

Response ID ANON-GQ4T-V5K9-F

Submitted to Eskdalemuir seismic array: managing onshore wind turbine interference
Submitted on 2026-05-11 12:58:56

About you

What is your name?

Name:
Ciaran Beggan

What is your email address?

Email:
BGSPolicy@bgs.ac.uk

What is your organisation?

Organisation:
British Geological Survey

We usually publish a summary of all responses, but sometimes we are asked to publish the individual responses too. Would you be happy for your response to be published in full?

Yes

How did you hear about this consultation?

How did you hear about this consultation?:
GOV.UK alert

Other (please specify):

Consultation questions - Restriction and Exclusion Zones

1 Do you agree with the proposal to establish an Exclusion Zone (anywhere within a radius of 15km) and Restricted Zone (anywhere between 15-50km) around the Array? Please explain your answer, including (if needed) reference to any affected projects, their current status and expected capacity.

Free text box with no character limit.:

The Earth's natural magnetic field is measured at the Eskdalemuir Geomagnetic Observatory. Its remote location away from manmade sources of interference including electrified rail lines and high voltage power lines allows for the provision of continuous high-quality measurements of the magnetic field.

From experience, BGS find geomagnetic observations are not typically affected by windfarms at a distance of more than 5 km. The effects of vibration are minimal on magnetic measurements beyond a few hundred metres from a source.

The extension of the exclusion zone from 10 km to 15 km will be beneficial for geomagnetic science and research at Eskdalemuir Observatory.

2 Does the draft Technical Guidance Document, and in particular the definitions of the Eskdalemuir Seismic Array and the spatial maps included at Annex 1, provide enough information for developers and Determining Authorities to accurately site their wind turbine developments and ensure the relevant requirements are undertaken?

Free text box with no character limit:

Consultation questions - Revising measuring SGVs, and introducing a SIL

3 Do you agree that the predictive methodology should be updated to incorporate turbine-specific SGV data? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit:

4 Do you agree with the process for generating and maintaining turbine-specific SGV data, as set out in Chapter 3 of the draft Technical Guidance Document? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit:

5 Do you agree that the SIL value should be set at a single point between 0.004614 – 0.005479 nm/√(MW), to allow for the optimisation of onshore wind capacity within the Restricted Zone whilst safeguarding the Array's detection capabilities? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit :

6 Do you agree that new regulations should require developers to submit information on their seismic impact and comply with the SIL, as laid out in the draft Technical Guidance Document? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit:

7 Does the draft SGV report in the draft Technical Guidance Document provide enough information for developers and Determining Authorities to ensure that these requirements have been fulfilled? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit:

8 Do you agree that these new process requirements should not apply to applications to vary consent, where the variation would not have any impact on the seismic impact of the development (e.g. where the application relates only to extending the operating period of a consented or operational wind farm)?

Free text box with no character limit:

9 Do you agree that SIL and seismic impact reporting requirements should apply to all repowering applications as if they were new applications?

Free text box with no character limit:

10 Do you agree that headroom should be attributed by MOD on a 'first come, first served' model, based on the date on which the relevant MOD office receives notification of the application as a statutory consultee. If you disagree please set out why?

Free text box with no character limit:

Consultation questions - Consenting and Determination

11 Do you agree with the proposal to introduce legislation that requires the Determining Authority to refuse, or decline to determine or accept, applications for wind turbine developments in order to protect the Array, under the circumstances outlined in this chapter? Please explain your answer.

Free text box with no character limit:

12 Do you have views on the proposed transitional arrangements for applications that have already been submitted but not yet determined at the point at which new regulations or guidance come into force? In particular, we welcome feedback on:

a) Whether, and in what circumstances, additional seismic information (such as an SGV report) should be requested for live applications:

b) How applications currently in the planning system should be treated where they include turbine models or layouts that may not comply with any future requirements; :

c) Whether any specific transitional provisions are needed for repowering or variation applications.:

Consultation Questions - Alternative approaches

13 Please provide details and evidence of any alternative solutions that, if implemented, could adequately mitigate against the interference that onshore wind turbines can cause to the detection capabilities of the Array.

If providing evidence, please provide a short summation of what is being attached i.e. report(s), experimental data etc.:

Please attach your evidence here; if the file size exceeds the maximum allotted - please send via email and state you have done this in the above free text box :

No file uploaded