

HEBRIDEAN HORIZON

ORGANISATIONAL OBJECTION TO THE
PROPOSED MACHAIRWIND OFFSHORE
WIND FARM



"Wilderness and the idea of wilderness is one of the permanent homes of the human spirit. If we lose wilderness, we lose forever the joy and wonder of what the world is. These are islands in time and there will be no greater grief than the loss of our native seascape"

Colonsay Community Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

2. Who We Are	5
3. Why Our Collective View Matters.....	6
4. THE Collective Picture	8
5. Singular Insight from Hebridean Horizon.....	10
6. Landscape and Seascape: More Than Visibility	12
7. Cultural Landscape and Heritage.....	13
8. The Visitor Economy: A Place-Based Question.....	15
9. Island Economies and Community Resilience	16
10. The Marine Environment	18
11. Fisheries and Marine Displacement	19
12. Ecology and Biodiversity	21
13. Dark Skies and the Night-Time Environment	22
14. Community Benefit and Equity	23
15. Cumulative Effects: Seeing the Whole	24
16. Has the Applicant Properly Understood the Place?	26
17. The Consultation Experience	27
18. Wider Social-Media engagement.....	28
19. Why the need for a Hebridean Horizon view?.....	30
21. Renewable Energy and a Just Transition.....	31
23. Our Overall Position	32
24. Request to Scottish Ministers.....	35

Submitted to: Scottish Ministers / Marine Directorate

Applications: MachairWind Offshore Wind Farm (00012385 / 00012386)

Applicant: MachairWind Limited / ScottishPower Renewables (UK) Limited

Submitted by: Hebridean Horizon

Date: 21/08/2026

1. INTRODUCTION

Hebridean Horizon submits this objection to the proposed MachairWind Offshore Wind Farm.

We recognise the importance of renewable energy and the need for Scotland to decarbonise. Our objection is not an objection to renewable energy in principle. It is an objection to this development, at this scale, in this location, and to what we consider to be significant deficiencies in the evidence and assessment presented in support of it.

MachairWind proposes an offshore wind development covering approximately 448 km², with up to 91 turbines reaching approximately 335 metres to blade tip, or an alternative configuration involving a greater number of smaller turbines. The proposed development sits within a seascape directly connected to Iona, Mull, Islay, Jura, Colonsay, Tiree and other islands and coastal communities.

For Hebridean Horizon, however, the most important question is not narrowed to the size of the development.

It is whether the applicant has adequately understood **the place in which it proposes to develop**.

2. WHO WE ARE

Hebridean Horizon is an islander-led campaign formed by people from communities surrounding the proposed development.

Our work has been to increase understanding of MachairWind, examine the application and supporting evidence, connect people with the statutory consultation process, and ensure that those who may be affected have an opportunity to participate.

We have deliberately worked across island and community boundaries.

We have engaged with residents, businesses, community organisations, tourism interests, marine-based businesses, creatives, environmentalists and others whose relationship with these islands is personal, professional, cultural or economic.

We have also worked to make the formal submissions of Community Councils and specialist organisations more accessible to the wider public.

We do not claim to speak for every resident of the affected islands.

Instead, our particular contribution is to **see the connections between the different concerns being raised by those bodies and by individuals.**

We have seen the proposal discussed from the perspectives of landscape, heritage, tourism, fishing, wildlife, community resilience, economics, culture and renewable energy.

That collective picture is the reason we are making a separate organisational representation.

3. WHY OUR COLLECTIVE VIEW MATTERS

We recognise that the number of objections received cannot determine the outcome of a statutory consenting process.

During the consultation, Hebridean Horizon has helped people understand the proposal and the evidence presented in support of it, and has facilitated participation through the ObjectNow platform.

At the time of this submission:

- **4,819** representations have been facilitated through ObjectNow which does not include direct submissions to Marine Directorate.
- **9527** individuals have signed an online petition at Change.org.
- those representations cover **numerous island representations as well as national and international representations**, to be expected due to the nature of the proposed location of development.

The significance of these figures is not that they prove a particular number of people oppose MachairWind - rather, they demonstrate the scale of engagement with the substance of the proposal.

