

Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site Management Plan 2008–13

Analysis Report

Historic Scotland

August 2008

Contents

	Page(s)
1 Acknowledgements	1
2 Introduction	2–3
2.1 Background to the consultation	
2.2 Report objectives	
2.3 Timing	
2.4 Distribution & advertising	
2.5 Encouraging participation	
2.6 Approach to the analysis	
3 Responses	4–7
3.1 Introduction	
3.2 Who responded and in what numbers?	
3.3 How does the list of respondents compare to the distribution list?	
4 Findings	8–20
4.1 Introduction	
4.2 Summary of responses	
5 Conclusions	21–22
5.1 Introduction	
5.2 Summary of findings	
5.3 Next steps	
Annexes	23–26
A List of organisations notified about consultation exercise	
B Written responses to the consultation	
C Representation at public meeting	

1 Acknowledgements

Historic Scotland would like to thank all those who responded to the consultation exercise by providing written comments and/or attending the stakeholder meeting.

2 Introduction

2.1 Background to the consultation

- 2.1.1 A consultative draft of the *Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site Management Plan 2008–13* was issued for public consultation on 8 May 2008. It is available at: www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/orkney-management-plan-consultation. It invited views on how the Partners – Historic Scotland, Orkney Islands Council, Scottish Natural Heritage and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds – propose to manage the Site over the next five years. It also set out the Partners' vision and long-term aims over the next thirty years and included an evaluation of how the Site has been managed since it was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1999.
- 2.1.2 A 'strategic environmental assessment' (SEA) of the draft was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 and an Environmental Report accompanied the draft Management Plan as an appendix.

2.2 Report objectives

- 2.2.1 This report provides a summary of the written responses and public meeting discussion, an analysis of the views expressed, and identifies the key issues raised. **You can find a summary of the findings in section 5.2 on page 21.**
- 2.2.2 Copies of this report can be downloaded from www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/closed-consultations. Printouts may be requested from the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site Co-ordinator at Historic Scotland, Longmore House, Salisbury Place, Edinburgh, EH9 1SH or hs.orkneywhs@scotland.gsi.gov.uk.
- 2.2.3 This report does not outline what will be taken forward into the final Management Plan and why. Any changes to the consultative draft made in the light of the consultation responses, public meeting discussion and any other relevant information will be set out in a separate Consultation Report.

2.3 Timing

- 2.3.1 The recommended period for all Scottish Government consultation exercises is 12 weeks. However, the action plan of the 2001 Management Plan took us up to March 2006 and its review could only commence in August 2007 with the appointment of a dedicated Co-ordinator. The Orkney Local Development Plan review process is also underway and it was felt that aspects of the Management Plan review would be relevant. In October 2007 Historic Scotland was granted ministerial clearance for a formal public consultation period of six weeks. The statutory public consultation period for the Environmental Report is also six weeks. A public meeting was scheduled for 7 June 2008, at the end of Week 4 of the consultation period.

2.4 Distribution & advertising

- 2.4.1 This consultation was advertised in the 'forthcoming' section of the Scottish Government's consultation webpages on 4 April 2008. Organisations and individuals registered with the SEconsult alert service were notified of the consultation during the week commencing 28 April. A list of stakeholders (see Annex A) were also notified in writing at the beginning of the formal consultation period.

2.4.2 The consultation was widely publicised. An interview with the WHS Co-ordinator about the consultation was broadcast on BBC Radio Orkney's 'Orky-ology' programme on 23 April. On 25 April a notice appeared in *The Orcadian* advertising the consultation and the determination of the Strategic Environmental Assessment screening process. Posters were distributed to advertise both the consultation period and the public meeting. A press release was issued on 6 May and articles appeared in print in *The Orcadian*, *Orkney Today*, *The Scotsman* and *The Herald*, on-line on the websites of those newspapers and in the Orkneyjar website, and a news item was broadcast on BBC Radio Orkney.

2.5 Encouraging participation

2.5.1 Several steps were taken to overcome any barriers to participation.

2.5.2 Advice from the Scottish Government's Equality Unit was sought on ways in which equality and voluntary groups could be consulted. Local rather than national organisations concerned with improving access and representing the voluntary sector were directly notified about the consultation exercise (see Annex A). Question 9 of the consultative draft sought comments on any issues in the Management Plan which might affect an equality group.

2.5.3 The consultative draft was divided into several separate pdf files to minimise download time. The pdfs were formatted in such a way to make them readable by text recognition software.

2.5.4 Six copies were printed and deposited in the libraries in Kirkwall and Stromness, the two mobile libraries, the Orkney Islands Council 'One Stop Shop' in Kirkwall and Skara Brae Visitor Centre. These were accompanied by multiple copies of the Respondent Information and Response Forms. As well as by email or post, written responses could be handed in to the reception or service desks of any one of above locations or at the public meeting.

2.5.5 The public meeting was scheduled for Saturday daytime to maximise opportunities for all interested persons to attend, including Monday–Friday workers and those caring for schoolchildren. The venue was fully accessible and local to the WHS area. The discussion at the public meeting forms part of this analysis. A pre-consultation meeting took place at the same venue on the evening of Thursday 28 February 2008 and 40 people attended. The opportunity to input into the Management Plan at an early stage and discuss overarching issues was welcomed by attendees.

2.6 Approach to the analysis

2.6.1 This analysis has been conducted in a series of analytical steps. Firstly, the written responses were summarised by respondent and question in a table. A note of the public meeting also formed part of the analysis. The list of organisations notified about the consultation, respondents and meeting attendees were grouped by interest. Next followed a statistical analysis which compared participants to the distribution list in order to determine the response rate and patterns related to interest groups. Key issues were identified and the responses and views expressed at the public meeting summarised under each consultation question. Finally, the key issues were then summarised as general conclusions.

2.6.2 The findings are specific to this consultation exercise and do not necessarily reflect the weight or range of views within the population or sub-populations as a whole and the respondents have not been representatively or purposively sampled.

3 Responses

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The following statistical analysis gives the numbers of organisations and individuals who responded to the consultation document in writing and attended the consultation meeting by interest group, and compares them with the numbers who were notified about the consultation exercise.

3.1.2 Written responses from consultees who agreed that their submissions be made public are available at: <http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/consultation-responses-orkney>.

