to specifying error bands on noise predictions. Table 5 of ISO 9613-2 suggests, at best, an estimated of accuracy of ± 3 dB(A). The work undertaken as part of the EC research study concluded that the ISO 9613-2 algorithm reliably predicted noise levels that would generally occur under downwind propagation conditions. The error bands referenced in the ISO standard itself relate to the general application of the standard. Additional, wind farm specific studies, have also been undertaken to validate the use of the standard to predict wind farm noise and these are referenced in Section 4 of the IOA GPG which goes on to conclude that: *"The outcome of this research has demonstrated that the ISO 9613-2 standard in particular, which is widely used in the UK, can be applied to obtain realistic predictions of noise from on-shore wind turbines during worst case propagation conditions (i.e. sound speed gradients due to downwind conditions or temperature inversions), but only provided that the appropriate choice of input parameters and correction factors are made."* TNEIs experience of undertaking compliance monitoring for operational wind farms indicates that the predictions undertaken using the guidance in the IOA GPG show a good correlation with measured levels.


- 4.4.6 The ISO 9613-2 model can take account of the following factors that influence sound propagation outdoors:

- Geometric divergence;
- Atmospheric absorption;
- Reflecting obstacles;
- Screening;

- Vegetation; and
- Ground attenuation.

- 4.4.7 The model uses as its acoustic input data the octave band sound power output of the turbine and calculates, on an octave band basis, attenuation due to the factors above, as appropriate.
- 4.4.8 The IOA GPG quotes a comparative study undertaken in Australia that indicated ISO 9613-2 can, in some conditions, under-predict ground attenuation effects and the potential for additional reflection paths ‘across a valley’, whilst slightly over-predicting on flat terrain. It should be noted, however, that the wind farm layouts studied were untypical for the UK, with rows of turbines spreading over 10 km on an elevated ridge. It also should be noted that no correction for background contribution was undertaken and the monitoring locations were located as far as 1.7 km from the nearest turbine, where turbine noise may be at similar levels to background noise and therefore difficult to differentiate. For the study’s modelling work topographic height data was included as an input, which is consistent with ISO 9613-2 methodology generally, but not with the requirements of the IOA GPG.
- 4.4.9 The model used in this assessment does not model barrier attenuation using the method in ISO 9613-2, but instead uses the guidance in the IOA GPG to consider whether any topographical corrections are required as set out below in Sections 4.4.10 to 4.4.13. Any differences in ground height (AOD) between the receptors and the turbines are considered when calculating the propagation distance between each source and receiver.
- 4.4.10 The IOA GPG states that a ‘further correction of +3 dB should be added to the calculated overall A-weighted level for propagation ‘across a valley’, i.e. a concave ground profile or where the ground falls away significantly between a turbine and the receiver location.’ The potential reflection paths are illustrated in Schematic 4.1 below.

Schematic 4.1: Multiple reflection paths for sound propagation across concave ground



Source: IOA GPG, page 21, Figure 5

- 4.4.11 A formula from the JOULE Project JOR3-CT95-0051 dated 1998 is suggested for determining whether a correction is required.

$$h_m \geq 1.5 \times (\text{abs}(h_s - h_r) / 2)$$

where h_m is the mean height above the ground of the direct line of sight from the receiver to the source (as defined in ISO 9613-2, Figure 3), and h_s and h_r are the heights above local ground level of the source and receiver respectively).

- 4.4.12 The calculation of h_m requires consideration of the digital terrain model and needs to be performed for each path between every turbine and every receiver. Interpretation of the results of the calculation above and the subsequent inclusion of a concave ground profile correction requires careful consideration with any topographical variation considered in the context of a site.

4.4.13 The IOA GPG also discusses the potential for topographical screening effects of the terrain surrounding a wind farm and the nearby noise sensitive receptors. Although barrier screening effects in ISO 9613-2 can make corrections of up to 15 dB, the IOA GPG states that where there is no line of sight between the highest point on the rotor and the receiver location a reduction of no more than 2 dB may be applied.

4.4.14 The modelling parameters used in this assessment are detailed in Section 6.3 below.

4.5 Setting the Site Specific Noise Limits (Stage 3)

4.5.1 As identified in Table 1.1, and shown on Figure A1.1a, there are a number of proposed, consented and operational cumulative wind developments located within the area of the Proposed Development. Where this is the case, noise limits for each individual wind development should be set such that the combined cumulative noise level does not exceed the TNL. Summary Box 21 of the IOA GPG states:


'Whenever a cumulative situation is encountered, the noise limits for an individual wind farm should be determined in such a way that no cumulative excess of the total ETSU-R-97 noise limit would occur.'

4.5.2 Section 5.4.2 of the IOA GPG provides guidance on setting SSNL for concurrent wind farm applications:

'Concurrent applications with no pre-existing wind farms permit the apportionment of the ETSU-R-97 limits on an energy basis to each wind farm from the outset. LPAs may wish to bring together concurrent wind farm applicants, such that apportionment can be discussed and agreed in conjunction with the applicants. Noise limits for all the wind farms operating cumulatively are derived at all noise sensitive receptors, just as they would be if one wind farm were being considered. Having derived noise limits for the cumulative effects of all the contributing wind farms, the wind farm developers can then work together to 'apportion' the noise limits for each wind farm operating in isolation such that the cumulative effects of all wind farms operating together cannot cause the cumulative noise limits derived in accordance with ETSU-R-97 to be exceeded. Thus the noise limits which meet with the requirements of ETSU-R-97 could only be exceeded if one or more of the wind farms were to operate above its own apportioned noise limits.'

4.5.3 This approach is demonstrated in Graph 4.1 below. In this example the total limit (shown in blue) is shared between two proposed wind farm developments (A and B). The two noise limits for a given receptor (the solid orange and green lines) when added together equate to the Total ETSU-R-97 noise limit, and the predicted levels for each wind farm (the dashed lines) meet the specific limits established for consented wind farm and the Proposed Development.

Graph 4.1: Limit Apportionment Example



4.5.4 While Section 5.4.2 of the IOA GPG discusses limit apportionment in the absence of pre-existing wind farm developments, limit apportionment can also be undertaken where consented or operational wind developments are present. The potential influence of other developments may be logarithmically subtracted from the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit, to allow the remaining noise headroom (referred to as the Residual Noise Limit, or RNL) to be apportioned as necessary, with respect to appropriate fixed minimum limits.

4.5.5 The limit derivation can also be undertaken with consideration to the amount of headroom between another schemes(s) predictions and the Total Noise Limit. With regard to this Section 5.4.11 of the IOA GPG states:

'In cases where there is significant headroom (e.g. 5 to 10 dB) between the predicted noise levels from the existing wind farm and the Total Noise Limits, where there would be no realistic prospect of the existing wind farm producing noise levels up to the Total Noise Limits, agreement could be sought with the LPA as to a suitable predicted noise level (including an appropriate margin to cover factors such as potential increases in noise) from the existing wind farm to be used to inform the available headroom for the cumulative assessment without the need for negotiation or cumulative conditioning. This may be the case particularly at low wind speeds.'

4.5.6 With this in mind, where appropriate, an additional 2 dB buffer has been added to the other schemes' turbine noise predictions. This is considered to be a suitable buffer in accordance with Section 5.4.11 of the IOA GPG and would represent a 60% increase in emitted noise levels from the other schemes.

4.5.7 Where predicted wind turbine noise levels from the individual wind farm schemes are found to be >10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits then it has been deemed appropriate to allocate the entire noise limit to the Proposed Development. Further information on the approach to apportionment is provided in Section 6.6 below.

5 Baseline

5.1 Identification of Potential Noise Receptors

- 5.1.1 At the start of the noise assessment, preliminary desktop noise modelling was undertaken using the Resoft 'WindFarm' (25) software in order to locate noise sensitive receptors which may be affected and to identify suitable locations at which to monitor background noise levels. An initial wind turbine layout was input into the 'WindFarm' software and using noise data for a candidate turbine representative of the type that could be installed on the Site, a noise contour plot was produced. The noise contour plot was included in the consultation letter sent to the Environmental Health Departments at Moray and Aberdeenshire Councils. A copy of the letters are included in Annex 2.
- 5.1.2 The noise contour plot predicted wind turbine noise levels at the noise sensitive receptors surrounding the Proposed Development with predicted turbine noise (measured in $\text{dB}_{(A), L90}$) decreasing with distance from the Proposed Development. All properties or clusters of properties within the 35 $\text{dB}(A)$ contour were identified and assessed to determine which properties would provide representative background noise data for others in the area.
- 5.1.3 In accordance with ETSU-R-97, the noise contour plot was based on a noise level at a wind speed of 10 ms^{-1} (as standardised to 10 m height) as the manufacturer determined that this is the wind speed with the highest predicted noise level between 0 and 10 ms^{-1} for the candidate turbine.
- 5.1.4 The IOA GPG notes that *'noise-sensitive receptors, [are] principally houses (existing or for which planning consent is being sought / has been given) and any building used for long-term residential purposes (such as a nursing home)'*. Following a review of noise sensitive receptors surrounding the Proposed Development, the closest receptors were found to be residential properties.
- 5.1.5 The properties identified for noise monitoring were selected following a detailed review of the area using aerial photography to identify receptors which would be representative of other nearby properties. Where possible, locations were selected which were subject to minimal influence from other noise sources such as local watercourses, operational wind turbines and vegetation.

5.2 Background Noise Survey

- 5.2.1 Background noise monitoring was undertaken for the purposes of setting the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. Data recorded over the period 18 March – 18 May 2021 at five noise sensitive receptors.
- 5.2.2 There was a software issue with the meters installed at NMLs 1 and 3-5 during the first month of monitoring which resulted in only one week's worth of data being collected at those locations. The issue was rectified during the maintenance visit and a full dataset was collected at each location during the second month of the survey.
- 5.2.3 Permission to monitor at Wester or Easter Braetown could not be obtained therefore it was initially agreed with MCs EHO that the data collected at NML4 Easterton (appeared to be quietest location upon installation) could be used to set noise limits at those locations as it

was deemed to be representative of Easter and Wester Braetown. However following a review of the background noise data collected, the background data collected at NML1 Tighnaird (which is located closer to the two properties) was found to be slightly quieter at the key wind speed ranges and therefore that dataset was used as a proxy for Wester and Easter Braetown. No monitoring was undertaken at a building initially identified as Glenbeg as the building was later found to be derelict as detailed in Section 4.2.8 above.