The issues emerging through that engagement closely correspond with those raised independently by Community Councils and specialist organisations.

*"True justice cannot be achieved by
sacrificing local ecological and human
communities"*

THE IONA COMMUNITY

International, Ecumenical Christian
Movement

4. THE COLLECTIVE PICTURE

The Community Council representations available to us include submissions from Iona, Islay, Colonsay and Tiree, with Mull Community Council and Gigha Community Council also engaging with the proposal. In addition, we have considered submissions from Visit Mull & Iona, The Iona Community, The Hebridean Whale & Dolphin Trust, an interim statement from The National Trust For Scotland and others submitted by individuals with particular areas of interest or expertise.

Despite the discrete characteristics of each individual island and their corresponding communities, many of the same concerns recur. These include:

- **landscape, seascape, visual impact and sense of place;**
- **the scale and location of the development;**
- **cultural, historic and spiritual heritage;**
- **tourism and the visitor economy, island economies and community resilience;**
- **nature, marine ecology, biodiversity and ecological integrity;**
- **fisheries, navigation and marine activity;**
- **dark skies and tranquillity;**
- **community benefit, just transition and equity;**
- **climate benefit and the case for the development**
- **cumulative effects;**
- **adequacy of the Environmental Impact Assessment;**
- **and the quality and completeness of the evidence upon which Ministers are being asked to make their decision.**

Iona Community Council's detailed objection identifies deficiencies across landscape, cultural heritage, socio-economic effects, ecology and biodiversity and argues that the EIA systematically understates impacts.

Islay Community Council raises landscape, heritage, island community, marine, fisheries, navigation, protected habitats and species, climate-benefit and EIA concerns.

Colonsay Community Council raises the suitability of the site, coastline, Oronsay Priory, economic effects, construction noise, the Colonsay Western Cliffs SPA and the omission of associated onshore infrastructure from the present application.

Tiree Community Council raises landscape and visual impact, dark skies, cultural heritage, socio-economic effects, wildlife and biodiversity and the absence of meaningful local benefit. Its submission concludes that the overwhelming majority of opinion submitted to the Council was strongly against the proposal.

Visit Mull & Iona identifies landscape, seascape and visual impact; historic and cultural heritage; ecological and marine disruption; socio-economic impacts; community benefit and equity; and mental health and wellbeing. It represents approximately 150 member businesses operating around 190 tourism enterprises across Mull and Iona.

These are each standalone pieces of painstaking work, undertaken by volunteers and community members, but taken together, they provide an even more striking picture of consistency of concern across multiple 'host' and neighbouring communities, as well as across varying interests and priorities.

5. SINGULAR INSIGHT FROM HEBRIDEAN HORIZON

Since late May, Hebridean Horizon has worked to help people understand the MachairWind proposal and the evidence presented by the applicant in support of it, and to participate in the statutory consultation process.

We have had direct and sustained contact with people across numerous islands and communities, including residents, businesses, community organisations, fishing and marine recreation, tourism operators, artists, environmentalists and others with a connection to the area.

The response we have witnessed is significant in volume, but also because of its breadth and range of interests and concerns represented.

The individual representations and engagements tend to examine particular aspects of the proposal whereas Hebridean Horizon has had the opportunity to observe these concerns **side by side**.

Hebridean Horizon therefore believes that the collective evidence points to a central weakness in the application - the proposal has been assessed through a series of individually narrow assessment categories, while the places affected are experienced as interconnected characteristics.

“The issue isn’t only whether these turbines would be seen — which they definitely would be — but that they would completely change the character of one of Europe’s most celebrated Atlantic seascapes, transforming it into an industrialised horizon.”

SHIONA RUHEMANN,
IONA COMMUNITY COUNCIL

6. LANDSCAPE AND SEASCAPE: MORE THAN VISIBILITY

Landscape and visual effects are among the most consistently raised concerns.

Hebridean Horizon wishes to reinforce this issue not simply because turbines will be visible, but because the applicant's approach risks reducing the significance of landscape to a question of visibility and distance.

The seascape surrounding these islands is characterised by openness, simplicity, natural darkness and a relative absence of industrial infrastructure.

