

The Full Impact Ledger

A community balance sheet for Pathway to 2030

SSEN has told Scotland what Pathway to 2030 may add. This report asks what it may cost.

Working draft for public review | 1 July 2026

Prepared by Save the Deveron Valley

Status note: This is a public-facing working draft. It is written to support scrutiny, not to make findings on unverified matters. Evidence categories are separated throughout: verified public record, promoter claim, community evidence, reported local intelligence and public-interest question.

Executive Summary

SSEN has published a benefits case for major transmission investment in the north of Scotland. It presents jobs, investment, supply-chain opportunities, community benefit, housing, roads, biodiversity work and regional economic growth.

Save the Deveron Valley does not reject the need for clean energy, grid investment or climate action.

But a benefits ledger is not a balance sheet.

A full public-interest assessment must also count the costs, risks, losses, burdens and irreversible impacts carried by host communities, landscapes, rivers, farms, wildlife, roads, public authorities and future generations.

The Deveron Valley is being asked to consider nationally significant infrastructure in a place already carrying multiple overlapping pressures: grid proposals, overhead-line infrastructure, quarrying, estate development, wind energy, road impacts, habitat concerns, enforcement questions and possible future associated infrastructure.

Communities are being asked to respond before many key questions are answered.

- What roads would be widened?
- Which bridges and culverts would carry abnormal loads?
- Which homes, walls, trees, hedgerows, verges and accesses may be affected?
- Where would the River Deveron and connected burns be crossed?
- Which protected species have been surveyed, and in which seasons?
- Has Scottish Fire and Rescue Service been formally engaged?
- Could the hub attract or enable future BESS, private-wire, energy-park or high-demand industrial infrastructure?
- Who monitors conditions?
- Who enforces promises?
- Who pays if mitigation fails?
- What is the full carbon, water, waste, materials and circular-economy evidence behind the green claims?

These are not side questions. They are the public-interest test.

| *A benefits ledger is not a balance sheet.*

Core argument

The Full Impact Ledger asks for equal clarity.

If benefits are presented in polished economic language, impacts should not be left scattered across technical documents, future assessments, missing maps and unanswered correspondence.

If SSEN can publish regional economic claims, it can publish project-level impact evidence. If community benefit is promoted, communities must also see who carries harm. If a project is described as green, communities must see the carbon, water, waste, materials, reuse, restoration

and circular-economy evidence. If national need is claimed, communities must see the demand story behind that need.

Equal clarity for benefits and harms. Equal evidence for promises and impacts. Equal respect for the people and places being asked to carry the transition.

What this report asks for

Before any preferred Strathbogie Hub site is selected, SSEN and the relevant public authorities should publish:

- a plain-English Full Impact Ledger for each shortlisted site;
- like-for-like 3D visualisations and landscape assessment;
- road, bridge, access and haul-route information;
- River Deveron and burn-crossing information;
- protected-species survey scopes and seasonal windows;
- fire, emergency access and resilience information;
- cumulative assessment including foreseeable associated infrastructure;
- clear answers on BESS, private-wire, energy-park and future high-demand connections;
- project-level whole-life carbon, water, waste and circular-economy evidence;
- an authority accountability plan showing who monitors, who enforces and who can stop works;
- community-benefit safeguards protecting the right to object;
- a reopened or extended evidence window once missing information is published;
- a dedicated Rothiemay consultation before site selection hardens.

Show the impacts before asking communities to accept the benefits.

How to read this report

This report separates evidence into five categories.

Verified public record: Information from official documents, planning portals, public consultations, council correspondence, statutory bodies, published reports or confirmed written responses.

Promoter claim: Statements made by SSEN, developers, applicants, consultants or associated bodies. These are not treated as false, but they are not treated as independent proof either.

Community evidence: Local observations, lived experience, survey responses, photographs, road knowledge, farming knowledge, wildlife observations and resident correspondence. Sensitive wildlife locations are not published.

Reported local intelligence: Information reported publicly or locally, such as possible developer interest in associated infrastructure. This is treated as a trigger for questions, not as proof of a formal proposal.

Public-interest question: Questions that SSEN, councils, Ministers, regulators or consultees should answer before decisions harden.

| *A fair ledger separates facts, claims, risks and questions.*

Evidence status note

This report does not make findings on separate planning enforcement, forestry, wildlife-crime, pollution or estate-development matters in the wider Deveron Valley.