Responses can be viewed in hard copy at the Scottish Government Library, Y Spur, Saughton House, Broomhouse Drive, Edinburgh, EH11 3XD. Copies of responses can also be provided by post. Charges for photocopies are made on a cost-recovery basis. To request copies by post, enquire about charges or make an appointment to view responses, telephone 0131 244 4556 or email SGLibrary@scotland.gsi.gov.uk.

3.1.3 Some organisations represent more than one interest. In these cases the general nature of the response has been used as a guide in order to facilitate the statistical analysis.

3.2 Who responded and in what numbers?

Table 1: Written responses to the consultation by interest group

	Public Bodies	Heritage Body	Amenity Group	Business & Enterprise	Environmental Group	Individuals
Number of Respondents (% of all respondents)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	7 (41%)

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

3.2.1 62 organisations and individuals were notified about the consultation; the 53 organisations are listed in Annex A. 17 responses were received (listed in Annex B), representing a 27.4% response rate.

3.2.2 11 (64.7%) of the 17 respondents expressed views on the Environmental Report. Two of these were from statutory consultees. Therefore nine (60%) of the remaining 15 responses were from non-statutory consultees.

Table 2: Representation at public meeting by interest group

	Public Body	Education Body	Amenity Group	Business & Enterprise	Environmental Group	Individuals
Number of Organisations/ Individuals represented (% of all representation)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	8 (53%)

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

3.2.3 26 people attended the public consultation meeting. 18 people represented eight organisations, seven attended as individuals, and one represented themselves *and*

an organisation. Historic Scotland is discounted from the statistical analysis as it conducted the consultation exercise therefore eight organisations were consulted.

3.2.4 Three organisations who were notified about the consultation were not specifically invited to the public meeting as they were not expected to be able to send a representative given the distances involved. Therefore 59 organisations and individuals were invited. 15 organisations and individuals were represented at the meeting (listed in Annex C), a 25.4% attendance rate.

Table 3: Responses/representation by interest group

	Public Bodies	Edu. Body	Heritage Body	Amenity Group	Business & Enterprise	Environ. Groups	Individuals
Number of participating organisations/ (% of all participants)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	5 (21%)	2 (8%)	12 (50%)

Notes: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Where an organisation or individual responded in writing *and* attended the public meeting, they are only counted once.

3.2.5 62 organisations and individuals were notified about the consultation. 24 separate organisations and individuals responded to the consultation either in writing and/or by attending the public meeting. This represents a 38.7% response rate.

3.2.6 This analysis shows that active participation in the consultation process increased by 11.3% by enabling views to be expressed at a public meeting.

3.2.7 The response rate has been compared to eight recent Historic Scotland consultation exercises for which the analysis has been completed and the associated reports are easily accessible (<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/closed-consultations>).¹ The formal public consultation period for each of the sample was at least 12 weeks. All of these have a broad national remit and six are part of the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) series. Seven of the eight exercises included stakeholder workshops but, as none of the analysis reports combine the figures as in Table 3 above, direct statistical comparison is only possible between the numbers of written responses and distribution lists. The response rates range from 4.9% to 13.1% for the seven exercises with a distribution of about 350 organisations and individuals and the rate is 23% for the one exercise with a distribution of about 100.

3.2.8 A rate of 27.4% for the written responses to this consultation exercise is therefore comparatively high and does not seem to have been unduly affected by a public consultation period of six rather than 12 weeks.

3.3 How does the list of respondents compare to the distribution list?

Table 4: Consultation participation by interest group: written responses

	Invited	Responded	Percent
Public Bodies	7	3	43
Community Group	1	0	0

¹ The consultation exercises studied took place in 2006–07: SHEP 1, 3–5; SHEP: Listed Building Consent; SHEP: Listing; SHEP: Scheduled Monument Consent; Investment Review: Archaeology Funding Programmes; and Operational Policy Paper: Voluntary Sector.

Education	4	0	0
Heritage Bodies	5	1	20
Tourism Sector	17	0	0
Amenity Groups	5	1	20
Business & Enterprise	4	4	100
Agriculture	4	0	0
Environmental Groups	4	1	25
Neighbour Organisations	2	0	0
Individuals	9	7	78

3.3.1 Of the 10 organisations who responded, four were not included in the original distribution list. However, one of these is a member of another umbrella group who had been notified and two are members of that group. Three of the seven individual respondents had not been directly notified.

Table 5: Consultation participation by interest group: public meeting

	Invited	Attended	Percent
Public Bodies	5	2	40
Community Group	1	0	0
Education	4	1	25
Heritage Bodies	4	0	0
Tourism Sector	17	0	0
Amenity Groups	5	1	20
Business & Enterprise	4	3	75
Agriculture	4	0	0
Environmental Groups	4	1	25
Neighbour Organisations	2	0	0
Individuals	9	8	89

3.3.2 Of the eight organisations represented, three were not included in the original distribution list. Five of the eight individual attendees had not been directly notified.

Table 6: Consultation participation by interest group: combined

	Invited	Responded/ Attended	Percent
Public Bodies	7	2	40
Community Group	1	0	0
Education	4	1	25
Heritage Bodies	5	1	20
Tourism Sector	17	0	0
Amenity Groups	5	1	20
Business & Enterprise	4	5	125
Agriculture	4	0	0
Environmental Groups	4	2	50
Neighbour Organisations	2	0	0
Individuals	9	12	133

Note: Where an organisation or individual responded in writing *and* attended the public meeting, they are only counted once.

3.3.3 Table 6 shows that the majority of organisations notified about the consultation (32%) were from the tourism sector as tourism/transport operators or as overarching bodies. In this statistical analysis, none of the responses received or the views expressed at the public meeting have been counted as representing that interest

group. However, one organisation who responded (counted here under Business & Enterprise) is also a significant tourism operator and certain individual respondents have tourism interests. The views of VisitOrkney on aspects of the draft plan had been sought prior to the public consultation exercise. Nevertheless, given the perceived contribution of the World Heritage Site monuments to Orkney in terms of tourism the lack of general participation from this sector is disappointing.

