



# Technical Appendix 5.2

## Scoping Opinion Summary of Responses

# Table of contents

Scoping Opinion Summary of Responses

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
<b>Statutory Consultees</b>			
Energy Consents Unit (ECU)	20/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scottish Ministers expect the EIA Report to take all responses received during consultation into consideration.</li> <li>Note that no responses were received from Barr Community Council; Pinmore and Pinwherry Community Council; Civil Aviation Authority; Crown Estates Scotland; Fisheries Management Scotland; John Muir Trust; Ofcom; Scottish Wild Land Group and; Scottish Wildlife Trust.</li> <li>Advise that Scottish Water is contacted and further enquires are made to ascertain whether Scottish Water assets are likely to be affected by the proposed development. Details of mitigation measures should also be included within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Advise that the Applicant investigates the presence of any private water supplies which may be affected by the proposed development. The EIA Report will include the details of PWS investigations and an assessment into the risk as well as any proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>Advise that where there is a demonstrable requirement for peat landslide hazard and risk assessment, the assessment should be undertaken as part of the EIA process to provide Ministers with a clear understanding of whether the risks are acceptable and capable of being controlled by mitigation measures. The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Development (Second Edition) should be followed in the preparation of the EIA Report and should contain details on the assessment and any mitigation measures put in place.</li> <li>Note that South Ayrshire Council and SNH have recommended that some viewpoints are omitted and some are added and state that final viewpoints are to be agreed with the ECU and relevant consultees.</li> <li>Advise that cumulative noise are carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards. State that the Noise chapter should include details about representative background noise survey locations as agreed with the relevant Planning Authority.</li> <li>Note that the blade tip height of the turbines exceeds 150m. As such, viewpoints will be required to consider the effects of aviation lighting and how chosen lighting mitigates the effects.</li> <li>Advise that South Ayrshire Council specific comment on lighting and SNH comments on night time assessment should be considered.</li> <li>Note that further engagement is required between parties in regards to surveys, management plans, peat, radio links, finalisation of viewpoints, cultural heritage, and cumulative assessments and request that the ECU is kept informed of relevant discussions.</li> <li>Suggest that mitigation measures suggested for any significant environmental impacts identified should be presented as a conclusion to each chapter.</li> <li>Recommend that a consolidated list of all mitigation measures proposed throughout the environmental assessment is provided in tabular form within the EIA Report where mitigation is relied upon in relation to reported conclusions of likelihood or significance of impacts.</li> <li>Advise that an additional scoping opinion be sought from Scottish Ministers in the event that no application has been submitted within 12 months of the date of this opinion.</li> <li>Recommend that the Applicant continues to engage with the ECU at the pre-application stage and before proposals reach design freeze.</li> <li>The Applicant is reminded that there is limited opportunity to vary the form and content of the development once an application has been submitted.</li> <li>Recommend that the EIA report provides a summary in tabular form of where the EIA report addresses each of the matters raised in this scoping opinion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIA Report will take full consideration of comments issued within this Scoping Opinion</li> <li>Scottish Water will be contacted with the relevant information on mitigation measures included within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Private Water Supplies will be investigated and details on assessment will be included within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Consideration will be given to the requirement for a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment as part of the EIA process.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held in relation to viewpoints and the ECU will be kept informed.</li> <li>Noise assessments will be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards and noise assessment survey locations will be discussed with the local authority.</li> <li>Further discussion and engagement with relevant parties will be held in reference to the specified topics.</li> <li>Mitigation measures will be presented as recommended.</li> <li>Engagement will continue with the ECU during the EIA process.</li> <li>The EIA Report will present a summary in the recommended format.</li> </ul>