It recognises that residents have had to navigate complex and fragmented processes across several authorities. That experience is relevant because it shows why clear accountability is needed before another nationally significant infrastructure process advances.

The purpose is forward-looking: who will hold SSEN and its partners to the law, to conditions, to environmental safeguards, to protected-species duties, to emergency-resilience requirements and to their own public promises?

| *Communities should not have to become the enforcement system.*

Public-safe wording on sensitive issues

- This report does not publish exact locations of nests, dens, setts, holts, roosts, redds, rare species records or other sensitive ecological information.
- It does not allege that any future associated infrastructure is already formally proposed unless verified.
- It does not claim that today's process is identical to the Highland Clearances.
- It does not accuse individual landowners, residents or public officers.
- It does say that local experience, historic memory, private land approaches, unequal benefit, unanswered questions and cumulative pressure can affect community trust, wellbeing and cohesion.

That human impact belongs in the ledger.

| *Community distress is not a side issue. It is evidence that the process is already affecting people.*

What the benefits ledger leaves out

SSEN's economic report counts jobs, investment, supply-chain opportunities, community benefit, housing, roads, forestry and biodiversity claims.

roads, bridges, homes, haul routes, water, wildlife, soil, river crossings, landscape, protected species, farming, rural businesses, tourism, public-body workload, emergency resilience,

community division, unpaid resident labour, future BESS, future data-centre demand, carbon, waste, materials, enforcement risk, land-take and cumulative loss.

Benefit claims should not be presented at brochure level while impacts are left at technical-map level.

If SSEN can produce a polished economic case for the benefits, it can produce an equally clear public evidence case for the impacts.

Equal clarity for impacts. Equal evidence for harms. Equal respect for communities.

The Missing Assessment Test

What has been assessed, who has been consulted, and what remains unknown?

Communities cannot meaningfully assess Strathbogie Hub while key assessments remain unpublished or unclear.

SSEN should publish, or provide a clear timetable for publishing, the Environmental Impact Assessment process, EIA screening or scoping material, environmental constraints reports, protected-species survey scopes, roads and bridge assessments, River Deveron and burn crossing assessments, fire and emergency-resilience assessments, alternatives appraisals, and the list of public bodies and specialist organisations consulted so far.

The question is not simply whether information may appear later. The question is whether communities are being asked to respond, accept or adapt before the evidence is visible.

Show the assessments before asking communities to accept the benefits.

The Landscape and Place Test

This is not a neutral industrial site

Site 14 / Rivestone must not be assessed as if it were an isolated engineering plot.

It sits within a valued rural landscape context connected to the Deveron Valley, farming land, homes, roads, hills, woodland, heritage, recreation, wildlife movement and community identity.

Landscape is not decoration. In Scotland, landscape is part of wellbeing, tourism, local economy, identity and belonging. It is also part of why people choose to live, farm, walk, visit, rest and remain in a place.

A development of this scale should not be assessed only by technical visibility maps. Communities need plain-English visualisations showing what people would actually live with from roads, homes, farms, hills, paths, viewpoints and everyday routes.

SSEN should publish like-for-like 3D visualisations for all shortlisted locations before any preferred site is selected.

A ZTV map is not the same as seeing what people will live with.

The Protected Species and Living Catchment Test

Protected species are not a biodiversity footnote

The Deveron Valley is not empty land. It is wildcat country, salmon water, otter habitat, red squirrel woodland, raptor sky, bat corridor, farmland, wet ground and a living catchment.

Protected, priority, threatened, declining or highly sensitive species known, recorded, publicly reported or reasonably requiring assessment in the wider valley and connected catchment include Scottish wildcat, otter, badger, pine marten, red squirrel, bats, breeding birds and raptors, Atlantic salmon, sea trout, brown trout, European eel and lamprey species where records or habitat support assessment.

Freshwater pearl mussel should also be subject to records checks and habitat-suitability assessment before any works affecting watercourses, sediment, banks, crossings, drainage or salmonid habitat are progressed.

This report does not publish sensitive species locations and does not assert unverified records. The point is that SSEN must carry out species-specific, seasonally appropriate assessment before decisions are made.

SSEN should publish species-specific survey scopes, survey seasons, records-check methods, avoidance measures, licensing requirements, ecological supervision, stop-work procedures, pollution-prevention measures and long-term monitoring commitments.