- 3.3.4 The table shows a high percentage of respondents from the Business & Enterprise group. As indicated by Annexes B and C and the Findings, however, most of the views expressed are concerned with one sector.
- 3.3.5 None of the notified groups associated with Agriculture responded to the consultation. The views of the Scottish Government Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate (listed in Annex A under Public Bodies) on aspects of the draft plan had been sought prior to the public consultation exercise. A number of the organisations and individuals who participated in the consultation have interests in the agricultural industry through landholding or affiliations.
- 3.3.6 Four organisations which have specific local remits concerned with access and volunteering opportunities were notified about the consultation. These are listed in Annex A under Amenity Bodies. One of these responded. A number of the other organisations who responded to the consultation have equality interests and obligations.
- 3.3.7 In terms of distribution, the only individuals who were directly notified about the consultation exercise were immediate neighbours; that is nine individuals or households. Only one of the nine participated in the consultation. However, others from this group attended the pre-consultation meeting in February. One of the respondents counted here under Business & Enterprise is also a 'neighbour organisation'. A greater level of feedback on the consultation from immediate neighbours is desirable.
- 3.3.8 Eight individuals who were not directly notified participated in the consultation. This may give some indication of the effectiveness of the publicity associated with the consultation. Several individual participants stated interests in specific sectors such as archaeology, agriculture, tourism and renewable energy. Although a response was not received from a community council, a number of individual members from the local community submitted their own response. 50% of those who participated in this consultation are classed as 'individuals' rather than 'organisations' in this analysis. This figure is based on the choices made by respondents on Respondent Information Forms and a pragmatic approach to categorising the public meeting attendees.

4 Findings

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The consultation document asked 18 questions, 17 of which invited yes/no responses as well as respondents' views and one asked for respondents' views. The first 13 questions related to the Management Plan itself which was supported by five appendixes and the final five questions related to the Environmental Report (Appendix E) which set out the strategic environmental assessment of the draft Plan.
- 4.1.2 Participants were encouraged to use a Response Form as it structured responses by providing a space beneath each of the 18 questions and could be filled out electronically or by hand. The Response Form was used by 12 of the 17 respondents. Two of the remaining five structured their responses using relevant questions as headings.
- 4.1.3 The Management Plan consultation elicited responses on proposals for modifying the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone; opinions on the suggested values of and interests in the Site; comments on the performance of the 2001 Plan, the long-term vision and aims, the medium-term issues and specific management objectives, the impact of the Plan on equality issues; and views on how the objectives will be monitored and implemented.
- 4.1.4 The Environmental Report described the results of the environmental assessment of the Management Plan. Comments were sought on the baseline environmental information and key issues; the scope and approach taken for the environmental assessment; the findings of the assessment; the measures proposed to mitigate the environmental effects of the plan; and the proposed approach to monitoring those effects.
- 4.1.5 The stakeholder meeting was more general in nature and initially focused on the Buffer Zone proposal. The attendees then formed two discussion groups to workshop the issues outlined in the consultation document and were given a list of the consultation questions as an aide memoire.
- 4.1.6 The written responses and views expressed at the public meeting are summarised under each of the consultation questions below and, where appropriate, the interest groups identified in the 'Responses' chapter above are used to structure the variety of views expressed.

4.2 Summary of responses

Question 1

Do you have any comments on the current Buffer Zone?

- 4.2.1 *The role of an UNESCO-defined Buffer Zone was summarised in Chapter 2 and explained in detail in Appendix B. What constitutes the area which acts as the 'Buffer Zone' for the World Heritage Site was described in Chapter 2 and illustrated on Figure A.3. The current Buffer Zone is in effect the 2004 Local Plan 'Zone of Visual Influence' and associated policy wording. The relevant extracts from the Structure and Local Plans formed Annex C of Appendix B. An Inner and Outer Buffer Zone were proposed in 1998 when the Heart of Neolithic Orkney was nominated for World Heritage Site status.*
- 4.2.2 12 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

- 4.2.3 Five respondents thought that the current Buffer Zone was reasonable in extent and how it was applied in terms of development control.² Two respondents thought that the current Buffer Zone was too large and restrictive and one respondent thought that it was not large enough given the landscape value of the World Heritage Site. Two respondents thought that the Buffer Zone did not prevent inappropriate development and was a poorly understood tool. One respondent felt that the current Buffer Zone could not be adequately justified and the way it was used in the planning process was inconsistent.
- 4.2.4 There was a general perception expressed at the public meeting and in a number of the written responses that the purpose of a Buffer Zone was to prevent development in a given area. Words such as “sterilise” were used.
- 4.2.5 One respondent suggested that there could be “a physical ground disturbance buffer zone” within the current Buffer Zone. Two respondents commented on visitor facility-related development around the World Heritage Site having “ruined the setting” or having been “destructive of the setting and ‘outstanding universal value’”.

Question 2

Do you have any comments on the proposed Buffer Zones?

- 4.2.6 *Chapter 2 and Appendix B set out the view that neither the Inner and Outer Buffer Zones nor the area which acts as the ‘Buffer Zone’ today adequately fulfil the stated purpose of an UNESCO-defined Buffer Zone. The report at Appendix B was commissioned to review the current situation and make recommendations. The consultants considered four options and recommended Option 2 (two local buffer zones with policy for development outside these areas) if supported by a robust Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance or Option 4 (two layers of buffer zone with detailed policy). They recommended that either option should be supported by World Heritage/Historic Environment Supplementary Guidance. Chapter 2 briefly set out which option the Partners in the management of the World Heritage Site felt would be most suitable in order to safeguard the outstanding universal value of the Site. They favoured Option 4 but supported by both Onshore Wind Energy and World Heritage/Historic Environment Supplementary Guidance. Option 4 consisted of two local buffer zones (designed to manage small-scale change in and around the Site) and a single large buffer zone (to manage large-scale change which may affect the setting of the Site). These were illustrated on Figure A.4. It was intended that these buffer zones be regarded as areas within which some developments could have an impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site and, therefore, it would be important to assess the potential level of that impact as part of the development control process.*
- 4.2.7 *Chapter 2 also referred to the inclusion of the proposed large buffer zone in the consultative draft (2 May) of the Supplementary Guidance for Onshore Wind Energy. The draft included the proposed large buffer zone as part of a ‘Wind Energy Sensitive Area’ within which there would be “a general presumption against on-shore wind energy development” unless for “small scale domestic or business related turbines” (Orkney Islands Council, 2 May 2008, SP2). The timing of the public consultation for this draft of the Supplementary Guidance (2 May–23 June) and the World Heritage Site Management Plan (8 May–19 June) were similar.*
- 4.2.8 12 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

² One respondent agreed with both the extent of the current Buffer Zone and the proposed Buffer Zones.