- 5.2.4 Details of the exact monitoring periods, the rationale behind the exact kit location and the dominant noise sources observed at each of the NMLs are detailed in the Field Data Sheets (FDS) and installation report included in Annex 3.
- 5.2.5 The NML is the position that the sound level meter was sited at each property, as shown on Figure A1.1 (Annex 1) and summarised in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1 Noise Monitoring Locations

NML/ Receptor Name	Easting	Northing
NML1 - Tighnaird	341569	836310
NML2 - Lynebain	341255	835330
NML3 - Belcherrie	340076	834061
NML4 - Easterton	339541	833034
NML5 - Rhinturk	336625	832908

5.3 Noise Monitoring Equipment

- 5.3.1 Section 2.4 of the IOA GPG includes information on the type and specification of noise monitoring equipment which should be used for background noise surveys and states:

‘Noise measurement equipment and calibrators used on site should comply with Class 1/Type 1 of the relevant standard(s). Enhanced microphone windscreens should be used. Standard windshields of a diameter of less than 100 mm cannot be relied upon to provide sufficient reduction of wind noise in most circumstances.’

- 5.3.2 The noise monitoring equipment used for the background noise survey meets with the requirements of the IOA GPG. Details of the noise monitoring equipment used, the calibration drift recorded and photographs at each NML are detailed in the FDS included in Annex 3. The IOA GPG states that for calibration drift greater than 1 dB the measurements should be discarded. The maximum calibration drift recorded during the noise survey was - 0.5 dB as detailed in the FDS (included in Annex 3) therefore no correction has been applied to the noise data.
- 5.3.3 Copies of the calibration/conformance certificates for the sound level meters and sound level calibrator used for the noise survey are included in Annex 4. All sound level meters conform to Class 1/ Type 1.
- 5.3.4 The microphones were all mounted between 1.2 m and 1.5 m above local ground level, situated between 3.5 m and 20 m from the dwelling and were located *‘in an area frequently*

used for rest and relaxation' (Section 2.5.1 of IOA GPG), where appropriate, away from obvious local sources of noise such as boiler flues, fans and running water. The sound level meters were situated as far away from hard reflective surfaces such as fences and walls as practicable.

- 5.3.5 All measurement systems were set to log the L_{A90} and L_{Aeq} noise levels over the required ten minute intervals continuously over the deployment period.

5.4 Meteorological Data

- 5.4.1 ETSU-R-97 states on Page 84 that:

'background noise measurements should be correlated with wind speed measurements performed at the proposed site, such that the actual operating noise levels from the turbines may be compared with the noise levels that would otherwise be experienced at a dwelling.'

- 5.4.2 The preferred methodologies for measuring or calculating wind shear are detailed in Section 4.3.4.

- 5.4.3 For the Proposed Development, concurrent wind speed/direction were recorded using an LIDAR unit which was located within the Site (grid reference 338727, 834756). The meteorological data was collected and provided by ZX Measurement Services. The installation report and calibration information for the LIDAR can be provided upon request.

- 5.4.4 A tipping bucket rain gauge was installed at NML2 and NML4 for the duration of the noise survey to record periods of rainfall, time synchronised to the sound measurements. Rain data were collected by TNEI. As per the recommendations in Section 3.1.9 of the IOA GPG, the rain data were analysed by TNEI and the 10 minute periods which contain the registered rainfall events and the preceding 10 minute period have been excluded. All excluded rainfall periods are shown on Figures A1.2a-A1.2e (Annex 1) as blue squares.

- 5.4.5 Wind speed and direction data were collected over the same time-scale, and averaged over the same ten minute periods as the noise data to provide the analysis of the measured background noise as a function of wind speed and direction.

- 5.4.6 In accordance with the IOA GPG, methodology B, has been adopted for this assessment which involved using data collected at 104 m and 124 m on the meteorological mast which were used to calculate hub height (125 m) wind speeds which, in turn, were standardised to a height of 10 m above ground.

- 5.4.7 Whilst the hub height of the current candidate turbine is expected to be 118.5 m, using 125 m to standardise to 10 m for the background levels / limits is robust and allows for limit to be valid for any turbine up to 125 m hub height. Overall, this is considered to be a conservative approach for any proposed hub height below 125 m.

5.5 Influence of Existing Turbines on Background Measurements

- 5.5.1 ETSU-R-97 states that background noise levels should be determined such that they are not influenced by existing turbine noise. The IOA GPG details that, in situations where

measurement locations are potentially influenced by existing turbine noise, the following approaches can be adopted:

1. The existing wind turbines can be switched off (assuming the applicant has control of those turbines and noting that there would be associated cost implications);
2. The contribution of the wind turbines can be accounted for by filtering the measured data by direction (only including background data when a receptor is upwind of the wind turbines) or by subtracting predicted turbine noise from the measured levels;
3. Limits can be set using 'proxy' datasets measured at location(s) outside of the influence of the wind turbines; or
4. Limits can be set using data collected as part of previous background noise assessments undertaken before the wind turbines were operational, providing the equipment and both noise and meteorological data obtained are appropriate.

5.5.2 The operational Clashindarroch and Dorenell Wind Farms are located to the south east and south west of the Proposed Development. NMLs were carefully selected such that they were located away from operational wind farms wherever possible. The wind farms were not audible at any NML during the Site visits, however, to minimise any potential influence from the operational turbines directional filtering was undertaken to remove all data collected when the NMLs were downwind or crosswind of the turbines (the excluded periods are shown as orange crosses on Figures A1.2a-e included within Annex 1).

5.6 Directional Filtering of Background Noise

5.6.1 In Section 3.1.22 of the IOA GPG the need to directionally filter background noise data is discussed. Where a receiver is located upwind of a dominant local noise source whilst also being systematically downwind of the turbines then it may be necessary to filter background noise data particularly when this corresponds to the prevailing wind direction.

5.6.2 For this Site there are no dominant local noise sources so no directional filtering was undertaken.

5.7 Analysis of Measured Data

5.7.1 Analysis of the measured data has been undertaken in accordance with the recommendations in ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG.

5.7.2 Meteorological data was screened upon receipt by TNEI and where rainfall occurred, the noise and wind speed data has been excluded from the assessment as detailed in Section 5.4 above.

5.7.3 Time series graphs are provided in Annex 5, which show the variation in measured wind speed/direction and noise level over the monitoring period. These graphs also show where data was excluded, either due to rainfall, birdsong or manual exclusions due to atypical data.

5.8 Prevailing Background Noise Level

5.8.1 Table 5.2 and Table 5.3 summarise the prevailing background noise levels measured during the noise monitoring period, after filtering of the individual datasets as discussed above.

Table 5.2 Summary of Prevailing Background Noise Levels during Quiet Daytime Periods (dB(A))

NML	Prevailing Background Noise Level $L_{A90,10 \text{ min}}$											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NML1 - Tighnaird	21.0	22.6	23.7	24.7	25.6	26.9	28.6	31.0	34.4	39.0	39.0*	39.0*
NML2 - Lynebain	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.3	28.8	29.5	30.4	31.5	32.7	34.1	35.7	37.3
NML3 - Belcherrie	27.6	27.9	28.1	28.4	28.8	29.6	30.8	32.7	35.3	38.8	38.8*	38.8*
NML4 - Easterton	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.8	31.6	32.9	34.8	37.4	37.4*	37.4*
NML5 - Rhinturk	25.0	25.0	25.9	27.4	29.3	31.3	33.1	34.5	35.1	35.1*	35.1*	35.1*

*flatlined where derived minimum occurs at lower wind speeds and derived maximum occurs at higher wind speeds, see Section 5.8.4.

Table 5.3 Summary of Prevailing Background Noise Levels during Night time Periods (dB(A))

NML	Prevailing Background Noise Level $L_{A90,10 \text{ min}}$											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NML1 - Tighnaird	21.1	22.8	23.7	24.1	24.5	25.1	26.5	29	32.8	38.5	38.5*	38.5*
NML2 - Lynebain	28.9	29.2	29.4	29.5	29.5	29.7	30.0	30.7	31.7	33.3	35.4	38.3
NML3 - Belcherrie	28.6	29.3	29.3	29.0	28.6	28.7	29.6	31.7	35.3	40.8	48.7	48.7*
NML4 - Easterton	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.5	30.6	31.2	32.3	34.1	36.8	36.8*
NML5 - Rhinturk	25.3	25.3	25.3	25.4	25.7	26.4	27.6	29.4	31.8	31.8*	31.8*	31.8*

*flatlined where derived minimum occurs at lower wind speeds and derived maximum occurs at higher wind speeds, see Section 5.8.4.

5.8.2 A series of graphs are presented for each of the NMLs to illustrate the data collected, these are included as Figures A1.2a - A1.2e (Annex 1). There is a set of graphs for each of the NMLs, which show the range of wind speeds and directions recorded during the survey at the nearest meteorological mast and the 10 minute average wind speeds plotted against the recorded $L_{A90, 10\text{min}}$ noise levels at the NML along with a calculated 'best fit' polynomial regression line for the quiet daytime and night time periods. Each Figure also includes a Table with the number of recorded data points per integer wind speed bin and the prevailing measured background noise levels.

- 5.8.3 The prevailing measured background noise levels have been calculated using a best fit polynomial regression line of no more than a fourth order through the measured $L_{A90, 10min}$ noise data, as required by ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG.
- 5.8.4 In line with the recommendations included in Section 3.1.21 of the IOA GPG, where relevant, the polynomial background curve has been flatlined at the lower wind speeds where the derived minimum occurs. The final regression analysis curve is shown as a continuous black line and the original polynomial line of best fit through the data is shown as a dashed black line on Figures A1.2a - A1.2e (Annex 1).
- 5.8.5 Section 2.9.5 of the IOA GPG recommends that no fewer than 200 valid data points should be recorded in each of the quiet daytime and night time periods, with no fewer than 5 valid data points in any 1 ms^{-1} wind speed bin. Where the background noise data has been filtered by wind direction the IOA GPG (Section 2.9.6) recommends that 100 data points and 3 per wind speed bin may be appropriate. Where the minimum number of data points in a wind speed bin was not achieved, data in that bin has been manually excluded from the assessment.
- 5.8.6 ETSU-R-97 states (Page 101) that data may not be extrapolated beyond the measured range of wind speeds. It is however reasonable to assume that background noise levels will not decrease at higher wind speeds. As such, in the interest of protecting residential amenity, the noise levels for higher wind speeds where data has not been collected have been set equal to those derived for lower wind speeds as set out below (as per Section 3.1.20 of the IOA GPG).
- 5.8.7 A summary of the analysis applied to the individual datasets as recommended by the IOA GPG is included in Table 5.4 below.