The proposed development would introduce a large concentration of very tall, repetitive engineered structures into that setting.

The issue is therefore not: "Can you see a turbine?" It is:

"What happens to the character of a place when its defining horizon becomes industrialised?"

The evidence available to Hebridean Horizon raises concerns that the applicant's assessment moderates the magnitude of effects with increasing distance, including for highly sensitive areas.

The detailed **Iona Community Council** objection identifies a consistent pattern in which highly sensitive areas beyond approximately 20 km are not assigned the highest magnitude of change and argues that this risks understating effects.

It also identifies limitations in the visualisation material and notes that the proposed aviation and navigation lighting would permanently alter the currently unlit night-time seascape for the operational life of the project.

Iona Community Council similarly considers the open Atlantic horizon and lack of industrial infrastructure central to Iona's landscape sensitivity.

Hebridean Horizon therefore asks Ministers to consider whether distance has been allowed to become a proxy for insignificance when the actual sensitivity of the receiving landscape is the more important consideration.

7. CULTURAL LANDSCAPE AND HERITAGE

The same issue becomes even more important when considering heritage. Iona itself is not simply a collection of individual heritage assets; its significance lies partly in the relationship between its archaeology, historic environment, sacred places, landscape, seascape and continuing living community.

The relationship between the Abbey, Nunnery, high crosses, pilgrimage routes, settlements and landscape is part of the experience.

The detailed evidence submitted through ObjectNow identifies a concern that the applicant recognises these experiential qualities in its baseline but does not adequately demonstrate that they have been incorporated into the assessment of heritage significance.

That matters because a heritage asset does not cease to have a setting simply because the proposed development is offshore - the setting is part of the asset's significance where that setting contributes to how the place is understood and experienced.

Colonsay Community Council raises similar concerns in relation to Oronsay Priory and its open maritime setting.

Hebridean Horizon therefore reinforces the need for Ministers to consider cultural heritage as a landscape relationship, rather than as a collection of isolated monuments.

"A development of this scale required a bespoke, place-based socio-economic assessment of Mull and Iona, and none was undertaken."

VISIT MULL & IONA

Destination Marketing Organisation

for the islands of Mull, Iona and Ulva

8. THE VISITOR ECONOMY: A PLACE-BASED QUESTION

Tourism is the clearest example of why a collective, place-based approach is necessary.

Visit Mull & Iona represents approximately 150 member businesses operating around 190 tourism enterprises across Mull and Iona. It argues that the applicant fails to recognise the interdependence of Iona, Staffa and the Treshnish Isles with Mull's wider economy, while assigning Mull's tourism economy a "low sensitivity" rating.

Visit Mull & Iona's published evidence also identifies the fundamental role of landscape, wildlife, Iona, Staffa and the Treshnish Isles in Mull's visitor proposition and raises concerns about the absence of a detailed, locally grounded assessment of the visitor economy.

Hebridean Horizon considers this a particularly important issue as a visitor does not necessarily experience "Mull tourism" and "Iona tourism" as separate economic units. They may stay on Mull, travel to Iona, visit Staffa, take a wildlife trip, eat in Tobermory, buy local products and stay elsewhere. The visitor economy is therefore geographically interconnected.

The landscape and seascape are not merely the backdrop against which the tourism economy operates - they are an intrinsic part of the visitor offering.

If those qualities are changed, the potential economic effect cannot be assessed simply by looking at the number of businesses within a defined study area.

Has the applicant assessed the visitor economy as it is actually experienced - as an interconnected island economy dependent upon landscape, wildlife, heritage and the character of place - rather than as a collection of businesses within an arbitrary study area?

9. ISLAND ECONOMIES AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

The same problem arises in the understanding of island communities. Small island economies are not simply smaller versions of mainland economies. They have different characteristics, including

- **limited economic diversification;**
- **smaller labour markets;**
- **fewer businesses;**
- **greater interdependence;**
- **higher reliance on individual sectors;**
- **constrained infrastructure;**
- **and limited capacity to absorb significant economic shocks.**

The Iona Community Council identifies a particularly important issue: the applicant's own consultants identified "habitability" as a potential pathway through which the proposal could affect island communities, but no specific assessment of habitability or the unique conditions of those islands was undertaken.