4.2.9 Eight respondents (four Business & Enterprise and four individuals) opposed the large buffer zone and provided justifications for their views which were of a similar nature and referred specifically to constraints on the wind energy sector. The following summarises the main points. It was felt that the large extent of the buffer zone was based on suppositions about how the Neolithic and Bronze Age peoples viewed or valued the landscape around the World Heritage monuments. It was felt that a “blanket ban” could not be justified given that wind turbines existed in the setting around the World Heritage Site before designation, they are “temporary” in nature (i.e. 25 years) and certain wind energy proposals within the proposed large buffer zone have not been objected to by Historic Scotland. The limit of the large buffer zone was informed by Figure 11 of Appendix B which showed a computer-generated model of the theoretical visibility of structures up to 150m tall from the Ring of Brodgar. This group of respondents felt that there was no justification for modelling based on a 150m height given that this was greater than the current maximum height of wind turbines which could be built on Orkney. One of these respondents provided a map relating to the visual envelope of the Ring of Brodgar used to inform a particular wind farm development. Another added that the issue of World Heritage Buffer Zones should be dealt with as part of the Local Development Plan review and not through the Management Plan review process.³ Four of these respondents expressed views that wind energy benefits (e.g. aesthetic, economic and in terms of sustainability) should be taken into account when considering options for Buffer Zones. These same views were expressed by a number of the public meeting attendees.

4.2.10 Two respondents stated that they were content with the proposed local buffer zones as they roughly followed the current buffer zone. One was content with the local zone around Brodgar–Stenness but felt that the zone around Skara Brae should be smaller given the subterranean nature of the monument and the extent to which the landscape had changed since the Neolithic. One respondent was content with the Skara Brae local buffer zone but felt that the Brodgar–Stenness zone was inadequate as it did not include the hill slopes and summits which Appendix B outlined as being an important factor of the setting of the Site. One respondent felt that it needed to be made clearer that the purpose of the large buffer zone was to offer three-dimensional protection and that policy protection extended to areas outside the map-drawn line. One attendee (Environmental Group) at the public meeting welcomed the commissioned report as there was a need for clarity in terms of suitable buffer zones for the World Heritage Site and what they meant.

4.2.11 The following quotes illustrate views from two different perspectives on the proposed World Heritage Buffer Zones:

“They are worse than the current zones and will undoubtedly cause more problems than ever before. I fully appreciate the resistance to ‘developments’ within a reasonable radius of the sites but to try and impose a ‘restricted zone’ that encompasses more than half of the Orkney mainland is quite ridiculous.”

Individual

“The Large Buffer Zone, taking in all the hillsides, and indeed the majority of the Mainland and a large extension South is ambitious and to be recommended.”

Heritage Body

³ This point was repeated by the respondent in answer to Question 11.

4.2.12 One attendee at the public meeting expressed the view that the Buffer Zone issue was in danger of dominating the agenda. A public meeting to discuss the Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance had taken place on 9 May. Another attendee asked how the comments would be taken into account and doubted that, on this issue, a 'consensus' could be reached.

Question 3

Do you have any comments on the Other Values of the World Heritage Site; is anything missing?

4.2.13 *UNESCO recommends that World Heritage Sites are also managed to promote values which may not necessarily link to their 'outstanding universal value'. Comments were sought on the 'Other Values' of Orkney's World Heritage Site which were outlined under three headings: Social, Natural Heritage and Landscape, and Research Potential.*

4.2.14 Nine respondents provided written comments on the Other Values.

4.2.15 Four respondents thought that the list covered all of the relevant values. Two respondents thought that the Site was valued more by visitors than by the local community. One of these respondents thought that the values were written from the perspective of "those looking in from the outside". Two respondents made suggestions for expanding the section on 'Research Potential'.

4.2.16 Under Social Values one respondent was pleased to see that tourism was recognised as being the primary benefit to the local economy. One respondent saw the benefits as being "too closely allied to tourism" and referred to the impact of the density of visitors on monument conservation and visitor appreciation. One respondent thought that the economic value of the Site had been underplayed and should be given greater emphasis. One respondent said that they felt that the other values, many of which link to sustainability, were not reflected in the way other issues had been addressed in the draft Plan.

4.2.17 Three Business & Enterprise respondents made comments on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which preceded the section on Other Values in Chapter 3. In particular, they felt that statements which related the intentions of the monument builders with wider topographical settings were unqualified.

Question 4

Do you have any comments on the range of Stakeholders that have an interest in the World Heritage Site; are any missing?

4.2.18 *Groups of stakeholders – organisations and individuals with an interest in the Site – were described under five headings: Community, Tourism, Business & Agriculture, Heritage & Environment, and Access & Education. This is essentially a different way of grouping the more comprehensive list in Annex A.*

4.2.19 11 respondents provided written comments on the range of Stakeholders.

4.2.20 Two respondents thought that the list was comprehensive. One respondent suggested that tourism, business and agriculture should be treated together or as three areas. One respondent thought that there was too much emphasis on tourism. Two respondents thought that more could be done to engage stakeholder groups. One respondent (Public Body) welcomed their inclusion as a named stakeholder. Four respondents (three Business & Enterprise and one individual) thought that the

renewables sector should be a stakeholder. This view was expressed by a number of attendees at the public meeting. Attendees also felt that local landowners and landholders needed to be involved and that the local community needed to be encouraged to participate more actively.

- 4.2.21 Three respondents made comments on the section which preceded that on Stakeholders. It described the organisations responsible for managing the World Heritage Site, and the structure of the Management Board and two subgroups. One respondent (Amenity Group) welcomed their inclusion on the Access & Interpretation Group. One respondent (Individual) queried the inclusion of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds on the Management Board. One respondent (Heritage Body) suggested that the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments for Scotland (RCAHMS) be included for their archiving and recording interest.

Question 5

Do you have any comments on the Evaluation of the Aims and Actions of the 2001 Management Plan; is anything missing?