Table 5.4 Analysis of Measured Datasets

NML	Quiet Daytime	Night Time
NML1 - Tighnaird	Flatlined beyond 10 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $11\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).	Flatlined beyond 10 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $11\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).
NML2 - Lynebain	Flatlined below 3 ms^{-1} (minimum level recorded).	No flatlining required.
NML3 - Belcherrie	Flatlined beyond 10 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $11\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).	Flatlined beyond 11 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the 12 ms^{-1} bin).
NML4 - Easterton	Flatlined below 5 ms^{-1} (minimum level recorded) and flatlined beyond 10 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $11\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).	Flatlined below 6 ms^{-1} (minimum level recorded) and flatlined beyond 11 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the 12 ms^{-1} bin).
NML5 - Rhinturk	Flatlined below 2 ms^{-1} (minimum level recorded) and flatlined beyond 9 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $10\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).	Flatlined below 3 ms^{-1} (minimum level recorded) and flatlined beyond 9 ms^{-1} (insufficient datapoints in the $10\text{-}12 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ bin).

- 5.8.8 The number of data points measured in each wind speed bin for each receptor, once exclusions were applied, are summarised in Figures A1.2a - A1.2e (Annex 1). The Figures also show the final prevailing background noise levels which have been determined following the analysis detailed above.

6 Noise Assessment Results

6.1 Noise Assessment Locations

- 6.1.1 Noise Assessment Locations (NALs) refer to the position on the curtilage denoted by the blue house symbol on Figure A1.1 (Annex 1). A total of 24 noise sensitive receptors were chosen as representative NALs. The NALs chosen were the closest receptors to the Proposed Development and other wind farm developments.
- 6.1.2 Some additional NALs (NALs 21-24) have been considered nearer to CEWF. For these NALs, background noise data measured at Oldtown of Corinacy were taken from the CEWF and used to set Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. This was sourced from the CEWF Environmental Impact Assessment Report which assessed wind turbines up to 120 m hub height.
- 6.1.3 Predictions of wind turbine noise have been made at each of the NAL as detailed in Table 6.1.
- 6.1.4 This approach ensures that the report models the worst case (loudest) noise immission level expected at each group of noise sensitive receptors, as, generally speaking, sound levels decrease due to the attenuating factors described in Section 6.3 and thus the closer to a noise source, the higher the noise level. Table 6.1 details which NML has been used to set noise limits for each NAL.

Table 6.1 Noise Assessment Locations

Noise Assessment Location (NAL)	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	Elevation (m AOD)	Approximate Distance to Nearest Craig Watch Turbine* (m)	Background Noise Data Used
NAL1 - Wester Braetown	339430	838844	285	2,514 (T11)	NML1
NAL2 - Easter Braetown	339670	838996	292	2,644 (T11)	NML1
NAL3 - Backside	341064	836153	295	1,300 (T11)	NML1
NAL4 - Tighnaird	341552	836317	300	1,773 (T11)	NML1
NAL5 - Mill of Lynebain	341194	835296	256	1,730 (T9)	NML2
NAL6 - Belcherrie	340033	834094	300	1,347 (T7)	NML3
NAL7 - Greenloan	339849	833907	293	1,323 (T5)	NML3
NAL8 - Succoth	339606	833351	302	1,560 (T5)	NML4

Noise Assessment Location (NAL)	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	Elevation (m AOD)	Approximate Distance to Nearest Craig Watch Turbine* (m)	Background Noise Data Used
NAL9 - Easterton	339516	833044	308	1,786 (T5)	NML4
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	339704	832100	276	2,617 (T2)	NML4
NAL11 - Milltown	338476	831436	268	2,669 (T2)	NML4
NAL12 - Ardlewie	337448	832304	320	1,826 (T2)	NML5
NAL13 - Rhinturk	336639	832954	368	1,723 (T2)	NML5
NAL14 - Ballochford	335986	833709	344	1,826 (T1)	NML5
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	334047	835691	249	3,800 (T1)	NML5
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	334727	837387	285	4,125 (T1)	NML1
NAL17 - Earnfold	336407	839244	238	4,325 (T10)	NML1
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg**	340416	837360	296	1,190 (T11)	NML1
NAL19 - Chapel Hill**	340770	836922	311	1,142 (T11)	NML1
NAL20 - Building NW of Chapel Hill**	340620	837170	310	1,171 (T11)	NML1
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	341912	834780	266	2,650 (T11)	CEWF Oldtown***
NAL22 - Tomnaven	340420	833468	266	2,043 (T5)	CEWF Oldtown***
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	339880	832476	259	2,456 (T5)	CEWF Oldtown***
NAL24 - Pyke	339302	831897	269	2,541 (T2)	CEWF Oldtown***

* Please note the distances to nearest turbines quoted above may differ from those reported elsewhere. Distances for the noise assessment are taken from the nearest turbine to the closest edge of the amenity area (usually the garden).

**Please note these buildings are unoccupied and appear abandoned but their status could not be confirmed therefore they have been included as noise sensitive receptors for completeness.

*** Background Noise Data from Clashindarroch Extension EIAR used at these locations.

6.2 Noise Emission Characteristics of the Wind Turbines

- 6.2.1 There are a range of wind turbine models which may be suitable for installation at the Proposed Development. This assessment considers the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW with serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades and a hub height of 118.5 m](#).
- 6.2.2 For the cumulative assessment, the turbines considered are summarised in Annex 6 and the noise immission from the cumulative schemes are included within Annex 7. The data for some turbines has not been included due to data confidentiality. The detailed noise data would be available upon request subject to the signing of the appropriate Non Disclosure Agreement.
- 6.2.3 Due to the differences in the way in which levels are provided by the different manufacturers, TNEI has accounted for uncertainty using the guidance contained within Section 4.2 of the IOA GPG (2013). Details of the sound power level, octave data and measurement uncertainty used for the turbines considered in this assessment are included in Annex 7.
- 6.2.4 Manufacturer data is usually supplied based on a specific hub height whilst values are presented as standardised to 10 m height. The noise model used in this assessment alters turbine noise data to account for different hub heights, where applicable. The hub height modelled for the Proposed Development is [118.5 m](#). The hub heights considered for the other wind farm/turbine developments are summarised in Annex 6.
- 6.2.5 The location of the wind turbines are shown on Figure A1.1a and grid references are included in Annex 6.

6.3 Noise Propagation Parameters

- 6.3.1 As detailed in Section 4.4 above, the full version of the ISO 9613-2 model has been used to calculate the noise immission levels at the nearest receptors.
- 6.3.2 For the purposes of the present assessment, all noise level predictions have been undertaken using a receiver height of 4.0 m above local ground level, mixed ground ($G=0.5$) and air absorption coefficients based on a temperature of 10 °C and 70 % relative humidity to provide a realistic impact assessment. The modelling parameters reflect current good practice as detailed within the IOA GPG.
- 6.3.3 The wind turbine noise immission levels are based on the $L_{A90,10 \text{ minute}}$ noise indicator in accordance with the recommendations in ETSU-R-97, which were obtained by subtracting 2dB(A) from the turbine sound power level data (L_{Aeq} indicator).
- 6.3.4 A topographical assessment has been undertaken between each noise sensitive receptor and wind turbine location to determine whether any concave ground profiles exist between the source and receiver (noise sensitive receptor). Analysis undertaken using a combination of CadnaA (26) and an Excel model found that if the formula in the IOA GPG is applied directly a +3 dB correction is required for some turbines at a number of receptors as summarised in Annex 6.
- 6.3.5 In addition, an assessment has been undertaken to determine whether any topographical screening effects of the terrain occur where there is no direct line of sight between the

highest point on the turbine rotor and the receiver location. Upon analysis of each noise sensitive receptor it was found that a barrier correction of -2 dB could be applied for some turbines at a number of receptors as detailed in Annex 6. In reality, there is significant screening at some of the locations so more attenuation may occur in practice, the use of a 2 dB value is therefore considered to be conservative as it results in the highest predicted levels. All corrections have been applied, where necessary, in all of the Tables and Graphs in this report.

- 6.3.6 The need to include a concave ground/screening correction may change depending on the final location of the turbines (following micrositing) and the final turbine hub height. Nevertheless, turbine noise levels will have to meet the noise limits detailed in planning conditions regardless of any difference in noise propagation caused by topography. Should consent be granted, the need to apply a concave slope correction will need to be considered by the Applicant prior to the final selection of a turbine make and model for the Proposed Development.
- 6.3.7 The cumulative assessment has taken into account directivity effects in line with good practice. The directivity of wind turbines has been recognised for some time. Building on earlier work by NASA, in 1988 Wyle Laboratories studied sound propagation using an omnidirectional loudspeaker source elevated 80 ft above ground, in upwind, downwind and cross wind situations, and in both flat and hilly terrain, then compared those measurements to measured data from actual wind turbines. Their study quantified directivity factors for a limited frequency range, but was unable to conclusively demonstrate the anticipated directivity effects on real wind turbines. It also highlighted, but was unable to explain, measured differences observed between flat and hilly terrain.
- 6.3.8 Hubbard (1990) (IOA GPG Section 4.4.3) described a number of factors believed to influence propagation and directivity, notably refraction caused by vertical wind and temperature gradients. In the downwind direction the wind gradient causes the sound rays to bend toward the ground, whereas in the upwind direction the rays curve upward away from the ground. Upwind of the turbine this results in a region of increased attenuation termed the 'shadow zone'. The excess attenuation is frequency dependent, with lowest frequencies least attenuated. Relating this to the earlier NASA studies, Hubbard noted that the distance from the source to the edge of the shadow zone is related to the wind speed gradient and the elevation of the source, which for a typical turbine source was calculated to be approximately 5 times the source height.
- 6.3.9 This observation was adopted in the IOA GPG, which states (Section 4.4.2) 'Such reductions (due to "shadow zone" refraction effects) will in practice only progressively come into play at distances of between 5 and 10 turbine tip heights', while Section 4.4.3 provides graphical examples of increasing broadband directivity with increasing tip height scaling in both flat and hilly terrain, without qualifying either of those designations.
- 6.3.10 The IOA GPG recommends (Section 4.4.1) that directivity attenuation factors adopted in any assessment should be clearly stated. The TNEI noise model can consider the effect of directivity, and in line with current good practice the attenuation values used are detailed in Table 6.2. These are based upon the examples given in the IOA GPG (Section 4.4.2), using interpolation where required, and adopt a single attenuation value for receptors between located more than 5 tip heights from a receiver.