Protected species must not be hidden inside a general biodiversity promise.

The River Deveron Crossing Test

A river crossing is not a line on a cable map

The River Deveron and its connected burns must be treated as living systems, not engineering obstacles.

Any cable crossing, drainage works, access track, compound, road widening, culvert work or construction near water could affect sediment, banks, fish habitat, spawning conditions, private water supplies, field drainage, riparian habitat, flood risk and pollution pathways.

SSEN should publish where the River Deveron and connected burns may be crossed, whether crossings would use trenchless methods, open-cut methods, existing bridges or new temporary works, where launch and reception pits would be placed, what construction compounds and access routes would be required, how pollution would be contained, what baseline monitoring would be used, and what trigger levels and stop-work points would apply.

A river crossing is a hydrology, ecology, fisheries, flood-risk, pollution and construction-risk event.

The Roads, Homes and Daily Life Test

A village is not a bypass

Rothiemay, the B9022, rural lanes, bridges, verges, walls, driveways, school routes, nursery routes and farm access points must not be reduced to haul-route lines.

A road-widening plan is also a land-take, tree, hedge, bridge, parking, safety and daily-life plan.

SSEN should publish which roads may be used, widened, strengthened, realigned or altered; which bridges and culverts may be affected; which verges, trees, hedgerows, ditches, walls, gardens, accesses and roadside features may be at risk; and whether any homes, parking areas or private accesses could be affected.

People should not discover late in the process that their front door, boundary wall, hedge, mature tree, parking space, farm access, school route or village road has become an engineering problem.

Rothiemay is not a passing point on a haul-route map. It is a village.

The Farming, Tenants and Biosecurity Test

A working farm is a managed living system

Farmland is not empty space. It is food production, livelihood, tenancy, family history, animal welfare, machinery movement, drainage, soil, grazing, water supply, shelter, gates, fences and seasonal rhythm.

The assessment must include impacts on landowners, tenant farmers, farm workers, contractors, neighbouring farms, livestock, access routes and rural businesses.

It should assess livestock stress, calving and lambing periods, fencing, gates, water troughs, field drainage, contractor movement, disease risk, farm biosecurity, dogs or workforce disturbance, machinery access, crop loss, soil compaction, reinstatement and long-term farming continuity.

Impact is not limited to those who own land.

The Foreseeable Associated Infrastructure Test

If the hub enables more, assess more

The concern is not only the proposed hub itself.

A major grid hub may attract or enable further infrastructure: BESS, private-wire connections, energy parks, additional substations, converter works, access roads, cable routes, compounds and future industrial demand.

Local intelligence has reported possible battery-storage developer interest near a future Rivestone substation. This report does not treat that as proof of a formal BESS proposal. It treats it as a credible local intelligence trigger requiring SSEN and public authorities to answer whether BESS, private-wire, energy-park or other associated infrastructure is current, likely, enabled, reasonably foreseeable or explicitly ruled out.

SSEN should confirm whether any BESS, energy-storage, private-wire, energy-park or grid-connection interest has been discussed in relation to Rivestone, Avochie, Site 14 or the wider Strathbogie Hub area. If SSEN says no BESS is proposed, it should also confirm whether BESS has been considered, ruled out, enabled or left open.

No community should be asked to assess a hub while the infrastructure it may attract is left outside the frame.

The Fire, Emergency and Resilience Test

Emergency planning must come before site selection hardens

Large electrical infrastructure in a rural landscape raises practical emergency questions: access, winter roads, water supply, transformer or converter incidents, hazardous materials, firefighting runoff, blocked routes, communication, evacuation, ambulance access, police access, and resilience for nearby homes, farms and villages.

Where associated infrastructure such as BESS is foreseeable or not yet ruled out, fire and emergency planning becomes even more important.

SSEN should confirm what engagement has taken place with SFRS, ambulance services, Police Scotland, council emergency planning, roads teams and public health bodies before any preferred site is selected.

Emergency resilience should not be left to planning conditions written later. It should be part of site comparison now.

Emergency access is not a technical afterthought. It is a public safety test.

The Noise, Vibration and Dark Skies Test

Rural quiet is part of the value of the place

The assessment must cover more than daytime construction noise.

It should include HGV vibration, abnormal-load movement, roadworks, piling or breaking where relevant, night-time noise, operational transformer or converter hum, tonal noise, cumulative noise from associated infrastructure, construction lighting, permanent security lighting, night-time glow, and impacts on homes, wildlife, bats, birds, roads and rural character.