- 4.2.22 *The 2001 Plan listed 23 aims and 52 actions for the period December 1999 to March 2006. Chapter 5 of the consultative draft provided an assessment of the performance of the Plan under each aim for the period December 1999 to April 2008 and Appendix D provided a more specific status report on whether and how each action had been carried out.*

- 4.2.23 13 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

- 4.2.24 One respondent felt that the appraisal was positive although they, and one other respondent, noted that the lack of stakeholder meetings in recent years (referred to under Aim 5) was a failing and impacted on Aim 1 (to achieve consensus on changes wherever possible). One respondent felt that the actual effects of the actions should have been described. One respondent thought that the text evaluating each aim could be better organised with higher level actions discussed first. One respondent thought more could have been done under Aim 13 to minimise energy consumption at the visitor facilities.

- 4.2.25 Four respondents (two Business & Enterprise and two Individuals) referred to wind energy in that its effects on site management and visitor appreciation had not been assessed and the impact of a policy of “blanket discouragement to wind development” on the economy had not been evaluated. Two other respondents also felt that economic impacts and benefits of the Site to Orkney should be evaluated.

- 4.2.26 One respondent felt that the Brodgar car park described under Aim 9 and the concentration of visitors detracted from the monument. One respondent felt that research on Neolithic cereal processing should have been mentioned under Aim 4. Two respondents clarified minor points of fact. Two respondents offered suggestions for meeting the Aims in the future including sourcing products locally, ways of dispersing visitors, and developing an off-site interpretation centre.

Question 6

Do you have any comments on The Vision or Long-term Aims for the World Heritage Site?

- 4.2.27 *The Vision and Long-term Aims summarised what the Partners hope to achieve by 2038. The Vision directly related to the particular outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site and the principles of the World Heritage Convention. 16 aims*

were then grouped under four headings: Protecting & Conserving, Understanding, Using & Enjoying, and Managing.

4.2.28 12 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.29 One respondent was content with The Vision and Aims, one respondent expressed support for the reference to sustainable management. Referring to the wording of the first aim under 'Protecting & Conserving', two respondents (Business & Enterprise) felt that the Setting of the World Heritage Site could not or should not be "preserved" and thought that it was an inappropriate word choice. One respondent thought that Historic Scotland could not exercise control over the Site's Setting. In answer to Questions 6 and 7 one respondent felt that the focus should be ensuring that the World Heritage Site benefits Orkney. This sentiment was echoed by three respondents. In particular, responding to Questions 6, 7 and 8, one of these stated:

"It needs to be refocused and should balance the real protection of these unique sites against the real needs for the economic viability of the successors of the people who built them."

Business & Enterprise

4.2.30 One respondent thought that the aspiration of providing visitor access needed to be balanced with protecting and conserving the Site. One respondent felt that The Vision and Aims had already been compromised by existing visitor provision.

4.2.31 Two respondents offered interpretations of what constitutes 'Setting'. One respondent offered comments on the type of research required to achieve a better understanding of the Site and one respondent requested that it be made clear that "dissemination" included to the general public.

Question 7

Do you have any comments on the Issues identified for the World Heritage Site over the next five years; is anything missing?

4.2.32 *Seven issues were set out in Chapter 7 under the following broad headings: Protecting, Conserving, Understanding, Accessing, Partnership, Stakeholders, and Sustainable Management. Each were expanded to describe what were thought to be the specific challenges of the next five years.*

4.2.33 10 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.34 Five respondents commented specifically on Issue 1. One of those thought that "consensus" would be difficult to achieve and the other three felt that the Setting of the Site was not or would not be undermined by wind energy development. Two respondents felt that it was therefore misleading to follow the discussion on Setting with steps the World Heritage Committee could take if it felt that the outstanding universal value of the Site was significantly threatened. One respondent would welcome dialogue on the relative threats to World Heritage Site status. One respondent felt that an assessment of the benefits and disbenefits of losing World Heritage status should be included in this review.

4.2.35 Responding to Issues 1 and 2, one respondent thought that visitor numbers and developments close to the monuments were the primary threat. In order to protect the setting of the Site (Issue 1), one respondent thought that initiatives which encouraged pedestrians and cyclists (Issue 4) to appreciate the landscape (Issue 3)

should be encouraged. One respondent felt that some of the Issues were contradictory as improving access (Issue 4) was at odds with preserving the Site (Issues 1 and 2). One respondent noted that coastal erosion had been identified under Issue 2. One respondent emphasised the importance of understanding the values of the Site (Issue 3).

Question 8

What in your opinion is/are the Issue(s) of the highest priority and why?

4.2.36 *The Issues had not been given a priority ranking. Consultation participants were asked to tell us what aspect was most important to them and why in order to gain an appreciation of stakeholder priorities.*

4.2.37 Of the 17 written responses, six did not answer this question. The table below indicates the preferences of the remaining 11 respondents:

Table 7: Medium-term priorities by interest group: written responses

Issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Other
	Protect	Conserve	Understand	Access	Partnership	Stakeholders	Sustainability	Benefits for Orkney
Interest Group								
Individual								x
Individual				x		x		
Individual					x	x		
Individual								x
Individual			x					
Business & Enterprise				x		x		x
Individual							x	
Business & Enterprise	x	x						
Heritage Body	x				x	x		
Business & Enterprise	x	x						
Business & Enterprise								x
Totals	3	2	1	2	2	4	1	4

4.2.38 Of the 11 respondents seven stated multiple choices. Four respondents suggested an additional Issue of ensuring that the World Heritage Site delivers benefits for Orkney and that this should be the priority. Economic benefits were emphasised in these responses. Four respondents also felt that engaging with stakeholders was important and three respondents felt that protecting the World Heritage Site and its Setting was of greatest priority. Two respondents suggested ways in which to address Issues 4 and 6 including a hop-on-hop-off bus service, World Heritage Site branding, and ways to involve the local community. Two respondents listed the major threats to the Site and the Setting (Issues 1 and 2) as visitor pressure, visitor facilities and artificial lighting. At the public meeting one of the groups highlighted access (Issue 4) as one of the most important and felt that opportunities for free access to Maeshowe and Skara Brae for local people should be considered. The renaming of the 6C service bus to the 'World Heritage Site bus' was also suggested at the public meeting.