The question should not be whether the proposal will create or remove a certain number of jobs - it is whether it could alter the conditions that enable a small community to remain viable.

Hebridean Horizon believes Ministers should therefore examine whether the socio-economic assessment has properly captured and understood:

- **population retention;**
- **attractiveness of the islands as places to live;**
- **tourism dependence;**
- **business interdependence;**
- **community capacity;**
- **access to services;**
- **and the relationship between economic activity and the character of place.**

We would therefore urge Scottish Ministers to carefully consider whether 'habitability' actually been assessed and understood by the proposer?

10. THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT

Hebridean Horizon does not seek to substitute its judgement for that of specialist marine organisations.

We instead wish to emphasise the implications of their evidence for the wider island system.

The Hebridean Whale & Dolphin Trust identifies concerns about construction noise, insufficient mitigation and quantitative assessment, and the failure to adequately consider how marine mammals experience the project spatially and temporally.

Collectively, the **Community Council** objections raise concerns about protected habitats and species, seabirds, marine ecology, fisheries and displacement.

The development area itself sits within a marine environment that supports wildlife, fishing, transport and tourism.

The sea is therefore simultaneously:

- an ecological environment;
- a working environment;
- an economic resource;
- a transport environment;
- a recreational environment;
- and part of the cultural identity of the islands.

This is another area where fragmentation of assessment risks obscuring cumulative effects.

Can Ministers be satisfied that the marine environment has been assessed as an interconnected system — ecological, economic, navigational, recreational and cultural — rather than as a series of separate characteristics?

11. FISHERIES AND MARINE DISPLACEMENT

Islay Community Council has raised concerns regarding fisheries, fishing displacement, navigation, lifeline connectivity and safety at sea. Hebridean Horizon reinforces these concerns.

If fishing or other marine activities cannot continue within the development area, activity may have to move elsewhere.

That can create:

- pressure on neighbouring grounds;
- increased journey distances;
- additional fuel consumption;
- increased interaction between marine users;
- and cumulative impacts beyond the development boundary.

The question for Ministers is therefore whether the proposed development has adequately demonstrated that marine activities can coexist with it without unacceptable consequences.

"The assessment does not provide a sufficiently robust or precautionary basis to conclude that significant effects on marine mammals have been adequately assessed or mitigated."

Hebridean Whale & Dolphin Trust

12. ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

The ecological significance of the area has been repeatedly identified by Community Councils and specialist organisations.

Concerns include seabirds, marine mammals, protected habitats, biodiversity and the effects of construction and operation.

The application itself includes a "Without Prejudice Derogation Case" and a "Without Prejudice Guillemot Compensation Plan" in relation to potential impacts on the North Colonsay and Western Cliffs SPA.

The detailed evidence submitted through ObjectNow highlights the significance of those documents because they indicate that adverse effects on protected features cannot simply be ruled out at this stage.

Hebridean Horizon considers that this uncertainty is material and we question whether Ministers have sufficient evidence to be confident that the relevant statutory tests can be satisfied.

13. DARK SKIES AND THE NIGHT-TIME ENVIRONMENT

Turbine lighting should not be treated as a minor extension of the daytime visual impact given that the night-time environment is part of the character of these islands.

Tiree Community Council specifically raises degradation of dark skies, while the **Iona Community Council** evidence identifies the concern regarding introduction of aviation lighting into an otherwise dark seascape.

The detailed evidence notes that the applicant itself acknowledges the introduction of aviation and navigation lighting into a currently unlit sea horizon for the 35-year operational period.

The proposal would change not just what the islands look like during the day, but how the seascape is experienced at night, which has implications for tranquillity, wildlife, residents and visitors.

Has the night-time environment, therefore, been assessed as part of the character and ecological functioning of these islands, rather than incorrectly treated as an extension of daytime visual impact?

14. COMMUNITY BENEFIT AND EQUITY

Hebridean Horizon does not consider community benefit to be an adequate answer to the impacts identified in this objection.