Table 6.2 Wind Directivity Attenuation Factors used in Modelling

Direction (°)	0	15	30	45	60	75	90	105	120	135	150	165
Attenuation dB(A)	-10	-9.9	-9.3	-8.3	-6.7	-4.6	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Direction (°)	180	195	210	225	240	255	270	285	300	315	330	345
Attenuation (dB(A))	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-4.6	-6.7	-8.3	-9.3	-9.9

6.4 Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits (Stage 1)

- 6.4.1 The ETSU-R-97 noise limits are derived by establishing the ‘best fit’ correlation between background noise level and wind speed. These limits, sometimes referred to as the ‘criterion curve’, are based on a level 5 dB(A) above this best fit correlation curve, over a wind speed range from 0 to 12 ms⁻¹. Where the derived criterion curve for the daytime period lies below a fixed level in the range 35 – 40 dB(A) then ETSU-R-97 provides that the criterion curve may be set at an absolute level somewhere within that range.
- 6.4.2 When considering the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development operating in conjunction with other operational, consented and proposed schemes a Fixed Minimum Limit of 40 dB has been adopted to establish the daytime Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit. This limit was chosen following a review of the noise limits allocated or proposed for nearby wind farms and with due regard to the guidance in ETSU-R-97.
- 6.4.3 Whilst a cumulative daytime Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit of 40 dB (or background noise plus 5 dB) is proposed, the Proposed Developments Site Specific Noise Limit has been set such that it never exceeds 35 dB (or background noise plus 5 dB whichever is the greater); this represents the lower end of the daytime limit that can be applied under in ETSU-R-97.
- 6.4.4 The Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits have been established for each of the NALs as detailed in Table 6.3 and Table 6.4 below, based on a fixed minimum of 40dB(A) (daytime) or 43 dB(A) (Night time) or background plus 5 dB(A).

Table 6.3 Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits Daytime

Location	Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10m height											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL1 - Wester Braetown	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
NAL2 - Easter Braetown	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
NAL3 - Backside	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
NAL4 - Tighnaird	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44

Location	Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10m height												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL5 - Mill of Lynebain	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.7	42.3	
NAL6 - Belcherrie	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.3	43.8	43.8	43.8	
NAL7 - Greenloan	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.3	43.8	43.8	43.8	
NAL8 - Succoth	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4	
NAL9 - Easterton	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4	
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4	
NAL11 - Milltown	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4	
NAL12 - Ardlewie	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1	
NAL13 - Rhinturk	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1	
NAL14 - Ballochford	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1	
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1	
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	
NAL17 - Earnfold	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	
NAL19 - Chapel Hill	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	
NAL20 - Building NW of Chapel Hill	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
NAL22 - Tomnaven	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
NAL24 - Pyke	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51

Table 6.4 Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits Night Time

Location	Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10m height											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL1 - Wester Braetown	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
NAL2 - Easter Braetown	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
NAL3 - Backside	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
NAL4 - Tighnaird	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5

Location	Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10m height											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL5 - Mill of Lynebain	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.3
NAL6 - Belcherrie	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45.8	53.7
NAL7 - Greenloan	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45.8	53.7
NAL8 - Succoth	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL9 - Easterton	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL11 - Milltown	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL12 - Ardlewie	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL13 - Rhinturk	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL14 - Ballochford	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5
NAL17 - Earnfold	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5
NAL19 - Chapel Hill	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5
NAL20 - Building NW of Chapel Hill	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48
NAL22 - Tomnaven	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48
NAL24 - Pyke	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48

6.5 Predicting the requirement for a cumulative assessment and the likely effects (Stage 2)

6.5.1 A comparison has been undertaken of the predicted wind turbine noise immission levels from the Proposed Development alongside all other schemes at each of the identified noise sensitive receptors in order to demonstrate whether predictions are within 10 dB of each other. All turbines have been assumed to be operating in full mode. Table 6.5 below summarises the results and whether a cumulative noise assessment is required. As is detailed in Section 4.4 above, if the predictions are greater than 10 dB apart then a cumulative noise assessment is not required. Where predictions are found to be within 10 dB of each other then a cumulative assessment is required.

Table 6.5 Cumulative Assessment Requirement

Noise Assessment Location (NAL)	Are predicted wind turbine noise levels within 10 dB?	Is a cumulative assessment required?
NAL1 - Wester Braetown	YES	YES
NAL2 - Easter Braetown	YES	YES
NAL3 - Backside	YES	YES
NAL4 - Tighnaird	YES	YES
NAL5 - Mill of Lynebain	YES	YES
NAL6 - Belcherrie	YES	YES
NAL7 - Greenloan	YES	YES
NAL8 - Succoth	YES	YES
NAL9 - Easterton	YES	YES
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	YES	YES
NAL11 - Milltown	YES	YES
NAL12 - Ardlewie	YES	YES
NAL13 - Rhinturk	YES	YES
NAL14 - Ballochford	YES	YES
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	YES	YES
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	YES	YES
NAL17 - Earnfold	YES	YES
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	YES	YES
NAL19 - Chapel Hill	YES	YES
NAL20 - Building NW of Chapel Hill	YES	YES
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	YES	YES
NAL22 - Tomnaven	YES	YES
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	YES	YES
NAL24 - Pyke	YES	YES

6.5.2 As summarised in Table 6.5 above a cumulative noise assessment was required at all NALs. A detailed list of all the wind farms considered in the noise predictions are included in Table 1 of Annex 6.

6.5.3 A likely cumulative noise assessment was undertaken at all NALs and the results are summarised in tabular form in Table 6.6 and Table 6.7. The results show that the predicted cumulative wind turbine noise immission levels meet the 'Total ETSU-R-97 Noise limits' under all conditions at all NALs. The predicted 'likely' cumulative levels are the actual levels

expected at an NAL and include the addition of an appropriate level of uncertainty to the turbine data as per Section 4.2 of the IOA GPG. The uncertainty level added is generally +2 dB but this can vary depending on the turbine manufacturer data available for each turbine.

- 6.5.4 [Figures A1.3a-x](#) (Annex 1) show predictions from the Proposed Development and 'cumulative (including Proposed Development)' against the 'Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits' at all NALs. The individual contribution of the cumulative schemes are also shown.

Table 6.6 ETSU-R-97 Compliance Table – Likely Cumulative Noise - Daytime

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL1 – Wester Braetown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.8	30.5	33.3	33.8	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14	-9.5	-6.7	-6.2	-6.1	-6.1	-10	-10	-10
NAL2 – Easter Braetown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.5	30.2	33.1	33.6	33.7	33.7	33.7	33.7	33.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-9.8	-6.9	-6.4	-6.3	-6.3	-10	-10	-10
NAL3 - Backside	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.2	32	35.8	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-13	-8	-4.2	-3.4	-3.4	-3.4	-7.4	-7.4	-7.4
NAL4 - Tighnaird	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.2	30.1	33.8	34.5	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-9.9	-6.2	-5.5	-5.4	-5.4	-9.4	-9.4	-9.4
NAL5 – Mill of Lynebain	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.7	42.3
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.3	30.1	33.8	34.5	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-9.9	-6.2	-5.5	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4	-6.1	-7.7
NAL6 - Belcherrie	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.3	43.8	43.8	43.8
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29	33.8	37.5	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-11	-6.2	-2.5	-1.8	-1.8	-2.1	-5.6	-5.6	-5.6

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL7 - Greenloan	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.3	43.8	43.8	43.8
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	28.8	33.6	37.4	38	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-11	-6.4	-2.6	-2	-1.9	-2.2	-2.2	-5.7	-5.7	-5.7
NAL8 - Surocoth	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	28	32.8	36.3	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12	-7.2	-3.7	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-5.5	-5.5	-5.5
NAL9 - Easterton	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	28.5	33.4	36.7	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12	-6.6	-3.3	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8	-5.2	-5.2	-5.2
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	30.3	35.2	38	38.3	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-9.7	-4.8	-2	-1.7	-1.6	-1.6	-1.6	-4	-4	-4
NAL11 - Miltown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42.4	42.4	42.4
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	26.6	31.5	34.6	35	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-13	-8.5	-5.4	-5	-4.9	-4.9	-4.9	-7.3	-7.3	-7.3
NAL12 - Ardlewie	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	26.1	30	33.7	34.9	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14	-10	-6.3	-5.1	-4.6	-4.7	-4.7	-4.7	-4.7	-4.7

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL13 - Rhinturk	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.9	30.4	34.2	35	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14	-9.6	-5.8	-5	-4.8	-4.9	-4.9	-4.9	-4.9	-4.9
NAL14 - Ballachford	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	24.8	28.7	32.4	33.6	34.1	34.1	34.1	34.1	34.1	34.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-11	-7.6	-6.4	-5.9	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	21.2	25.2	28.5	29.7	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-19	-15	-12	-10	-9.8	-9.9	-9.9	-9.9	-9.9	-9.9
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	21.5	25.6	28.9	30	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-19	-14	-11	-10	-9.6	-9.6	-14	-14	-14	-14
NAL17 - Earnfold	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	20.3	24.8	27.8	28.6	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-20	-15	-12	-11	-11	-11	-15	-15	-15	-15
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	28.1	32.9	36.3	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12	-7.1	-3.7	-3	-3	-3	-7	-7	-7	-7

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL19 – Chapel Hill	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.6	32.3	36.1	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12	-7.7	-3.9	-3.1	-3.1	-3.1	-7.1	-7.1	-7.1
NAL20 – Building NW of Chapel Hill	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	44	44	44
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.9	32.7	36.3	36.9	37	37	37	37	37
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12	-7.3	-3.7	-3.1	-3	-3	-7	-7	-7
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25	30	33.8	34.6	34.7	34.7	34.7	34.7	34.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-10	-6.2	-5.4	-5.3	-8.3	-10.3	-13.3	-16.3
NAL22 - Tomnaven	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.6	32.4	35.8	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12.4	-7.6	-4.2	-3.7	-3.7	-6.7	-8.7	-11.7	-14.7
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29.4	34.3	37.1	37.5	37.6	37.6	37.6	37.6	37.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-10.6	-5.7	-2.9	-2.5	-2.4	-5.4	-7.4	-10.4	-13.4
NAL24 - Pyke	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	43	45	48	51
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29	33.9	36.9	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-11	-6.1	-3.1	-2.7	-2.7	-5.7	-7.7	-10.7	-13.7

Note: For the cumulative noise predictions the noise model considers the range of noise data available for each turbine type modelled. For some turbines noise data was not available for wind speeds less than 4 ms⁻¹ therefore no cumulative predictions are included for wind speeds less than 4 ms⁻¹.