Question 9

Do you think that there any issues in the Management Plan that may affect an equality group (age, disability, religion and belief, gender, LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender), race); if so, how, and what can be done to mitigate them?

4.2.39 *It was felt that the consultation exercise could be used as an opportunity to gauge opinion on what type of equality issues should be considered in developing and implementing the Plan.*

4.2.40 Five respondents provided answers to this question. One respondent thought that no equality groups would be affected. One respondent had no comment although queried the relevance of this question. One respondent (Individual) stated that “access for all is important both intellectual and physical as well as modern druids” and one respondent thought that access for those with disabilities is always difficult to address in an open landscape. One respondent (Individual) thought that the Management Plan would discriminate against the “average Orcadian, seeking to move with the times,... and anyone even vaguely connected with renewable energy”.

Question 10

Do you have any comments on any of the specific Objectives, how they relate to the Issues and how they have been prioritised?

4.2.41 *Objectives which had derived from the seven identified issues were listed in a table in Chapter 8 and cross-referred to the related Issues. Timescales for implementation, priority (high, medium or low), and (a) responsible party/parties were linked to each of the 46 objectives.*

4.2.42 10 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question. In some cases detailed responses were given on specific objectives. By way of summary, these are grouped under the main Issue to which they relate. One respondent (Public Body), who was involved in drafting the Objectives as a Partner in the management of the World Heritage Site, provided further comments. These will be considered when finalising the Plan, however, they do not form part of this analysis.

4.2.43 Protecting the World Heritage Site – Objectives 1–9

One respondent felt that an improved description of setting had broad implications for all heritage assets and that a World Heritage Scottish Historic Environment Policy would be welcomed. Two respondents felt that linking the findings of the setting report and revised buffer zones with the Local Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance could not be justified. One respondent suggested creative ways to improve the public’s understanding of the implications of World Heritage status through press features and mail shots.

4.2.44 Conserving the World Heritage Site – Objectives 10–17

One respondent (Public Body) said that they would welcome consultation on proposals related to coastal erosion. One respondent (Heritage Body) suggested that data from monitoring the condition of monuments could be used to inform the Scottish Historic Environment Audit.

4.2.45 Understanding the values of the World Heritage Site – Objectives 17–23

One respondent commented on the need to incorporate wide-ranging interests in the Research Committee objective and commented on the value of visitor surveys. One

respondent (Heritage Body) would welcome further information on the proposed review of the Research Agenda in relation to the Scottish Archaeological Research Framework Project, suggested external links in the development of educational activities and encouraged improved data sharing between the RCAHMS and local authority.

4.2.46 Accessing the World Heritage Site – Objectives 24–30

One respondent commented on the value of the Core Paths Network whereas another cautioned against paths and car park improvement as it damages visitor appreciation of the monuments. Some of the public meeting attendees welcomed pedestrian routes between the monuments and thought that an off-site interpretation centre should be an Objective and suggested Stromness as a possible site. One respondent welcomed the idea of a microsite for the Orkney World Heritage Site whereas another suggested broadening this into a Scottish World Heritage Sites Portal.

4.2.47 The Partners in the World Heritage Site – Objectives 31–36

One respondent (Heritage Body) thought that the value of the Single Outcome Agreement should not be underestimated. One respondent (Amenity Group) felt that an Orkney-based Co-ordinator would be a positive step. One respondent (Individual) stated that the “Rangers are the WHS greatest asset (after the sites themselves)”.

4.2.48 The Stakeholders in the World Heritage Site – Objectives 37–41

One respondent felt that stakeholder engagement should be a two-way process. Two respondents felt that objectives which achieved this were vitally important and should not be lost sight of.

4.2.49 Sustainable Management – Objectives 42–46

One respondent (Public Body) welcomed objectives aimed at environmental sustainability, in particular waste reduction. One respondent (Individual) emphasised the need to promote trails and bus services. One respondent (Business & Enterprise) felt that carbon footprint of visitors could be offset by wind energy production in Orkney. Some of the attendees at the public meeting felt that it was important to develop more sustainable transport options and include these in the Plan. One respondent felt that the effects of the World Heritage Site on the economy should be measured.

Question 11

Do you have any comments on how any of the specific Objectives will be monitored?

4.2.50 *In the same table in Chapter 8 each of the 42 objectives were linked to a ‘monitoring indicator’ (the ideal status which would show that the objective has been achieved) and how progress would be measured.*

4.2.51 Seven organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.52 Two respondents thought that economic impacts should be monitored, one respondent thought that evaluation should be done externally, and one respondent suggested a risk assessment methodology. In answer to Questions 11 and 12 one respondent suggested that the Stakeholder Forum could have a role in monitoring.

One respondent suggested an additional objective relating to Issue 4 should be to maintain and develop global access to the World Heritage Site resource.

Question 12

Do you have any general comments about how the Management Plan will be implemented and progress reported?

4.2.53 *Other than the monitoring indicators and success measures identified in the table, Chapter 8 highlighted other methods for implementing the Plan and reporting progress. It emphasised the role of the World Heritage Site Co-ordinator, the proposed annual Monitoring Report, the risk strategy objective, and the intentions to incorporate the recommendations of the Strategic Environmental Assessment into the final Plan and to include Equality Impact Assessment in the Plan review cycle.*

4.2.54 Seven organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.55 Two respondents highlighted the need for wider stakeholder involvement, and one suggested that the Management Board should include other stakeholder representation, particularly related to economic interests. Two respondents reiterated their views on the proposed large Buffer Zone. One respondent felt that community updates should be more high profile and one respondent welcomed the Plan and encouraged Historic Scotland to maintain transparency in its development and implementation.

Question 13

Do you have any other comments about the Management Plan that you have not covered in your responses to other questions?

4.2.56 10 organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.57 Three respondents (the Partners) stated that they had been involved in the development of the plan and welcomed the consultation. One respondent thought that the Plan was a significant improvement on the 2001 Plan and urged Historic Scotland to keep the World Heritage Site in the public eye (a view also expressed at the public meeting). One respondent had 'No Comment'. One respondent suggested minor additions to Chapter 4 of the Plan.