Community benefit may be relevant to the wider economic consequences of a development but it cannot, however, make an otherwise unacceptable landscape, ecological, heritage or socio-economic impact acceptable.

Nor should an uncertain future benefit be weighed against known or potentially significant impacts.

The information available to Iona Community Council indicates that offshore community benefit is voluntary and that SPR has not been able to provide a firm indication of the eventual level before consent.

This creates an important question of equity - Who experiences the impacts? Who receives the benefits? Where do the economic benefits accrue?

Hebridean Horizon believes Ministers should keep those questions separate.

15. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS: SEEING THE WHOLE

Cumulative impact is one of the strongest reasons for a collective Hebridean Horizon representation.

The application necessarily divides the development into technical assessment chapters, but communities do not experience their lives in chapters:

The different parts of an island community's character are interconnected; the landscape contributes to the visitor experience. The visitor experience contributes to the reputation of the island. That reputation supports tourism businesses and employment. Those businesses and jobs help families remain on the island. Families and community life contribute to the character and resilience of the place. And that living community is itself part of what visitors come here to experience.

Marine ecological changes may affect wildlife tourism. Fishing displacement may affect other marine users. Heritage impacts may affect visitor experience and cultural identity. Lighting affects landscape, tranquillity and potentially wildlife.

These impacts interact.

The detailed **Iona Community Council** objection also raises a separate concern about the treatment of deferred project components, including export cable and onshore transmission works, arguing that the project should be understood as a whole rather than fragmented into separate future applications.

Hebridean Horizon asks Ministers to consider both forms of cumulative effect: the cumulative effects of the project itself, and the cumulative effects of the project upon the interconnected systems that sustain these islands.

*“Human culture emerges from a place while
simultaneously being cradled by it”*

Rutger Emmelkamp
KNOCKVOLOGAN STUDIOS

16. HAS THE APPLICANT PROPERLY UNDERSTOOD THE PLACE?

This is the central question of our objection.

The application contains an enormous quantity of technical information but understanding a place is not the same as measuring it.

The applicant can measure distance, visibility, population, visitor numbers, turbine dimensions, habitat areas and predicted changes.

WE do not believe that the applicant has adequately addressed or understands:

- **What makes a place valuable?**
- **Why do people visit?**
- **Why do people choose to stay?**
- **What makes a landscape culturally significant?**
- **What makes a community resilient?**
- **What happens when the qualities supporting all of these things are changed simultaneously?**

The detailed evidence submitted through the consultation process describes this as a cascading relationship between landscape, visitor experience, reputation, tourism, employment, families and community resilience.

Hebridean Horizon believes this is the point at which the various strands of the consultation come together and would ask that Scottish Ministers take this into account when considering their decision.

17. THE CONSULTATION EXPERIENCE

There is also a question about whether island communities have had a realistic opportunity to engage with the evidence;

The current application comprises **thousands of pages of highly technical information**.

The consultation period fell during the **busiest part of the tourism season** for many of the communities most directly affected.

The detailed evidence **identifies the imbalance** between an applicant with years and substantial professional resources to prepare its case and island communities being asked to scrutinise it during peak season.

Iona Community Council has separately raised **concerns about the earlier strategic consultation** and the limited opportunity for affected communities to participate when the development area was identified.

Additional concerns have been raised regarding the **imbalance of the Marine Directorate approach to process and publish representations after the final date of the public consultation** period rather than processing to the portal on receipt. This process prevents the public from accessing important key information i.e. representations from local or national bodies, prior to the submission deadline.

Hebridean Horizon has attempted to help individuals address this imbalance by making information more accessible and facilitating participation.

The scale of public engagement achieved should therefore be understood by Scottish Ministers in that context.

Can Ministers regard the evidence before them as having been tested through a genuinely balanced consultation process when island communities were required to scrutinise thousands of pages of technical material during their busiest period of the year, and whilst important representations were not necessarily visible before the submission deadline?

18. WIDER SOCIAL-MEDIA ENGAGEMENT

Hebridean Horizon has also recorded substantial organic engagement with information about MachairWind during the consultation.