A landscape does not only change by day. It changes after dark too.

Rural quiet is not empty silence. It is part of the value of the place.

The Property, Security and Privacy Test

Uncertainty has a cost before any digger arrives

This report does not attempt to value individual property impacts. It asks SSEN to assess how prolonged uncertainty, visual impact, construction disturbance, access changes, road widening, future associated infrastructure and perceived blight may affect residential amenity, confidence, property saleability, mortgage valuation and insurance concerns.

Large electricity infrastructure may also require fencing, lighting, CCTV, access controls, security patrols, exclusion zones and restricted routes. These may affect nearby homes, farms, paths, privacy, rural character and the feel of the place.

Security infrastructure is still infrastructure.

The Waste, Spoil and Materials Test

Construction creates waste that must go somewhere

Construction does not only bring materials in. It also creates waste, spoil and disturbance that must go somewhere.

SSEN should publish expected volumes and routes for excavated spoil, stone, concrete, aggregates, imported fill, removed soil, contaminated material, packaging, oils, drainage sediment, temporary

compound materials, borrow pits, quarry demand, disposal routes and waste-management responsibility.

The assessment should show what will be avoided, reduced, reused, repurposed, recycled or disposed of - and who audits those claims.

| *A circular economy is not a slogan. It is a material trail.*

The Archaeology and Buried Heritage Test

Underground does not mean impact-free

Underground cables, pits, trenches, access tracks, compounds, road widening and river crossings can affect archaeology, old field systems, walls, tracks, designed landscapes, buried remains and historic routes.

SSEN should publish how archaeological and heritage assessment will cover not only the hub footprint, but also roads, crossings, construction compounds, cable corridors and temporary works.

| *Underground does not mean invisible.*

The Design Envelope and Future Expansion Test

Assess the maximum, not the brochure version

Communities need to know whether they are responding to a fixed proposal or a flexible envelope.

SSEN should publish the maximum parameters it wishes to keep open, including building heights, platform levels, lighting, layout, road access, drainage, compounds, future bays, future connections, BESS, private-wire infrastructure, cable routes and expansion potential.

If future expansion is possible, it should be assessed now. If it is not possible, that should be stated clearly.

| *Assess the maximum, not the brochure version.*

The Community Benefit and Private Deal Test

Benefit is not consent

Community benefit can support useful local projects. It cannot replace proper assessment, lawful consent, avoidance of harm, mitigation, compensation, monitoring, enforcement or meaningful consultation.

People should not have to trade their right to object for the possibility of future funding.

Where land payments, access agreements, community benefit, contractor opportunities or compensation may exist, SSEN and public authorities must recognise the risk of unequal pressure inside small communities.

Community benefit cannot be used to buy silence around public harm.

The Public-Body Capacity Test

A private project can create public workload

A project can be privately promoted while creating public workload for councils, roads teams, emergency services, regulators, ecological bodies, police, community councils and residents.

SSEN should explain how monitoring, enforcement and public-body capacity will be funded and protected. Public authorities should not be left under-resourced while communities are told to trust that the system will deal with problems later.

Do not approve what can only be enforced by exhausted residents with inboxes full of evidence.

The Human Impact Test

Distress, division and unpaid public-interest work

Major infrastructure is often described in technical language: megawatts, substations, converters, ducts, haul routes, economic output and construction jobs.

But communities experience it differently.

They experience uncertainty. They experience fear of what may happen to roads, homes, trees, farms, wildlife, water and daily life. They experience pressure on neighbour relationships. They experience rumours, land approaches, private negotiations, unanswered questions and shifting information.

They spend unpaid hours reading technical documents, writing emails, attending meetings, checking maps, reporting concerns and trying to understand processes that should have been explained clearly from the start.

This is not emotional background noise. It is part of the impact ledger.

Community distress is not a side issue. It is evidence that the process is already affecting people.

Large infrastructure can divide small communities long before a planning application is submitted. Some people may be approached privately. Some may be offered land payments, access agreements, contracts, options, compensation or future benefit. Others may receive no direct payment but still live with construction traffic, visual change, uncertainty, loss of quiet, road disruption, school-route impacts, property anxiety or landscape loss.

A fair process must recognise that private benefit and public burden do not always land in the same place.

Private deals can create public impacts.