4.2.58 One respondent appended their comments to Orkney Islands Council on the consultative draft of the Supplementary Guidance for Onshore Wind Energy. Three respondents made comments related to wind energy, one of these queried why the impact of turbines had not been assessed, one questioned the implications of a UNESCO response to such impacts, and one provided specific comments on Appendix B.

4.2.59 Some of the attendees at the public meeting asked that summaries be included in future papers and for their tone to be less academic. Some attendees raised concerns over the possible implications of Plan initiatives to affect land values.

Question 14

Do you have any comments on the baseline information, or the environmental problems/issues?

4.2.60 *Section 2 and Annexes B and C of the Environmental Report provide an overview of the environmental baseline within and around the World Heritage Site. They also identified key environmental problems for the Site, including coastal erosion and*

visitor wear at Skara Brae, maintaining biodiversity interests, transport and access to the Site, and understanding the links between the Site, other archaeological sites and the landscape as a whole. The report also identified other environmental issues present in Orkney that were relevant to the Management Plan, including the loss of biodiversity, pollution of watercourses, the potential for increasing flood events, soil erosion, the loss of landscape features and the use of non-renewable resources.

4.2.61 Six organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.62 One respondent agreed with the baseline environmental information and the key environmental issues identified in the report (Public Body). Two respondents provided factual comments on the baseline information (one Public Body and one Individual). One respondent (Individual) suggested further baseline information relating to past sea level change that could be considered in the setting report (Appendix B). One respondent queried the relevance of the baseline information provided for population and human health (Individual). Two respondents suggested that the baseline information should include an assessment of the effects of the existing wind turbines that are visible from parts of the World Heritage Site (one Business & Enterprise and one Individual).

Question 15

Do you have any comments on the approach taken for the environmental assessment?

4.2.63 *Section 3 of the Environmental Report described the approach taken to assess the environmental effects of the Management Plan. It explained that the assessment was focussed on a number of environmental factors and that a number of issues were scoped out of the assessment. The methods used to undertake the assessment were described along with an explanation of the parts of the Plan that were scrutinised during the assessment process.*

4.2.64 Eight organisations and individuals responded in writing to this question.

4.2.65 Three respondents agreed with the scope of the environmental assessment (three Public Bodies). One respondent suggested that more detail on the ongoing environmental assessment that was undertaken as the Plan was prepared would have been helpful (Public Body). Four respondents suggested that the environmental assessment should have considered the effects of the proposed buffer zone on wind energy developments and the consequential effects on climate change (two Individuals and two Business & Enterprise). One respondent considered that the assessment should have identified a conflict between the aims relating to improving access to the World Heritage Site and carbon emissions (Individual). One respondent believed that the assessment lacked focus and that the real issues were obscured (Individual). One respondent considered that the assessment should include an evaluation of socio-economic effects (Individual).

Question 16

Do you agree with the results of the environmental assessment? Have we identified the key issues?

4.2.66 *Section 4 of the Environmental Report summarises the results of the environmental assessment of the Management Plan's vision, long-term aims and objectives. The detailed assessment tables were set out in Annexes D, E and F. The assessment found that the environmental effects of the Plan were largely associated with the development of any new visitor facilities or access provision, the proposals to address coastal erosion at Skara Brae and any invasive archaeological investigation.*

It also found that there were opportunities for positive environmental effects through incorporating natural heritage management aims where possible. The assessment considered the effects of climate change on the World Heritage Site (e.g. flooding) and found that none of the Plan's objectives specifically considered the long-term effects of climate change.

4.2.67 Eight individuals and organisations responded in writing to this question.

4.2.68 Two respondents agreed with the findings of the environmental assessment (two Public Bodies). One respondent commented that care should be taken with the landscape (Individual). One respondent considered that the effects of visitor access on the World Heritage Site should be highlighted as a long-term problem (Individual). Three respondents believed that the assessment failed to consider the effects of the Plan on climate change in terms of impact of the proposed buffer zone on wind energy development (two Individuals and one Business & Enterprise). One respondent considered that the assessment overlooked the effects of the World Heritage Site on the local community (Individual). Three respondents considered that a full socio-economic assessment of the Plan's policies and proposals should have been undertaken (one Individual and two Business & Enterprise).

Question 17

Do you have any comments on the environmental mitigation measures, including the schedule of commitments?

4.2.69 *A number of recommendations were made as an outcome of the environmental assessment process to try to mitigate adverse environmental effects and enhance positive environmental effects of the Plan. This was described in Section 5 of the Environmental Report, where Table 7 set out the specific commitments that Historic Scotland and our Partners would take forward when implementing the Management Plan.*

4.2.70 Five individuals and organisations responded in writing to this question.

4.2.71 Three respondents agreed with the proposed mitigation measures (one Individual and two Public Bodies). One respondent considered that a more holistic approach was needed to the environmental assessment process (Individual). One respondent commented that there should be a mitigation measure that promotes the use of renewable energy as they considered that the visitor centres and facilities at the World Heritage Site are energy intensive (Individual).

Question 18

Do you have any comments on the proposed additional environmental monitoring indicators?

4.2.72 *Monitoring the environmental effects of the Management Plan is an important part of the strategic environmental assessment process, and Section 5 of the Environmental Report suggested ways that this could be undertaken. This includes monitoring the progress made for each objective included in the Plan, and monitoring how effectively the schedule of commitments are applied over the lifetime of the Plan.*

4.2.73 Four individuals and organisations responded in writing to this question.

4.2.74 One respondent agreed with the proposed monitoring programme (Public Body). One respondent suggested monitoring the energy consumption of visitor centres, using baseline information from before the construction of the current visitor centre at

Skara Brae (Individual). One respondent suggested establishing a performance indicator that could relate increases in sea level rise with wind energy developments that are refused consent (Individual). One respondent noted that there was no evidence for the proposed restriction of wind energy development that they consider to be an effect of the Management Plan (Individual).

5 Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section sets out a summary of the findings of this consultation exercise and outlines the process to finalise the Management Plan in 'Next steps'.