Between **7 May and 20 August 2026**, Facebook content generated:

- **501,662 views;**
- **103,708 viewers;**
- approximately **11,500 content interactions;**
- approximately **3,000 link clicks;**
- approximately **10,800 page visits;**
- and **867 new follows.**

The Facebook analytics show **501,662 organic views and zero views from paid advertising.**

Instagram generated a further:

- **42,577 views;**
- approximately **2,300 content interactions;**
- approximately **1,300 profile visits;**
- and **290 new follows;**

again with **zero paid views.**

Hebridean Horizon does **not** present these figures as evidence of the number of people opposed to MachairWind.

We present them as evidence of the extent to which the public has engaged with information about the proposal, the consultation process and the evidence being raised by objectors.

The most widely viewed Facebook material included:

- a light-hearted video demonstrating the physical scale of the proposed turbines — approximately **72,100 views**;
- the publication of the Iona Community Council objection — approximately **23,800 views**;
- material highlighting another island community's response — approximately **19,800 views**;
- EIA and mapping information — approximately **17,300 views**;
- and the launch of ObjectNow — approximately **16,900 views**.

The strongest Instagram content similarly included the Iona Community material, National Trust for Scotland material and consultation information.

This is significant because we believe that it demonstrates to Scottish Ministers the public appetite for understanding and scrutinising when the strongest engagement was with evidence, community submissions and mechanisms for participating in the statutory process.

19. WHY THE NEED FOR A HEBRIDEAN HORIZON VIEW?

We are conscious that Ministers will receive many representations and we do not believe our value lies in repeating them. Our purpose for this document is to identify the bigger picture when the evidence is considered collectively.

- The Community Councils provide place-based, democratic representation.
- Specialist organisations provide technical expertise.
- Businesses provide direct economic evidence.
- Visit Mull & Iona provides evidence from the tourism sector.
- Individuals provide lived experience.

Hebridean Horizon has had the opportunity to bring those perspectives together. Our particular insight is that the issues repeatedly identified by different groups are **not separate problems**. The proposed development therefore cannot properly be understood by considering each effect in isolation.

Across the representations we have reviewed, a recurring concern is that the applicant's conclusions are more confident than the evidence supporting them.

If the applicant has not adequately understood what makes these places valuable, how can Ministers be confident that it has accurately assessed the consequences of changing them?

We believe that question remains unanswered.

21. RENEWABLE ENERGY AND A JUST TRANSITION

Hebridean Horizon wishes to be explicit about our position.

We support the transition away from fossil fuels.

We support renewable energy.

We understand that significant infrastructure will be required if Scotland is to decarbonise.

But a just transition cannot mean that rural and island communities are expected to absorb disproportionate environmental, cultural and economic impacts simply because their population is small. Nor should a development be considered acceptable merely because its purpose is renewable energy.

The question is where infrastructure is located, what impacts it creates, who experiences those impacts, who receives the benefits and whether the evidence demonstrates that the balance is acceptable.

Renewable energy is vital, but development must be at the right scale and in the right location to minimise negative impacts on communities, heritage and nature. We do not consider MachairWind to be in the right location.

23. OUR OVERALL POSITION

Having considered the following:

- MachairWind application and Environmental Impact Assessment;
- the submissions of the affected Community Councils;
- the evidence from Visit Mull & Iona;
- the submissions of specialist organisations;
- the representations facilitated through ObjectNow;
- and the direct public engagement witnessed through Hebridean Horizon's work,

we consider that serious unresolved questions remain regarding:

1. the fundamental suitability of the chosen location;
2. the scale of the proposed development;
3. landscape and seascape effects;
4. cultural and historic heritage;
5. tourism and the visitor economy;
6. island economic resilience;
7. marine ecology and biodiversity;
8. fisheries and marine;
9. dark skies and tranquillity;
10. cumulative and in-combination effects;
11. the treatment of island communities;
12. the adequacy of the socio-economic assessment;
13. the adequacy of the visual and heritage assessment;
14. the completeness of the environmental information;
15. the treatment of deferred project components;
16. and the distribution of costs and benefits.