Table 6.7 ETSU-R-97 Compliance Table – Likely Cumulative Noise – Night-time

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL1 – Wester Braetown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.8	30.5	33.3	33.8	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-17.2	-12.5	-9.7	-9.2	-9.1	-9.1	-9.1	-9.6	-9.6	-9.6
NAL2 – Easter Braetown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.5	30.2	33.1	33.6	33.7	33.7	33.7	33.7	33.7	33.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-17.5	-12.8	-9.9	-9.4	-9.3	-9.3	-9.3	-9.8	-9.8	-9.8
NAL3 - Backside	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.2	32	35.8	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6	36.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15.8	-11	-7.2	-6.4	-6.4	-6.4	-6.4	-6.9	-6.9	-6.9
NAL4 - Tighnaid	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.2	30.1	33.8	34.5	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-17.8	-12.9	-9.2	-8.5	-8.4	-8.4	-8.4	-8.9	-8.9	-8.9
NAL5 – Mill of Lynebain	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.3
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.3	30.1	33.8	34.5	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6	34.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-17.7	-12.9	-9.2	-8.5	-8.4	-8.4	-8.4	-8.4	-8.4	-8.7
NAL6 - Belcherrie	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45.8	53.7	53.7
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29	33.8	37.5	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2	38.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14	-9.2	-5.5	-4.8	-4.8	-4.8	-4.8	-7.6	-15.5	-15.5

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL7 - Greenloan	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45.8	53.7	53.7
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	28.8	33.6	37.4	38	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14.2	-9.4	-5.6	-5	-4.9	-4.9	-4.9	-7.7	-15.6	-15.6
NAL8 - Succoth	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	28	32.8	36.3	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15	-10.2	-6.7	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1
NAL9 - Easterton	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	28.5	33.4	36.7	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14.5	-9.6	-6.3	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8
NAL10 – Oldtown of Corinacy	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	30.3	35.2	38	38.3	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-12.7	-7.8	-5	-4.7	-4.6	-4.6	-4.6	-4.6	-4.6	-4.6
NAL11 - Milltown	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	26.6	31.5	34.6	35	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-16.4	-11.5	-8.4	-8	-7.9	-7.9	-7.9	-7.9	-7.9	-7.9
NAL12 - Ardlewie	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 LA90	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise LA90	-	-	-	26.1	30	33.7	34.9	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-16.9	-13	-9.3	-8.1	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL13 - Rhinturk	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25.9	30.4	34.2	35	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-17.1	-12.6	-8.8	-8	-7.8	-7.8	-7.8	-7.8	-7.8
NAL14 - Ballachford	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	24.8	28.7	32.4	33.6	34.1	34.1	34.1	34.1	34.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-18.2	-14.3	-10.6	-9.4	-8.9	-8.9	-8.9	-8.9	-8.9
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	21.2	25.2	28.5	29.7	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-21.8	-17.8	-14.5	-13.3	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	21.5	25.6	28.9	30	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-21.5	-17.4	-14.1	-13	-12.6	-12.6	-13.1	-13.1	-13.1
NAL17 - Earnfold	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	20.3	24.8	27.8	28.6	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-22.7	-18.2	-15.2	-14.4	-14.1	-14.1	-14.6	-14.6	-14.6
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	28.1	32.9	36.3	37	37	37	37	37	37
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14.9	-10.1	-6.7	-6	-6	-6	-6.5	-6.5	-6.5

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL19 – Chapel Hill	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.6	32.3	36.1	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9	36.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15.4	-10.7	-6.9	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.1	-6.6	-6.6	-6.6
NAL20 – Building NW of Chapel Hill	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.9	32.7	36.3	36.9	37	37	37	37	37	37
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15.1	-10.3	-6.7	-6.1	-6	-6	-6	-6.5	-6.5	-6.5
NAL21 - Melklee Gouls	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48	50
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	25	30	33.8	34.6	34.7	34.7	34.7	34.7	34.7	34.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-18	-13	-9.2	-8.4	-8.3	-8.3	-8.3	-10.3	-13.3	-15.3
NAL22 - Tomnaven	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48	50
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	27.6	32.4	35.8	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3	36.3
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-15.4	-10.6	-7.2	-6.7	-6.7	-6.7	-6.7	-8.7	-11.7	-13.7
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48	50
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29.4	34.3	37.1	37.5	37.6	37.6	37.6	37.6	37.6	37.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-13.6	-8.7	-5.9	-5.5	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4	-7.4	-10.4	-12.4
NAL24 - Pyke	Total Noise Limit: ETSU-R-97 L _{A90}	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	45	48	50
	Predicted Cumulative Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	-	29	33.9	36.9	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-	-14	-9.1	-6.1	-5.7	-5.7	-5.7	-5.7	-7.7	-10.7	-12.7

Note: For the cumulative noise predictions the noise model considers the range of noise data available for each turbine type modelled. For some turbines noise data was not available for wind speeds less than 4 ms⁻¹ therefore no cumulative predictions are included for wind speeds less than 4 ms⁻¹.

6.6 Derivation of Site Specific Noise Limits (Stage 3)

6.6.1 In order to protect residential amenity, the IOA GPG (2013) recommendations are that cumulatively, all schemes operate within the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. This can be found in summary box SB21 of the IOA GPG (2013) which states:

‘Whenever a cumulative situation is encountered, the noise limits for an individual wind farm should be determined in such a way that no cumulative excess of the total ETSU-R-97 noise limit would occur.’

6.6.2 As detailed in Section 4.3.8 above, the daytime Site Specific Noise Limits have been derived based on the lower Fixed Minimum Noise Limits as detailed within ETSU-R-97. At this stage, the Site Specific Noise Limits do not consider whether the occupiers of a property have a financial interest in the Proposed Development or a nearby scheme. As detailed in Section 2.4.11 above, if the occupiers of a property are financially involved then both the day and night time fixed minimum limits can be increased to 45 dB. It also assumes that the proposed Garbet and Clashindarroch II Wind Farms are consented and built, and that the wind farms which are operational continue to operate for the lifetime of their consent.

6.6.3 The apportionment options provided in the IOA GPG were considered to determine the most appropriate option for each scheme. Site Specific Noise Limits have been derived for each of the noise sensitive receptors considered within Table 6.1 above. Table 6.8 below summarises the approach adopted at each NAL in order to derive the Site Specific Noise Limits for the Proposed Development. Figures A1.4a-x show the addition of the buffers as detailed in Table 6.8 below.

Table 6.8 Limit Derivation Strategy

NAL	Limit Derivation Strategy
NALs 15-17	The likely predictions level from other schemes were found to be more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits and as such the entire noise limits has been allocated to the Proposed Development.
NALs 1-5, 12-14, 18-21	<p>The likely predicted noise levels from other cumulative schemes were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. As such, the limit has been apportioned based on a cautious prediction of cumulative turbine noise. The contribution from CEWF to the cumulative predictions is negligible at these locations.</p> <p>The noise predictions for the other proposed, consented and operational schemes show that there is, in theory, significant headroom between the likely predicted levels and the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit (>5 dB). In accordance with Section 4.5 above, a 2 dB buffer was therefore added to the turbine noise predictions for each of the other developments; this is considered to be a suitable buffer in accordance with Section 5.4.11 of the IOA GPG and would represent a 60 % increase in emitted noise levels from the other schemes.</p> <p>The resulting ‘cautious’ predictions of cumulative wind turbine noise have then been logarithmically subtracted from the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit to determine the ‘Residual Noise Limit’ (RNL).</p> <p>The Site Specific Noise Limits are then determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night time: The SSNL is set to the RNL. • Daytime: The noise limit is determined by taking the lowest of either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The RNL; or

NAL	Limit Derivation Strategy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background noise plus 5 dB or the daytime fixed minimum limit of 35 dB (whichever is greater).
<p>NALs 6-7, 22</p>	<p>Predicted noise levels from CEWF were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits during the daytime only; likely predicted noise levels from all other cumulative schemes were found to be more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits during the daytime and night-time periods.</p> <p>The Site Specific Noise Limits were determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night-time: Predicted noise levels from all cumulative sites are more than 10 dB below the TNL; the SSNL was set equal to the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. • Daytime: Predicted noise levels from CEWF and the Proposed Development are both within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits; all other cumulative predictions are more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits. The Site Specific Noise Limit for both developments are set equal to the individual predicted noise level plus the difference between the predicted level and the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits.
<p>NALs 8-9</p>	<p>Predicted noise levels from CEWF were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits during the daytime and night-time; likely predicted noise levels from all other cumulative schemes were found to be more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits during the daytime and night-time periods.</p> <p>The Site Specific Noise Limits are determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daytime and Night-time: Predicted noise levels from CEWF and the Proposed Development are both within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits; all other cumulative predictions are more than 10 dB below the TNL. The Site Specific Noise Limit for both developments are set equal to the individual predicted noise level plus the difference between the predicted level and the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits.
<p>NALs 10, 23-24</p>	<p>Predicted noise levels from cumulative developments, including CEWF, were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits and predicted noise levels from the Proposed Development are more than 10 dB below the Total Noise Limits during the night-time period.</p> <p>The Site Specific Noise Limits are determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night-time: Predicted noise levels from the Proposed Development are more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits; the SSNL is therefore set equal to the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits minus 10 dB. • Daytime: Likely predictions of cumulative noise (excluding the Proposed Development and CEWF) are subtracted from the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits to determine the RNL. Predicted noise levels from CEWF and the Proposed Development are both within 10 dB of the RNL. The Site Specific Noise Limit for both developments are set equal to the individual predicted noise level plus the difference between the predicted level and the RNL.
<p>NAL 11</p>	<p>Predicted noise levels from cumulative developments, including CEWF, were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits and predicted noise levels from the Proposed Development are more than 10 dB below the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits for both Daytime and night-time periods.</p> <p>The Site Specific Noise Limits are determined as follows:</p>

NAL	Limit Derivation Strategy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daytime and Night time: The SSNL is set equal to the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits minus 10 dB.