South Ayrshire Council	2/05/2019	<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the windfarm is proposed within Landscape Character Type (LCT) 18c (Plateau Moorland with Forestry with Windfarms) and LCT 21 (Rugged Uplands with Lochs and Forest). State that no support is offered for turbines greater than 50m high in this location (the proposed turbines are very large typology turbines (130m+)).</li> <li>With reference to South Ayrshire Landscape Wind Capacity Study 2018 (SALWCS), note that LCT 18c is described as having High-Medium sensitivity to Very Large Typology turbines. LCT 18c is close to reaching capacity with operational and consented windfarms already occupying the less sensitive "interior" of the plateau uplands. Further development is likely to impact upon the more sensitive peripheries of the uplands. State that there is no scope for turbines &gt; 50m within LCT 21.</li> <li>The SALWCS notes that turbines of 200m could result in significant cumulative effects if seen in close proximity with operational and consented turbines with. State the operational Mark Hill windfarm would form a significant consideration.</li> <li>Consideration should be given to the impacts on the Galloway Dark Sky Park.</li> <li>Note that the site is located within 5km of the Merrick Wild Land Area (part of the site is located within the Craigenreoch and Eldrick Hill Wildlife site, RSPB Important Bird Area and Scenic Area).</li> <li>The proposed Development will be required to set out how it meets the criteria specified within SAC LDP Wind Energy Policy.</li> <li>Any identified mitigation measures in relation to the direct and indirect effects on the landscape should be detailed within the LVIA.</li> <li>The proposed LVIA methodology and the study area of 45km is appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operational Mark Hill windfarm will be included within any cumulative assessment.</li> <li>Potential impacts upon the Merrick Wild Land Area will be considered assessed.</li> <li>The proposed Development will discuss how it meets the criteria set out in SAC LDP Wind Energy Policy.</li> <li>The LVIA will detail the mitigation measures which will be put in place.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held in order to determine an appropriate study area following comments from SNH.</li> <li>The approach to forest felling will adhere to best practice guidelines.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State that Turbines 7, 10 and 13 may be problematic due to their potential impacts on Fell Hill and Craigenreoch.</li> <li>• Forest felling should comply with best landscape design practice as set out in UK standards.</li> <li>• A detailed and clearly reproduced ZTV map based on a 1:50km OS map base showing visibility within 15km of the windfarm should be included within the LVIA.</li> <li>• Request more representative views from closer viewpoints, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Auchensoul Hill which lies immediately north-west of Barr;</li> <li>- Pinbreck Hill GR 345937;</li> <li>- B7027 in the High Altercannoch area south-east of Barrhill;</li> <li>- Barrhill Railway Station or on the minor road between Barrhill and the station where the operational Marks Hill wind farm is already visible above the Duisk Valley;</li> <li>- Views from more open sections of the Barr footpaths within Changue Forest (<a href="http://www.ayrshirepaths.org.uk/walkbarr.htm">www.ayrshirepaths.org.uk/walkbarr.htm</a>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommend that the LVIA assesses the impacts of the windfarm on local settlements and more dispersed and defined groups of residential development within the Stinchar and Duisk Valleys.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAC EHO has advised that a dust management plan for the construction and operation phase of the windfarm will be required.</li> <li>• Construction works must be carried out in accordance with BS 5228-1 and 2:2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites.</li> <li>• Require a detailed method statement for construction to be prepared for approval by SAC Planning Department. This is to include an assessment into potentially noisy operations and an outline of the mitigation measures proposed. This should also include a programme and phases for the work.</li> <li>• Require site contractors to conduct all site operations in line with documented and accredited procedures.</li> <li>• State that no blasting will take place until a monitoring scheme to address borrow pit blasting has been submitted to SAC and subsequently received written approval.</li> <li>• No blasting shall take place except between the following times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10:00 – 12:00 and 14:00 – 16:00 Mondays to Fridays</li> <li>- 10:00 – 12:00 Saturdays</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The scheme shall account for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Blasting monitoring locations (nearest sensitive properties);</li> <li>- Type of monitoring equipment to be used;</li> <li>- Frequency of monitoring.</li> <li>- The methods to be employed to minimise the effects of overpressure arising from blasting, having regard to blast design, methods of initiation and prevailing weather conditions;</li> <li>- Limits of overpressure levels at specified properties; and</li> <li>- Submission of blasting records to the planning authority.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• State that the windfarm will not be permitted to commence until a method statement has been submitted and approved in writing by SAC Planning Team, detailing proposed mitigation measures to be delivered to ensure water quality, quantity and continuity.</li> <li>• The method statement should include an environmental impact assessment, Emergency Plan of Action statement, water quality sampling methods and abstraction points.