5.2 Summary of findings

5.2.1 The responses relating to Questions 1 and 2 suggest that the purpose of World Heritage Buffer Zones and how it relates to the Orkney World Heritage Site was not explained in adequate detail or in a sufficiently clear way in the consultative draft. For example, rather than to prevent all development, the policy attached to the current Buffer Zone in Orkney is: "development that would adversely affect this area would normally be refused" (2004 Local Plan, Policy LP/B1). Opinions were sought on Buffer Zones through the Management Plan consultation and, at the same time, opinions were sought on planning policy attached to the proposed Buffer Zones in a separate consultation on onshore wind energy. Most of those who responded to the Management Plan consultation exercise were specifically concerned with wind energy development. The analysis of responses shows that certain sectors, notably tourism, agriculture and community representatives, were not as engaged with the process. It was apparent from the responses that aspects of the Plan were often conflated with the Supplementary Guidance consultation document. This proved problematic as the two documents have very different purposes – the Management Plan sets out ways to protect and manage the World Heritage site and the Supplementary Guidance sets out detailed planning policy to guide development – and they differ in terms of exactly how the proposed large buffer zone would function. Historic Scotland and Orkney Islands Council recognise this inconsistency and are committed to resolving this issue.

5.2.2 The other main comments related to community values and economic benefits, the composition of the Management Board and Stakeholder Forum, and the impacts of visitor-related development. The ways in which the World Heritage Site sustains and enhances public benefits could have been emphasised. Responses suggest that the composition of the local authority representation on the Management Board, membership of the two subgroups, and a full list of stakeholders would have been welcomed in the draft Plan. In general, the concept of 'setting' appears to have been problematic for participants to fully comprehend and certain word choices, such as 'preserve', 'sustainability' and 'dissemination', would have benefited from qualification. Most respondents thought that the long-term aims were commendable but some thought that they were, or could be, compromised by visitor-related developments close to the World Heritage Site. Most of the 46 specific objectives of the Plan did not appear to be problematic; in particular, those aimed at increasing environmentally sustainable access were welcomed.

5.2.3 Many of the comments on the Environmental Report were also related to wind energy. In particular, some respondents felt that the economic and climatic effects of limiting wind energy development through Buffer Zones should have been assessed. Some respondents also suggested that there should have been an assessment of the socio-economic effects of World Heritage Site designation. This suggests that the scope of a strategic environmental assessment – particularly exclusions – could have been more clearly explained for those less familiar with this process. The statutory consultees and one non-statutory consultee (Public Body) felt that the strategic environmental assessment of the Plan had been fair and thorough.

5.3 Next steps

- 5.3.1 The draft Management Plan will now be reviewed and informed by the consultation responses, public meeting discussion and any other relevant information. This includes using the analysis of responses to seek views from under-represented sectors.
- 5.3.2 As promised at the public meeting, Orkney Islands Council and Historic Scotland have shared relevant written responses to the Management Plan and Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance consultation exercises with each other. There is now an opportunity to review how the setting of the World Heritage Site could be protected in terms of Buffer Zones and planning policy.
- 5.3.3 Historic Scotland proposes to publish the final Management Plan in September 2008 after it has been considered by Orkney Islands' councillors.
- 5.3.4 The substantive changes between the consultative and final drafts of the Management Plan and the reasons for those changes will be set out in a Consultation Report. It will also include the Strategic Environmental Assessment Post-adoption Statement and will be published on Historic Scotland's website (www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/closed-consultations).

Annex A: List of organisations notified about consultation exercise

Public Bodies

Department of Culture, Media & Sport
English Heritage
Orkney Islands Council
Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland
Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Scottish Government Rural Payments and Inspections Directorate
Scottish Natural Heritage

Community Group

Orkney Community Councils

Education

(Orkney College UHI, part of Orkney Islands Council)
Orkney Research Centre for Archaeology
Stenness Community School
Stromness Academy
Stromness Primary School

Heritage Bodies

Birsay Heritage Trust
Friends of Orkney Archaeological Trust
International Council of Sites and Monuments UK
Orkney Archaeological Trust
Orkney Heritage Society

Tourism Sector

Archaeology Tours
Brass's Buses
Discover Orkney Tours
Dragon History
5 Senses Tours
John O'Groats Ferries Ltd.
Maynes Coaches
NorthLink Ferries Ltd.
Orkney Coaches
Orkney Island Holidays
Orkney Tour Guides Association
Orkney Tourism Group
Pentland Ferries
Rapsons Coaches Ltd.
(Skail House, Breckness Estate)
Tour Orkney & Shetland Ltd.
VisitOrkney
Wildabout Orkney Tours

Amenity Groups

Access Orkney
Orkney Disability Forum
Orkney Local Access Forum & Countryside Committee
Orkneyjar website
Voluntary Action Orkney

Business & Enterprise

Highlands & Islands Enterprise Orkney
Stromness Community Business Forum
Stromness Community Development Trust
Breckness Estate

Agriculture

Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group
National Farmers Union
Scottish Agricultural College
Scottish Crofting Foundation

Environmental Groups

Environmental Concern Orkney
Orkney Natural History Society
Orkney Skyline Concern
The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Scotland

Immediate neighbours

Stenness Church session
Orkney Trout Fishing Association
(Breckness Estate)

Note: other immediate neighbours were also notified as individuals

Annex B: Written responses to the consultation

ORGANISATIONS

Public Bodies

Orkney Islands Council
Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Scottish Natural Heritage

Heritage Body

Society of Antiquaries of Scotland

Business & Enterprise

Breckness Estate
Fairwind Statkraft Orkney Ltd.
Orkney Sustainable Energy Ltd.
Orkney Renewable Energy Forum

Amenity Group

Orkney Local Access Forum & Countryside Committee

Environmental Group

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Scotland

INDIVIDUALS

Dineley, Merryn
Flett Brown, John
Lynn, David
Rendall, Bryan
Wickham-Jones, Caroline
Individual A
Individual B

Annex C: Representation at public meeting

ORGANISATIONS

Public Body

Orkney Islands Council

Education Body

(Orkney College UHI, part of Orkney Islands Council)

University of Minnesota

Business & Enterprise

Breckness Estate

Hammars Hill Energy Ltd.

Orkney Sustainable Energy Ltd.

Amenity Group

Orkney Local Access Forum & Countryside Committee

Environmental Group

Orkney Skyline Concern

INDIVIDUALS

Bickin, Cliff

Brown, Keith

Flett Brown, John

King, Judith

King, Rachael

Leith, Peter

Lynn, David

Wickham-Jones, Caroline