

Ref: GLA/0512002

12<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Mr Richard Kerr  
Argyll & Bute Council  
Whitegates Office  
Whitegates Road  
Lochgilphead PA31 8SY

By email to

[richard.kerr@argyll-bute.gov.uk](mailto:richard.kerr@argyll-bute.gov.uk); [planning.maki@argyll-bute.gov.uk](mailto:planning.maki@argyll-bute.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Kerr

**Expansion of fin fish farm to comprise 10 x 80 metre cages and increase in extent of moorings Port Na Mine Fish Farm (Etive 3) ref 16/01971/MFF**

I continue to act for Friends of Loch Etive (FoLE).

I refer to the message of support for the application made on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016 by Mr R Salvesen, International Sales Manager, Dawnfresh Seafoods Limited (appended to this letter).

Mr Salvesen states:

*“the move of 70m pens to 80m pens **reduces the number of pens required** and therefore the physical impact whilst maximising efficiency”.*

This is factually wrong. The application is for the same number of pens as currently exist at Etive 3, with the applicant seeking to move to ten 80m cages from ten 60m cages.

The application describes the proposed use of Fusion Marine Oceanflex cages.

Second Floor Offices, 12 Castle Street, Hereford HR1 2NL  
Telephone: 01432 379093 Mobile: 07837 881219  
guy@linley-adams.co.uk  
[www.linley-adams.co.uk](http://www.linley-adams.co.uk)

Oceanflex 80m cages provide 1.78 times the volume of enclosed water per metre depth of nets under the cages.

Therefore, the same number of farmed fish as can be accommodated at the current stocking density (which enjoys RSPCA certification) in ten 60m cages, can be accommodated within between only five and six 80m Oceanflex cages operating to the same depth of net. Indeed, given the proposed repositioning of Etive 3 into deeper water, fewer 80m cages cages still may be required than at the current Etive 3 site.

As FoLE has argued in its objection - as this application comes with no application for an increase in permitted biomass - no need has been demonstrated for the increase in cage size and grid that can warrant the negative landscape impact and additional interference with other users of the loch.

This appears now to be agreed by the applicant's senior staff.

Yours sincerely

Guy Linley-Adams  
Solicitor

enc