</li> <li>• All forestry works, including access, should be appropriately mapped and the Forestry and Water guidelines are to be adhered to.</li> <li>• State that robust risk assessment measures, and clear, detailed plans relating to proposed future construction which may have the potential to affect Private Water Supplies will be required.</li> <li>• The method statement shall include a robust site specific emergency plan of action procedures to be in place prior to commencement of any construction works for the windfarm, access roads or compounds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A ZTV will be produced and included within the LVIA.</li> <li>• Viewpoints will be agreed in consultation with SAC.</li> <li>• An LVIA and RVAA will be carried out to assess the impacts upon local communities and residences within the Stinchar and Duisk Valleys.</li> </ul> <p><b>Construction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Dust Management Plan will be prepared.</li> <li>• Construction will be carried out in line with recommended guidance.</li> <li>• A detailed method statement for construction, including assessment into potentially noisy operations will be prepared and supplied to SAC. A programme and phasing information will also be provided.</li> <li>• Site contractors will carry out site operations in line with documented and accredited procedures.</li> <li>• If blasting is required this will be discussed further and agreed with SAC.</li> <li>• A method statement will be prepared and submitted to SAC detailing proposed mitigation measures to ensure water quality,</li> <li>• Forestry works will adhere to Forestry and Water guidelines.</li> <li>• Risk assessment measures and potential impacts associated with proposed future construction upon PWS will be provided.</li> <li>• A site specific emergency plan will be provided prior to the beginning of construction.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<p><b>Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that noise from the operational Mark Hill wind farm has been omitted.</li> <li>Note that 'Wind Turbine Development: Submission Guidance Note' (SAC SGN) issued by South Ayrshire Council Environmental Health has not been referred to.</li> <li>Advise that the study area should consider the relevant guidance on cumulative operational effects as well as potential direct effects arising as a result of the proposed Development.</li> <li>Suggest that the Planning Team/ACCON should be consulted, rather than the Environmental Health Team when determining background noise survey locations.</li> <li>Expect the advice detailed in the SAC SGN to be considered when the Applicants derive operational noise limits for the Development and in the approach to the cumulative assessment.</li> <li>Note that the mitigation of operational noise 'will be achieved through design of the proposed Development'. While this is considered appropriate, it is stated that the need for further mitigation cannot be completely ruled out.</li> <li>Confirm that operational effects on vibration can be scoped out of further assessment.</li> <li>Confirm that the proposed noise assessment methodology is acceptable and request that advice detailed within SAC scoping response is taken into consideration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic and Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ayrshire Roads Alliance understands that the proposed access route is located within Dumfries and Galloway and abnormal loads would not travel within the administrative boundary of SAC. As such, they have no detailed comments to make but state that they reserve the right to make comments when more information becomes available.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise concerns over the proposed lifespan of the wind farm and have suggested that this should be discussed in more detail.</li> <li>Maintain that any consent issued would require the need for decommissioning provisions.</li> <li>Recommend that the applicant details all significant impacts, relating to all issues, and the appropriate mitigation in one clearly identified chapter within the EIA Report.</li> <li>SAC require a performance bond for restoration, detailing the full restoration of the site, to be put in place prior to development commencing on site.</li> <li>Should consent be granted, SAC will require an independent Planning Monitoring Officer to ensure that necessary monitoring is taking place. This will be paid for by the developer.</li> <li>Where shadow flicker is confirmed to result in the loss of amenity, mitigation measures will be required.</li> <li>SAC's Sustainability (Biodiversity) officer agrees with the proposed assessment methodology and survey framework plan</li> <li>It is suggested that the Applicant consults with the South West Scotland Environmental Information Centre in relation to the proposals.</li> <li>Require further information on the nature of turbine lighting proposed and clarification on whether reduced intensity lighting or radar activated proximity lighting will be used.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mark Hill windfarm will be included in the noise assessment.</li> <li>The 'Wind Turbine Development: Submission Guidance Note' (SAC SGN) will be referred to.</li> <li>The EIA Report will consider cumulative and direct operational effects.</li> <li>The Planning Team/ ACCON will be consulted when determining background noise survey locations.