These concerns are not confined to one island, nor to any one sector nor are they confined to one aspect of the proposal.

We do not claim to speak for every affected community or every individual within them. We do claim to have developed, through the course of this consultation, an unusually broad understanding of the concerns being raised across those communities.

Our contribution is therefore not simply another statement of objection. It is highlighting and reinforcing the evidence already before Ministers.

What we have seen is a striking convergence: different communities, organisations, businesses and individuals, approaching MachairWind from different perspectives, repeatedly identify the same underlying concern — that the proposal has not adequately understood the interconnected landscape, seascape, ecology, heritage, economy and community life upon which these islands depend.

We ask Ministers to consider that collective evidence when determining whether the applicant has demonstrated that this development is appropriate for this place.

*“We do not agree that the MachairWind
Offshore Windfarm is in the right location.”*

The National Trust For Scotland

24. REQUEST TO SCOTTISH MINISTERS

Hebridean Horizon respectfully asks Scottish Ministers to **refuse consent for the MachairWind Offshore Wind Farm and refuse the associated marine licence**.

We ask Ministers to consider in particular whether the applicant has demonstrated, with sufficient evidence, that:

- the development can be accommodated without unacceptable harm to nationally important landscapes and seascapes;
- the cultural and historic significance of affected places will be protected;
- internationally and nationally important ecological interests will be adequately safeguarded;
- marine activities can coexist with the development;
- affected island communities have been properly assessed as places in their own right;
- the potential effects upon tourism and community resilience have been adequately understood;
- cumulative effects have been properly assessed;
- and the environmental information before Ministers is sufficiently complete and robust to permit a properly informed determination.

If Ministers are not minded to refuse the application outright, Hebridean Horizon considers that determination should not proceed until the material deficiencies and uncertainties identified through the consultation have been properly addressed and sufficient further environmental information has been provided to enable a fully informed decision.

Should any proposed amendments to the scheme be forthcoming in response to the concerns raised during this public consultation, we would urge that a **further round of public consultation be required** given the sensitivity of the area, the scale of development, and the level of public interest.

APPENDIX 1 — CROSS-COMMUNITY THEMES

Theme	Iona	Mull	Gigha	Islay	Colonsay	Tiree
Landscape/seascape	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tourism	✓	✓		✓		✓
Heritage	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Island resilience	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fisheries		✓		✓		
Ecology	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dark skies		✓				✓
Community benefit	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Assessment methodology	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cumulative effects	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

APPENDIX 2 — HEBRIDEAN HORIZON ENGAGEMENT

Social media: 7 May–20 August 2026

Facebook

- Views: **501,662**
- Viewers: **103,708**
- Content interactions: **11,500**
- Link clicks: **3,000**
- Page visits: **10,800**
- New follows: **867**
- Paid views: **0**
- Organic views: **501,662**

Instagram

- Views: **42,577**
- Content interactions: **2,300**
- Profile visits: **1,300**
- New follows: **290**
- Paid views: **0**
- Organic views: **42,577**

These figures are presented as measures of **public engagement with information and consultation material**, not as measures of opposition.

Highest-performing substantive content

Facebook

- 'My MachairWind' scale video: **72,100 views**
- Iona Community Council objection: **23,800 views**
- "Another island has spoken": **19,800 views**
- EIA/map material: **17,300 views**
- ObjectNow launch: **16,900 views**

Instagram

- Iona Community material: **16,900 views**
- Closing days of consultation: **19,800 views**
- Hebridean Horizon campaign material: **12,500 views**
- National Trust for Scotland objection: **8,200 views**

Lost

Stay still. The ocean ahead and the surge beside you are not lost. Wherever you are is called Here,

And you must treat it as a powerful stranger, Must ask permission to know it and be known.

The sea breathes. Listen. It answers, I have made this place around you.

If you leave it, you may come

back again, saying Here.

No two waves are the same to Seal.

No two glittering are the same to Tern.

*If what a sea or wave does is lost on you, You are surely lost. Stand still. The seas knows Where you
are. You must let it find you.*

originally by David Wagoner

and adapted by John MacLean of Lagandorain, Iona