The Hidden Burdens Test

What does not appear in the benefits ledger?

A benefits ledger counts paid work. A full ledger must also count unpaid burden.

Communities are already spending unpaid hours gathering evidence, checking maps, writing submissions, protecting sensitive wildlife information, contacting authorities, chasing acknowledgements, correcting errors, asking for missing information and trying to understand decisions that should have been explained clearly from the start.

This unpaid public-interest work is not invisible. It is part of the true cost of an unclear process.

The Full Impact Ledger counts what is often left out: fear, uncertainty, neighbour division, broken sleep, loss of quiet, property anxiety, farm disruption, wildlife worry, public-body strain, repeated consultations and the grief of watching a valued landscape become a technical exercise.

These are not sentimental extras. They are real impacts on people, place and community resilience.

A benefits ledger counts what is paid for. A full ledger counts what is carried.

Community scrutiny is unpaid public-interest work.

The Clearance Memory Test

When land-use change reopens old wounds

The Deveron Valley and wider north-east do not sit on blank ground. These are places with long memories: cleared townships, abandoned settlements, estate power, rural depopulation, forced economic change, and communities shaped by decisions made elsewhere.

This report does not claim that today's infrastructure process is identical to the Highland Clearances. It asks a more careful and important question: how does a community already shaped by historic clearance experience another wave of externally driven land-use change?

Displacement is not only eviction. It can also be loss of quiet, loss of landscape, loss of trust, loss of neighbourly safety, loss of access, loss of farming continuity, loss of wildlife, loss of confidence, and loss of the ability to stay without distress.

Clearance is not only a past event. It is also a warning about what happens when land is valued above people.

The Extractive Logic Test

Who is expected to disappear so something more profitable can appear?

The Deveron Valley is not empty space awaiting a more profitable use. It is home, farmland, river catchment, wildlife corridor, working landscape, cultural memory and community.

When a rural place is treated primarily as a host site for infrastructure, while the main benefits, power flows, profits, contracts or strategic gains may land elsewhere, communities are entitled to ask whether old extractive patterns are being repeated in modern form.

This is the same underlying question in modern clothing: who decides what rural land is for, who benefits from that decision, and who is expected to adapt, endure, leave, fall silent or disappear?

A just transition must not reproduce old clearance logic: distant decisions, private agreements, local division, public harm, landscape loss and benefits flowing away from the communities asked to carry the burden.

If the land becomes more profitable by making the people, wildlife, quiet, farming and local memory less visible, that is not progress. It is extraction with greener language.

Rural Scotland is not empty space. It is memory, livelihood, nature, belonging and home.

The Planetary Limits Test

Not green if it repeats the harm

The energy transition cannot simply repeat the old extractive pattern with new language.

A project should not be called green merely because it is connected to renewable electricity if its delivery still depends on large-scale land take, concrete, steel, quarrying, road widening, habitat loss, water risk, diesel-heavy construction, rural disruption, community division and value flowing away from the places asked to carry the burden.

The climate and nature crises cannot be solved by treating more rural places as sacrifice zones.

The question is not whether renewable electricity matters. It does. The question is whether the infrastructure built in its name is genuinely future-fit, circular, accountable and least-harm - or

whether it repeats the same extractive habits that helped create the crisis: maximising output, centralising profit, externalising harm, and treating land, water, wildlife and rural communities as costs to be managed rather than lives to be respected.

A dying planet does not need greener extraction. It needs different logic.

Green purpose does not erase industrial impact.

The Green Claims Test

Show the evidence behind the environmental branding

A project should not be treated as environmentally positive simply because it is connected to renewable electricity, transmission infrastructure or net zero targets.

If SSEN, contractors, land partners, supply-chain companies or associated developers use green language, nature-positive claims, sustainability claims, community-benefit claims or just-transition language, those claims should be evidenced in plain English.

SSEN and its project partners should publish a project-level green-credentials evidence statement for Strathbogie Hub, covering whole-life carbon, materials, water, heat, waste, circular economy, supply chain, contractor standards, carbon training, climate literacy and independent audit.

Communities should be shown what the project consumes, what it emits, what it wastes, what it reuses, what it restores, what it locks in and what it leaves behind.

Green claims are not credentials. Evidence is.

Show the carbon. Show the water. Show the waste. Show the reuse.

A just transition needs receipts.