</li> <li>Operational noise limits and cumulative effects will be determined based on the advice detailed in the SAC SGN.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held in relation to operational noise mitigation measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic and Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ayrshire Roads Alliance will be consulted again as the project progresses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed justification for the lifespan of the project will be detailed in the EIA Report and assessed accordingly.</li> <li>Mitigation will be provided in the relevant topic chapters within the EIA Report and summarised in a separate appendix.</li> <li>A performance bond for restoration will be provided to SAC.</li> <li>Mitigation measures will be put in place to address shadow flicker.</li> <li>South West Scotland Environmental Information Centre will be consulted.</li> <li>Further information on turbine lighting will be provided in the relevant topic chapter.</li> </ul>
SNH	11/04/2019	<p><b>Ecology and Ornithology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm they are broadly content with the proposed assessment methodology for ecology.</li> <li>Recommend that ecological chapters are separated based on topic and have provided examples such as protected areas, species (bat, birds) and habitats.</li> <li>Confirm that the Galloway Moors SSSI, Merrick Kells SSSI and SAC and Bogton Loch SSSI can be scoped out of the EIA.</li> <li>State that a number of protected species may be present and advise that species surveys should have been completed no more than 18 months prior to submission of the application.</li> <li>Advise that the Applicant familiarises themselves with the details of species and associated legislation and advise that any licensing issues are fully established as part of the planning application.</li> <li>Full details of survey methodologies, areas surveyed and details of any limitations to survey efforts should be included within the EIA Report. Where survey methods or other work deviates from published guidance, deviations should be agreed in writing with SNH in advance of carrying out survey work.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Ecology and Ornithology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Species surveys will be completed in no more than 18 months prior to submission.</li> <li>Legislation and licensing issues will be reviewed as part of the planning application.</li> <li>Full details of survey methodologies, limitations etc. will be set out in the topic chapters within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Justification for any deviation from published guidance will be provided and agreed in writing with SNH.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State that if survey work indicates that otters could be affected by the proposed Development, an otter protection plan should be prepared and put in place. If mitigation measures are not sufficient, a licence will be required before work starts.</li> <li>State that if any suitable roosting sites are identified then further survey work to identify presence or absence, species, numbers, roost function and flightlines should be undertaken prior to the submission and determination of any planning application for this proposal.</li> <li>With regards to the ground-level static surveys proposed for bats, provided SNH can get assurances from ITP Energised/SPR that at least 50% of detectors to be used will be full-spectrum detectors e.g. SM2s or SM4s then using a 50:50 combination of zero-crossing vs. full spectrum detectors would be acceptable. SNH further advise that the different detector types should be distributed randomly throughout the site during survey work.</li> <li>In relation to <i>Nyctalus spp</i>, if there are any met masts available on site, recommend that these should be used for at-height monitoring where available.</li> <li>Advise that a bat protection plan should be put in place if any roosts are found.</li> <li>Confirm that birds of low conservation value can be scoped out of further assessment.</li> <li>Agree that Great Crested Newt surveys can be scoped out of the EIA; the EIA Report should explain the rationale behind this.</li> <li>Advise that water vole, badger, red squirrel and pine marten protection plans should be put in place if any habitats or affected populations are found. A license will be required from SNH in the event that identified mitigation measures are deemed insufficient.</li> <li>Recommend that, at a minimum, all areas directly or indirectly affected by the development and appropriate buffers up and downstream should be subject to a habitat survey following the Scottish Fisheries Coordination Centre Method. This will inform the likelihood of the presence of salmonids, eels, freshwater pearl mussel and other protected/BAP species and the potential requirement for other species specific surveys.</li> <li>Recommend that if deer are present or use the site, an assessment into potential impacts on deer welfare, habitats, neighbouring and other interests should be carried out and presented. If the development will have significant impacts, a draft deer management plan should be produced setting out mitigation measures.</li> <li>Advise that ground or vegetation clearing are carried out outwith the main bird nesting season (March-August). If this is not possible an experienced ecologist should check the development site for presence of nesting birds. A suitable buffer should be set up around nests in the event of nesting birds being discovered.