- 6.6.4 Please note the buffers detailed above are in addition to the appropriate level of uncertainty already added to the turbine data as per Section 4.2 of the IOA GPG.
- 6.6.5 As summarised in Table 6.8 above, it is proposed that the full ETSU-R-97 noise limits be allocated to the Proposed Development at a number of NALs, as the other schemes do not need a portion of the limit. For the remaining noise assessment locations, apportionment was required in order to allow the Proposed Development and the other wind farm developments to co-exist to within the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits.
- 6.6.6 Table 6.9 and Table 6.10 show the daytime and night time Site Specific Noise Limits, noise predictions for the Proposed Development and the exceedance level. A negative exceedance demonstrates compliance with the Site Specific Noise Limits.
- 6.6.7 The Tables show that the predicted wind turbine noise immission levels meet the Site Specific Noise Limits under all conditions and at all locations during both the daytime and night time periods. An exceedance (up to 1.4 dB) of the Site Specific Noise Limit was predicted in full mode for the candidate turbine at wind speeds of 6-7 ms⁻¹ during the daytime period at NAL6 and NAL7, and at NAL18, NAL19 and NAL20 (up to 0.4 dB) therefore some turbines would need to be operated in low noise mode for certain wind speeds and certain wind directions when considering the Nordex N163 6.X with serrated trailing edge blades as the candidate turbine. The mode management has been applied to the predicted levels included within Tables 6.9 and 6.10.
- 6.6.8 A series of graphs to show the predicted wind turbine noise from the Proposed Development compared to the Site Specific Noise Limits are included as Figures A1.4a - A1.4 (Annex 1). There is a set of graphs for each of the NAL, which show the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit (solid red line), the Residual Noise Limit (dashed red line with triangles), the Site Specific Noise Limit for the Proposed Development (dashed blue line with circles) and the predicted wind turbine noise from the Proposed Development (solid blue line). At NALs where predicted noise levels from Clashindarroch Extension are within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit and will therefore Clashindarroch Extension will require a share of the limit, the Site Specific Noise Limit for Clashindarroch Extension (dashed pink line with crosses), and the predicted wind turbine noise from Clashindarroch Extension (solid pink line) are displayed.
- 6.6.9 The Site Specific Noise Limits calculated for Clashindarroch Extension shown on Figures A1.4a - A1.4 are provided in tabulated format in Annex 8.

Table 6.9 Site Specific Noise Limits Compliance Table – Daytime

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL1 – Wester Braetown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.1	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	17.9	19.5	24.3	28.7	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-17.1	-15.5	-10.7	-6.3	-5.5	-6.5	-9.6	-14.5	-14.5	-14.5
NAL2 – Easter Braetown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.2	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.0	19.6	24.4	28.8	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-17.0	-15.4	-10.6	-6.2	-5.4	-6.4	-9.6	-14.4	-14.4	-14.4
NAL3 - Backside	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.4	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.4	25.0	29.8	34.2	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.6	-10.0	-5.2	-0.8	0.0	-1.0	-4.4	-9.0	-9.0	-9.0
NAL4 - Tighnaird	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.4	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-14.5	-12.9	-8.1	-3.7	-2.9	-3.9	-7.3	-11.9	-11.9	-11.9
NAL5 – Mill of Lynebain	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.4	36.5	37.7	39.1	40.7	42.3
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-14.5	-12.9	-8.1	-3.7	-3.3	-4.4	-5.6	-7.0	-8.6	-10.2
NAL6 - Beicherrie	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.8	37.7	39.2	42.7	42.7	42.7
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	25.4	27.0	31.8	35.0*	35.8*	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-9.6	-8.0	-3.2	0.0	0.0	-0.7	-2.2	-5.7	-5.7	-5.7

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL7 - Greenloan	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.8	37.7	39.2	42.7	42.7	42.7
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	25.6	27.2	32.0	35.0*	35.8*	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-9.4	-7.8	-3.0	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-2.0	-5.5	-5.5	-5.5
NAL8 - Succoth	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.8	36.6	37.9	38.0	40.4	40.4	40.4
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	24.1	25.7	30.5	34.9	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.3	-9.7	-4.9	-0.9	-0.9	-2.2	-2.3	-4.7	-4.7	-4.7
NAL9 - Easterton	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.8	36.6	36.9	36.9	39.3	39.3	39.3
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	22.9	24.5	29.3	33.7	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-12.5	-10.9	-6.1	-2.1	-2.1	-2.4	-2.4	-4.8	-4.8	-4.8
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.2	31.9	31.7	31.7	31.7	34.9	34.9	34.9
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.6	20.2	25.0	29.4	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.7	-10.1	-5.2	-2.5	-1.5	-1.5	-1.5	-4.7	-4.7	-4.7
NAL11 - Milltown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	32.4	32.4	32.4
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	16.4	18.0	22.8	27.2	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-13.6	-12.0	-7.2	-2.8	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0	-4.4	-4.4	-4.4
NAL12 - Ardlewie	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.3	38.1	38.6	38.7	38.7	38.7	38.7
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-14.5	-12.9	-8.1	-5.0	-6.0	-6.5	-6.6	-6.6	-6.6	-6.6

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL13 - Rhinturk	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.3	38.1	38.2	38.4	38.4	38.4	38.4
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	21.2	22.8	27.6	32.0	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-13.8	-12.2	-7.4	-4.3	-5.3	-5.4	-5.6	-5.6	-5.6	-5.6
NAL14 - Ballachford	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.3	38.1	38.8	38.9	38.9	38.9	38.9
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.6	20.2	25.0	29.4	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-16.4	-14.8	-10.0	-6.9	-7.9	-8.6	-8.7	-8.7	-8.7	-8.7
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.3	38.1	39.5	40.1	40.1	40.1	40.1
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	11.9	13.5	18.3	22.7	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-23.1	-21.5	-16.7	-13.6	-14.6	-16.0	-16.6	-16.6	-16.6	-16.6
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.4	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	13.3	14.9	19.7	24.1	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-21.7	-20.1	-15.3	-10.9	-10.1	-11.1	-14.5	-19.1	-19.1	-19.1
NAL17 - Earnfold	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.4	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	11.6	13.2	18.0	22.4	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-23.4	-21.8	-17.0	-12.6	-11.8	-12.8	-16.2	-20.8	-20.8	-20.8
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.0	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.5	25.1	29.9	34.3	35.0**	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.5	-9.9	-5.1	-0.7	0.0	-0.9	-3.9	-8.9	-8.9	-8.9

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL19 – Chapel Hill	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.0	39.4	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.8	25.4	30.2	34.6	35.0**	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.2	-9.6	-4.8	-0.4	0.0	-0.6	-4.0	-8.6	-8.6	-8.6
NAL20 – Building NW of Chapel Hill	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0**	36.0	39.2	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.6	25.2	30.0	34.4	35.0	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-11.4	-9.8	-5.0	-0.6	0.0	-0.8	-4.0	-8.8	-8.8	-8.8
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	37.0	38.0	39.2	43.0	45.0	48.0	51.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	19.0	20.6	25.4	29.8	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-16.0	-14.4	-9.6	-7.2	-7.4	-8.6	-12.4	-14.4	-17.4	-20.4
NAL22 - Tomnaven	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	36.9	37.3	37.3	40.3	42.3	45.3	48.3
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	21.5	23.1	27.9	32.3	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-13.5	-11.9	-7.1	-4.6	-4.2	-4.2	-7.2	-9.2	-12.2	-15.2
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	32.2	32.2	32.2	32.2	32.1	33.7	34.2	34.2	37.2	39.2	42.2	45.2
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	19.6	21.2	26.0	30.4	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-12.6	-11.0	-6.1	-3.3	-3.0	-3.0	-6.0	-8.0	-11.0	-14.0
NAL24 - Pyke	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.1	32.7	33.2	33.2	36.2	38.2	41.2	44.2
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.4	20.0	24.8	29.2	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-12.8	-11.2	-6.3	-3.5	-3.2	-3.2	-6.2	-8.2	-11.2	-14.2

*Mode management required (and have been assumed in the predicted levels presented here) for certain wind directions at a wind speeds of 6-7 ms⁻¹

**Minor mode management required (and have been assumed in the predicted levels presented here) for certain wind directions at a wind speed of 7 ms⁻¹

Table 6.10 Site Specific Noise Limits Compliance Table – Night time

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL1 – Wester Braetown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	17.9	19.5	24.3	28.7	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-25.1	-23.5	-18.7	-14.3	-13.5	-13.5	-13.5	-13.5	-14.0	-14.0	-14.0
NAL2 – Easter Braetown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.0	19.6	24.4	28.8	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-25.0	-23.4	-18.6	-14.2	-13.4	-13.4	-13.4	-13.4	-13.9	-13.9	-13.9
NAL3 - Backside	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.4	25.0	29.8	34.2	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-19.6	-18.0	-13.2	-8.8	-8.0	-8.0	-8.0	-8.0	-8.5	-8.5	-8.5
NAL4 - Tighnaird	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-22.5	-20.9	-16.1	-11.7	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-11.4	-11.4	-11.4
NAL5 – Mill of Lynebain	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.3
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-22.5	-20.9	-16.1	-11.7	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-11.2
NAL6 - Belcherrie	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	45.8	53.7	53.7
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	25.4	27.0	31.8	36.2	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0	37.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-17.6	-16.0	-11.2	-6.8	-6.0	-6.0	-6.0	-6.0	-8.8	-16.7	-16.7