Green-credentials questions for SSEN and partners

- What is the estimated whole-life carbon cost of the project?
- How much comes from concrete, steel, aggregates, quarrying, haulage, road widening, cable production, construction plant, worker accommodation, land-use change and maintenance?
- Will SSEN publish a project-level carbon budget?
- Are project leads, senior decision-makers, community liaison teams, designers and principal contractors Carbon Literate, climate-literate or undertaking recognised training?
- What carbon training is required for contractors, consultants and supply-chain partners?
- How much water will be required during construction and operation?
- Will rainwater or construction water be captured and reused?
- How will runoff, sediment, oils, firefighting water and contaminated water be contained?

- Will the converter station, substation or associated equipment produce recoverable waste heat? If yes, has heat reuse been assessed? If no, will SSEN publish the technical reason why not?
- What spoil, soil, concrete, timber, steel, packaging, cable drums, oils and temporary works materials will be generated?
- What percentage of material will be reused, repurposed, recycled or disposed of?
- Will procurement require low-carbon concrete, recycled steel, sustainable timber and circular supply chains, or merely encourage them?
- How will waste, reuse, carbon, water and materials be independently audited and publicly reported?

What communities need now

Equal evidence for impacts before any preferred site is selected

The Full Impact Ledger does not ask SSEN to stop explaining benefits. It asks SSEN to explain impacts with the same clarity, investment and public accessibility.

Communities should not be asked to respond to polished benefit claims while the costs are scattered across technical documents, future assessments, missing maps, unclear consultation windows and unanswered questions.

Benefits are being presented as a story. Impacts are being left as homework.

A Plain-English Impact Ledger for Strathbogie Hub

SSEN should publish a project-level public document showing what each shortlisted site would require, what each site would affect, what assumptions have been made, what remains unknown, who has been consulted, what assessments are complete, what assessments are pending, what impacts are avoidable, what impacts are unavoidable, what mitigation is proposed, what monitoring would be required, who would enforce conditions, and what happens if mitigation fails.

Like-for-like site comparison

SSEN should publish a clear comparison of all shortlisted locations using the same level of detail for each site, including landscape, roads, homes, farming, ecology, water, protected species, cultural heritage, emergency access, future expansion, BESS risk, construction logistics, public cost, community impact and cumulative infrastructure pressure.

Rothiemay consultation before site selection

Rothiemay and surrounding affected communities should receive a dedicated consultation event before any preferred site is selected, with large printed maps, plain-English summaries, 3D visualisations, road and bridge information, protected-species safeguards, River Deveron and burn-crossing information, emergency-resilience information, free-text written feedback and a clear explanation of how feedback will be recorded and responded to.

Reopened or extended evidence window

If major information was missing during the first feedback period, communities should have a further opportunity to respond once that information is published.

Full roads, bridges and daily-life assessment

SSEN should publish haul routes, abnormal-load routes, roads requiring widening or strengthening, bridges and culverts affected, verges, walls, trees, hedges, ditches and accesses at risk, homes, gardens, parking areas and farm entrances potentially affected, school/nursery/care/emergency/winter-route implications, traffic volumes, duration, repair and compensation arrangements.

River Deveron and water-protection plan

SSEN should publish crossing methods, launch and reception pit locations, drainage design, sediment control, pollution prevention, private water supply protection, fisheries impacts, otter and riparian-habitat safeguards, baseline water-quality monitoring, public trigger levels and stop-work procedures.

Protected-species survey disclosure

SSEN should publish the scope and timing of protected-species surveys for each shortlisted site, road corridor, watercourse crossing, cable route, compound and temporary works area, while protecting sensitive locations.

Foreseeable associated infrastructure assessment

SSEN should state clearly whether Strathbogie Hub could attract, enable or connect further infrastructure, including BESS, private-wire infrastructure, energy parks, additional substations, data-centre or AI-compute demand, hydrogen or industrial loads, future grid connections, road works or cable corridors.

Emergency-resilience and fire-safety engagement

SSEN should confirm what engagement has taken place with Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, Scottish Ambulance Service, Police Scotland, council emergency-planning teams, roads teams, public-health bodies and SEPA where pollution or water risk is relevant.

Authority accountability plan

The relevant authorities should explain who monitors and enforces conditions at each stage, who can order works to stop, what evidence residents can submit, what timescales apply, what happens if conditions are breached, and who pays for harm, repair, restoration or failure.