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL7 - Greenloan	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	45.8	53.7	53.7
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	25.6	27.2	32.0	36.4	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-17.4	-15.8	-11.0	-6.6	-5.8	-5.8	-5.8	-8.6	-16.5	-16.5
NAL8 - Surcooth	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	39.8	39.8	39.8	39.8	39.8	40.7	41.0	41.0	41.0	41.0	41.0	41.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	24.1	25.7	30.5	34.9	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7	35.7
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-15.7	-14.1	-9.3	-5.8	-5.3	-5.3	-5.3	-5.3	-5.3	-5.3
NAL9 - Easterton	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	38.5	38.5	38.5	38.5	38.5	39.6	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9	39.9
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	22.9	24.5	29.3	33.7	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-15.6	-14.0	-9.2	-5.9	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4	-5.4
NAL10 - Oldtown of Corinacy	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.6	20.2	25.0	29.4	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-14.4	-12.8	-8.0	-3.6	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8
NAL11 - Milltown	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	16.4	18.0	22.8	27.2	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-16.6	-15.0	-10.2	-5.8	-5.0	-5.0	-5.0	-5.0	-5.0	-5.0
NAL12 - Ardlewie	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	20.5	22.1	26.9	31.3	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-22.5	-20.9	-16.1	-11.7	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9	-10.9

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
NAL13 - Rhinturk	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	42.2	42.2	42.2	42.2	42.2
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	21.2	22.8	27.6	32.0	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8	32.8
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-21.8	-20.2	-15.4	-11.0	-10.2	-9.4	-9.4	-9.4	-9.4	-9.4
NAL14 - Ballachford	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.6	20.2	25.0	29.4	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2	30.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-24.4	-22.8	-18.0	-13.6	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8	-12.8
NAL15 - Bridgehaugh	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	11.9	13.5	18.3	22.7	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-31.1	-29.5	-24.7	-20.3	-19.5	-19.5	-19.5	-19.5	-19.5	-19.5
NAL16 - Parkhead Steading	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	13.3	14.9	19.7	24.1	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9	24.9
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-29.7	-28.1	-23.3	-18.9	-18.1	-18.1	-18.1	-18.6	-18.6	-18.6
NAL17 - Earnfold	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	11.6	13.2	18.0	22.4	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-31.4	-29.8	-25.0	-20.6	-19.8	-19.8	-19.8	-20.3	-20.3	-20.3
NAL18 - Building SE of Greens of Glenbeg	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.5	25.1	29.9	34.3	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-19.5	-17.9	-13.1	-8.7	-7.9	-7.9	-7.9	-8.4	-8.4	-8.4

Location		Wind Speed (ms ⁻¹) as standardised to 10 m height												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
NAL19 – Chapel Hill	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.8	25.4	30.2	34.6	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-19.2	-17.6	-12.8	-8.4	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6	-7.6	-8.1	-8.1	-8.1
NAL20 – Building NW of Chapel Hill	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.5	43.5	43.5
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	23.6	25.2	30.0	34.4	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2	35.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-19.4	-17.8	-13.0	-8.6	-7.8	-7.8	-7.8	-7.8	-8.3	-8.3	-8.3
NAL21 - Meikle Gouls	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	45.0	48.0	50.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	19.0	20.6	25.4	29.8	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6	30.6
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-24.0	-22.4	-17.6	-13.2	-12.4	-12.4	-12.4	-12.4	-14.4	-17.4	-19.4
NAL22 - Tornnaven	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	45.0	48.0	50.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	21.5	23.1	27.9	32.3	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-21.5	-19.9	-15.1	-10.7	-9.9	-9.9	-9.9	-9.9	-11.9	-14.9	-16.9
NAL23 - Hillock of Echt	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	35.0	38.0	40.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	19.6	21.2	26.0	30.4	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2	31.2
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-13.4	-11.8	-7.0	-2.6	-1.8	-1.8	-1.8	-1.8	-3.8	-6.8	-8.8
NAL24 - Pyke	Site Specific Noise Limit L _{A90}	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	33.0	35.0	38.0	40.0
	Predicted Wind Turbine Noise L _{A90}	-	-	18.4	20.0	24.8	29.2	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Exceedance Level	-	-	-14.6	-13.0	-8.2	-3.8	-3.0	-3.0	-3.0	-3.0	-5.0	-8.0	-10.0

6.7 Choice of Daytime Fixed Minimum Noise Limit (35 – 40 dB)

- 6.7.1 Having due regard to the guidance in ETSU-R-97 and considering noise limits already allocated to other wind farms in the area, a daytime Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit of 40 dB has been used. The Proposed Developments Site Specific Noise Limits have been derived separately and have been set based upon the lower fixed minimum limit of 35 dB or background plus 5dB during the daytime period and 43 dB or background plus 5 dB during the night time.
- 6.7.2 If consent is granted for the Proposed Development it would be appropriate to set noise limits equal to the Site Specific Noise Limits contained within Table 6.9 and Table 6.10 which have been derived based on the use of the 35 dB day time fixed minimum limit.

6.8 Micrositing

- 6.8.1 It should be noted that the need to include a concave ground profile correction and/or barrier correction may change depending on the final location of the turbines (following micrositing) and the final turbine hub height. Nevertheless, turbine noise levels will have to meet the noise limits established in this report regardless of any increases and decreases in noise propagation caused by topography. Should consent be granted, the need to apply a concave ground profile/ barrier correction will need to be considered by the Applicant prior to the final selection of a turbine make and model for the Site.

7 Summary and Conclusions

- 7.1.1 This report has assessed the potential impact of operational noise from the Proposed Development on the residents of nearby receptors. The guidance contained within ETSU-R-97 and current good practice (IOA GPG) has been used to assess the potential noise impact of the Proposed Development.
- 7.1.2 [The Proposed Development considered is for 10 wind turbines and associated infrastructure.](#)
- 7.1.3 Background noise monitoring was undertaken by TNEI at five noise sensitive receptors neighbouring the Proposed Development. A total of 24 noise sensitive receptors were chosen as noise assessment locations. The assessment locations were chosen to represent the noise sensitive receptors located closest to the Proposed Development and other nearby wind farms. For the assessment locations where no background noise measurements were undertaken, noise data collected at proxy locations and as part of the noise assessments for other nearby schemes considered representative of the expected background noise environment was used to assess the noise impact at those receptors.
- 7.1.4 Wind speed data was collected using a LIDAR unit located within the Site. The data collected at 104 m and 124 m height were used to calculate hub height wind speeds (125 m) which were then standardised to 10 m height, in accordance with current good practice. [As such, limits are applicable for any proposed hub up to 125 m.](#)
- 7.1.5 Analysis of the measured data was undertaken in accordance with ETSU-R-97 and current good practice to determine the pre-existing background noise environment and to establish the daytime and night time noise limits for each of the assessment locations. A 'Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit' of 40 dB(A) daytime or background plus 5dB (whichever is the greater) and 43 dB(A) night time or background plus 5dB (whichever is the greater) was used for this assessment.
- 7.1.6 There are a number of operational, consented and proposed wind farms in proximity to the Proposed Development. A cumulative assessment was undertaken where predicted levels from the Proposed Development were found to be within 10 dB of the predicted cumulative levels from other schemes in the area. The results show that the predicted cumulative wind farm noise immission levels would meet the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits at all NALs during both the daytime and night time periods.
- 7.1.7 'Site Specific Noise Limits' have also been derived based on a daytime fixed minimum limit of 35 dB or background plus 5 dB and a night time limit of 43 dB or background plus 5 dB. The limit derivation took account (where required) of the other consented wind farms in the area. Where immission from other wind farms at a given receptor were found to be at least 10 dB below the 'Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limit'; then the other wind farms would be using a negligible proportion of the limit. As such it is considered appropriate to allocate the entire noise limit to the Proposed Development. For receptors where turbine predictions were found to be within 10 dB of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits, apportionment of the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits was undertaken.
- 7.1.8 [In 2023, a Section 36 application was submitted for Clashindarroch Extension Wind Farm, located approximately 3.5 km to the southeast of the Proposed Development. Section 5.4.2 of the IOA GPG discusses a method of apportioning ETSU-R-97 noise limits between](#)

concurrent wind farm applications in order to allow multiple developments to coexist. Suitable noise limits allowing both CEWF and the Proposed Development to coexist have been calculated by TNEI in line with the IOA GPG recommendations, with an equal portion of the available noise limit (after other cumulative developments have been accounted for) being assigned to each site.

- 7.1.9 The likely cumulative assessment undertaken at all NALs shows that the Proposed Development can operate concurrently with the proposed, consented and operational wind farms in the area, whilst still meeting the Total ETSU-R-97 Noise Limits at the receptors.
- 7.1.10 An assessment was undertaken to determine whether the Proposed Development could operate within the 'Site Specific Noise Limits' and it was found that predicted wind turbine noise immission were below the Site Specific Noise Limits when considering the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW with serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades](#) as a candidate turbine. An exceedance (up to 1.4 dB) of the Site Specific Noise Limit was predicted at a wind speed of 6-7 ms⁻¹ during the daytime period at NAL6 and NAL7, and also at NAL18, NAL19 and NAL20 (up to 0.4 dB) at 7 ms⁻¹, therefore if the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW](#) is installed at the Site, some of the nearest wind turbines to these identified NALs would need to be operated in a lower noise mode, only during the daytime at a wind speed of 6-7 ms⁻¹ and for certain wind directions. The predictions presented in this report incorporate the required low noise mode operation therefore the assessment shows that Site Specific Noise Limits are met at all NALs and in all conditions.
- 7.1.11 There are a range of potential turbine models that could be installed on the Site should consent be granted. When undertaking the modelling presented in this report TNEI has sought to adopt appropriate assumptions in terms of turbine models and dimensions, specifically:
- Topographical corrections have been considered in accordance with Section 5.3 of this report. Topographical blocking points have considered the highest tip height being considered (200 m) this is worst case as the model applies additional attenuation where the landform blocks line of sight between a turbine and a receptor. Consideration of concave ground profiles has considered the lowest hub height being considered (118.5 m) as this results in the greatest likelihood of concave ground corrections being calculated (which would increase the predicted levels).
 - Sound power level data has been used for the [Nordex N163 6.X 7 MW](#) with a hub height of 118.5 m and [serrated trailing edge \(STE\) blades](#). This model is considered to be representative of the type of turbine that could be installed on the Site.
- 7.1.12 The [Nordex](#) turbine model was chosen as it is considered to be representative of the type of turbine that could be installed at the Site. There are a number of wind turbine makes and models that may be suitable for the Proposed Development. Should the proposal receive planning permission, the final choice of turbine would be subject to a competitive tendering process. Depending on the final turbine selected for the Site and confirmation of final warranted levels from chosen manufacturer, mode management may not be required. The final choice of turbine would, however, have to meet the noise limits determined and contained within any condition imposed.

8 Glossary of Terms

AOD: Above Ordnance Datum is the height above sea level.

Amplitude Modulation: a variation in noise level over time; for example observers may describe a ‘whoosh whoosh’ sound, which can be heard close to a wind turbine as the blades sweep past.

Attenuation: the reduction in level of a sound between the source and a receiver due to any combination of effects including: distance, atmospheric absorption, acoustic screening, the presence of a building façade, etc.

Background Noise: the noise level rarely fallen below in any given location over any given time period, often classed according to daytime, evening or night time periods. The L_{A90} indices (see below) is often used to represent the background noise level.

Bin: subset or group into which data can be sorted; in the case of wind speeds, bins are often centred on integer wind speeds with a width of 1 m/s. For example the 4 m/s bin would include all data with wind speeds of 3.5 to 4.5 m/s.

Broadband Noise: noise with components over a wide range of frequencies.

Decibel (dB): the ratio between the quietest audible sound and the loudest tolerable sound is a million to one in terms of the change in sound pressure. A logarithmic scale is used in noise level measurements because of this wide range. The scale used is the decibel (dB) scale which extends from 0 to 140 decibels (dB) corresponding to the intensity of the sound level.

dB(A): the ear has the ability to recognise a particular sound depending on its pitch or frequency. Microphones cannot differentiate noise in the same way as the ear, and to counter this weakness the noise measuring instrument applies a correction to correspond more closely to the frequency response of the human ear. The correction factor is called ‘A Weighting’ and the resulting measurements are written as dB(A). The dB(A) is internationally accepted and has been found to correspond well with people’s subjective reaction to noise. Some typical subjective changes in noise levels are:

- a change of 3 dB(A) is just perceptible;
- a change of 5 dB(A) is clearly perceptible;
- a change of 10 dB(A) is twice (or half) as loud.

Directivity: the property of a sound source that causes more sound to be radiated in one direction than another.

Frequency: the pitch of a sound in Hz or kHz. See Hertz.

Ground Effects: the modification of sound at a receiver location due to the interaction of the sound wave with the ground along its propagation path from source to receiver. Described using the term ‘G’, and ranges between 0 (hard), 0.5 (mixed) and 1 (soft).

Hertz (Hz): sound frequency refers to how quickly the air vibrates, or how close the sound waves are to each other (in cycles per second, or Hertz (Hz)).

L_w : is the sound power level. It is a measure of the total noise energy radiated by a source of noise, and is used to calculate noise levels at a distant location. The L_{WA} is the A-weighted sound power level.

L_{eq} : is the equivalent continuous sound level, and is the sound level of a steady sound with the same energy as a fluctuating sound over the same period. It is possible to consider this level as the ambient noise encompassing all noise at a given time. The $LA_{eq,T}$ is the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound level over a given time period (T).

L_{90} : index represents the noise level exceeded for 90 percent of the measurement period and is used to indicate quieter times during the measurement period. It is often used to measure the background noise level. The $L_{A90,10min}$ is the A-weighted background noise level over a ten minute measurement sample.

Noise emission: the noise energy emitted by a source (e.g. a wind turbine).

Noise immission: the sound pressure level detected at a given location (e.g. the nearest dwelling).

Night Time Hours: ETSU-R-97 defines the night time hours as 23.00 to 07.00 every day.

Quiet Daytime Hours: ETSU-R-97 defines the amenity hours as 18.00 to 23.00 Monday to Friday, 13.00 to 23.00 on Saturdays and 07.00 to 23.00 on Sundays.

Sound Level Meter: an instrument for measuring sound pressure level.

Sound Power Level: the total sound power radiated by a source, in decibels.

Sound Pressure Level: a measure of the sound pressure at a point, in decibels.

Standardised Wind Speed: a wind speed measured at a height different than 10 m (generally measured at the turbine hub height) which is expressed to a reference height of 10 m using a roughness length of 0.05 for standardisation purpose (in accordance with the IEC 61400-11 standard).

Tonal Noise: noise which covers a very restricted range of frequencies (e.g. a range of ≤ 20 Hz). This noise can be more annoying than broadband noise.


Wind Shear: the increase of wind speed with height above the ground.

9 References

1. ETSU for the DTI (Department of Trade and Industry. *The Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines ETSU-R-97 The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms*. 1996.
2. Institute of Acoustics. *Good Practice Guidance on the application of ETSU-R-97 for wind turbine noise assessment*. 2013.
3. National Planning Policy Framework 4. <https://www.transformingplanning.scot/national-planning-framework/what-is-the-national-planning-framework/>. [Online]
4. The Scottish Government. Web Based Renewables Advice: 'Onshore Wind Turbines' – <https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-turbines-planning-advice/>. [Online] 28 May 2014.
5. —. Planning Advice Note PAN 1/2011: Planning and Noise - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/343210/0114180.pdf>. [Online] 2011.
6. Government, Scottish. Onshore wind: policy statement 2022. [Online] <https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-policy-statement-2022/>.
7. The Scottish Government. Technical Advice Note Assessment of Noise (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/343341/0114220.pdf>). [Online]
8. Moray Local Development Plan 2020. http://www.moray.gov.uk/moray_standard/page_133431.html. [Online] [Cited: 20 04 2022.]
9. Moray Onshore Wind Energy Non-Statutory Guidance 2020. http://www.moray.gov.uk/moray_standard/page_80938.html. [Online] 21 10 2020. [Cited: 20 04 2022.]
10. Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017. <https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/planning/plans-and-policies/aberdeenshire-local-development-plan-2017/>. [Online] 17 04 2017. [Cited: 20 04 2022.]
11. Aberdeenshire Proposed Local Development Plan 2020. <https://www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk/planning/plans-and-policies/pldp-2020/proposed-local-development-plan-2020/>. [Online] [Cited: 20 04 2022.]
12. Letter John Swinney, MSP Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth to Prof B Shield, IOA, 29 May 2013. <http://www.ioa.org.uk/pdf/scottish-government-endorsement-of-ioa-gpg.pdf>. [Online]
13. WSP. A review of noise guidance for onshore wind turbines. [Online] 10 02 2023. <https://www.wsp.com/en-gb/insights/wind-turbine-noise-report>.
14. *Visual and acoustic impact of wind turbine farms in residents Final report*. Frits van den Berg et al. s.l. : FP6-2005-Science-and-Society-20 Specific Support Action, 3 June 2008.
15. *Low frequency noise and annoyance* . HG, Leventhall. s.l. : Noise & Health Journal, 2004, Vol. 6.
16. *Do wind turbines produce significant low frequency sound levels? Conference paper 11th International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control* . Berg, G.P. van den. Maastricht The Netherlands : s.n., 2004.
17. Department of Trade and Industry. *The Measurement of LFN at three UK Wind Farms* . 2006 : s.n.
18. Keele University Rejects Renewable Energy Foundation. <http://archive.is/d3WB>. *Low Frequency Noise Research Claims* . [Online]
19. Institute of Acoustics Bulletin. *Prediction and assessment of wind turbine noise*. 2009.

20. *Infrasound and the ear, 5th International conference on Wind Turbine Noise*. Leventhall, G. Denver : s.n., 2013.
21. The Health Effects of 72 Hours of Simulated Wind Turbine Infrasound: A Double-Blind Randomized Crossover Study in Noise-Sensitive, Healthy Adults - PMC (nih.gov).
22. renewable UK. <http://www.renewableuk.com/search/all.asp?bst=amplitude+modulation>. [Online]
23. Department of Energy & Climate Change. *Wind Turbine AM Review Phase 2 Report*. 2016.
24. International Standards Organisation. *ISO9613:1996 'Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors' – Part 2: General method of calculation*. 1996.
25. ReSoft. WindFarm, Version 4.2.2.1.
26. DataKustik GmbH. CadnaA Version 4.4.
27. The Scottish Government. Web Based Renewables Advice: 'Onshore Wind Turbines' – <https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-turbines-planning-advice/> . [Online] 28 May 2014.
28. —. Web Based Renewables Advice: 'Onshore Wind Turbines' – <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0045/00451413.pdf>. [Online] 28 May 2014.

Annex 1 – Figures



LEGEND

- ⊗ Proposed Development
- Noise Assessment Locations (NALs)**
- Original EIA R NALs
- Additional SEI NALs
- Noise Monitoring Location (NML)**
- NML1
- NML2
- NML3
- NML4
- NML5
- Baseline Dataset Used To Derive Limits**
- NML1
- NML2
- NML3
- NML4
- NML5

Rev.	Date	Amendment Details	Drawn	Approved
1	13/08/2024	UPDATED SITE LAYOUT	JCM	GC
0	08/03/2022	FIRST ISSUE	GC	JM

Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2022

This drawing should not be relied on or used in circumstances other than those for which it was originally prepared and for which TNEI Services Ltd was commissioned. TNEI Services Ltd accepts no responsibility for this drawing to any party other than the person by whom it was commissioned. Any party which breaches the provisions of this disclaimer shall indemnify TNEI Services Ltd for all loss or damage arising therefrom.

Client:	CRAIG WATCH WIND FARM LTD
Drawing Status:	FOR PLANNING
Project Title:	CRAIG WATCH WIND FARM
Drawing Title:	FIGURE A1.1: NOISE MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT LOCATIONS
Scale:	1:30,000
Original Size:	A3
Spatial Reference:	British National Grid
Drawing Number:	14138-013