Green-credentials evidence statement

SSEN should publish whole-life carbon, construction emissions, materials footprint, quarrying and haulage impacts, water use and reuse, waste and spoil management, heat or energy-loss recovery

where possible, circular-economy design, contractor carbon requirements, carbon-literacy or climate-literacy training, independent audit and public reporting.

Community benefit safeguards

SSEN should confirm that community benefit, land agreements, access payments, contracts or compensation will not be used to reduce, silence or delegitimise objections.

Human impact and community cohesion assessment

SSEN and public authorities should assess distress, uncertainty, neighbour division, unequal access to information, private approaches, fear of speaking out, unpaid evidence burden, and effects on elderly, disabled, neurodivergent, low-income and isolated residents, tenants, carers, school families, farm workers and non-landowners.

Maximum build-out statement

SSEN should publish the maximum development envelope it wishes to keep open: heights, platform levels, land take, road works, compounds, lighting, future bays, cable corridors, expansion potential, and whether BESS or associated infrastructure is excluded, possible or left open.

Independent monitoring and public reporting

For a project of this scale, monitoring should not depend only on the organisation being monitored. SSEN should fund independent monitoring for ecology, water quality, roads, bridges, noise, vibration, lighting, reinstatement, carbon, waste, community complaints and compliance with conditions. Reports should be public, plain-English and regular.

Who benefits? Who pays? Who carries the impact? Who monitors the harm? Who enforces the promises? What is lost? What is reused? What is restored? What is left behind?

Equal clarity for benefits and harms. Equal evidence for promises and impacts. Equal respect for the people and places being asked to carry the transition.

Closing statement

The Deveron Valley is being asked to carry decisions made at a scale far above ordinary village life. But scale does not remove responsibility.

National need does not erase local rights. Future benefit does not cancel present harm. Green language does not make extractive logic just.

A full ledger must count what the benefits report leaves outside the frame: who is expected to carry the burden, who receives the value, what is lost from the land, and whether a truly modern system would ask this much of a living rural place at all.

The Deveron Valley is not refusing the future. It is asking for a future that does not repeat the violence of the past.

A living planet cannot be protected by systems that keep treating land as disposable, communities as inconvenient, rivers as engineering constraints, and wildlife as mitigation paperwork.

If this is truly a transition, it must be judged not only by how much electricity it moves, but by whether it protects life while doing so.

Do not call it future-fit if it repeats the oldest pattern: take from the land, silence the people, export the value, and leave the place changed forever.

Evidence anchors for final checking

These sources and project-held records should be checked and cited before any final public version is published. This working draft intentionally keeps evidence categories separate and avoids presenting local intelligence as formal proof.

- SSEN Transmission, Re-energising the North: Transforming Scotland - 2026 Economic Report: benefits, investment, jobs, housing, roads, community benefit, forestry, peatland and biodiversity claims.
- SSEN / project ZTV and Viewpoint Plan for Rivestone, Figure 1.1.3, June 2026: viewpoint locations, 20km study area, Deveron Valley Local Landscape Area, ZTV assumptions and limitations.
- Save the Deveron Valley formal SSEN consultation response and addenda submitted June 2026: local evidence, cumulative assessment, ecology, roads, emergency resilience, BESS/future infrastructure questions and green-claims questions.
- Save the Deveron Valley correspondence audit and submission response pages: record of submitted materials, final supplementary feedback, post-deadline request for extended evidence window, Rothiemay consultation, 3D modelling and environmental information.
- Scottish Government NPF4: climate, nature, biodiversity, soils, natural places, woodland and trees.
- NatureScot protected species guidance: protected species as material planning consideration and need for assessment where reasonable evidence exists.
- National Fire Chiefs Council grid-scale BESS guidance: early engagement with fire and rescue services where BESS is relevant or foreseeable.
- Scottish Government Just Transition and Place Principle: fairness, partnership with those impacted, joined-up place-based decision-making.
- VisitScotland and regional tourism data: scenery, landscape, tourism employment and local visitor economy context.

- Project-held Gmail/correspondence records on SFRS engagement, ESS/cumulative assessment and local intelligence: use only with careful evidence status labels.

Version note

Working draft produced 1 July 2026 for Save the Deveron Valley. Public wording should remain: not anti-renewables, not anti-grid, pro-community, pro-nature, pro-evidence, pro-joined-up assessment and meaningful participation.