</li> <li>The EIA Report should include a map of the phase 1 and NVC survey results with the site boundary, turbines, tracks and infrastructure layout overlapping.</li> <li>Recommend SNH continues to engage with Forestry and Land Scotland regarding requirements for compensatory planting in line with Scottish Government woodland removal policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SNH confirm they are content with the approach to peat, peat slide risk and habitat proposed with planned mitigation.</li> <li>Peat surveys should be used to inform the design and layout of the windfarm to avoid, where possible, priority habitats and other sensitive areas.</li> <li>Advise that any blocking of drains with excavated peat needs to be carefully managed to avoid disproportionate tracking damage and the risk of redeposited peat entering water courses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State that the scale and layout of proposed turbines as well as their relationship to key characteristics would likely be inconsistent with the other schemes in the vicinity, resulting in a complex and confusing pattern of development.</li> <li>Advise that for turbines of this height, the study area should be &gt;45km.</li> <li>Recommend that the proposed co-located technologies and the context of the view should be clearly shown in visualisations for viewpoints &gt;5km.</li> <li>Suggest that a viewpoint location should be investigated at the south of the Isle of Arran from where turbines may be visible in the foreground of the Merrick WLA.</li> <li>Recommend clear numbering of turbines on at least one visualisation for each viewpoint.</li> <li>Recommend that effects on night skies should be appropriately considered given the proximity of the proposed Development to the Galloway Dark Sky and advise that the LVIA-related lightning assessment should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear information on the positions and intensity of lighting proposed on the turbines themselves and a plan showing which turbines (numbered turbines) would be lit.</li> <li>Production of a ZTV map which shows the areas from which the nacelle and tower lights may be seen.</li> <li>Annotation of the positions of turbine lighting (including intermediate tower lights) on all wirelines from every viewpoint.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIA Report will detail information in relation to roosting sites, if required.</li> <li>A bat protection plan will be put in place if roosts are found.</li> <li>Birds of low conservation value and Great Crested Newt will be scoped out of the EIA assessment with justification provided.</li> <li>Where appropriate, otter, water vole, badger, red squirrel and pine marten protection plans will be put in place where appropriate. If necessary, a license will be obtained from SNH.</li> <li>All areas directly or indirectly affected by the development and appropriate buffers up and downstream will be subject to a habitat survey following the Scottish Fisheries Coordination Centre Method.</li> <li>Habitat surveys will inform the likelihood of the presence of protected/BAP species and the potential requirement for other species specific surveys.</li> <li>If required, an assessment into the potential impacts on deer associated with the proposed development will be carried out and a draft deer management plan will be prepared if required.</li> <li>The EIA Report will include information on Phase 1 and NVC as well as a map which will be included with other relevant figures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results from peat surveys will be incorporated into the design and layout of the windfarm.</li> <li>A Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan will be prepared.</li> </ul> <p><b>Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further discussion will be held to determine an appropriate study area.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held in regards to a potential viewpoint located at the south of the Isle of Arran.</li> <li>Turbines will be clearly numbered on at least one visualisation.</li> <li>The suggestions given for the assessment of potential impacts upon the night sky will be addressed.</li> <li>A ZTV map showing where the nacelle and tower lights may be seen will be produced and included within the EIA Report figures.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A table which lists how many lit turbines will be visible from each viewpoint.</li> </ul>	
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	16/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the 5km study area to be too restrictive and should be expanded in order to consider the potential impacts on heritage assets beyond this distance and suggest that a ZTV model is applied to aid in the identification of these features.</li> <li>• Note that the Cairnderry, chambered cairn (SM1007) is located within the site boundary. Any works within the scheduled area of this monument would require prior written consent in the form of a Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) obtained through HES.</li> <li>• States that it would be unlikely that consent would be granted under an SMC. Thus, the applicant should take care to avoid planning any services, access or amendments to the scheme to avoid this Scheduled Monument and any others within the vicinity.</li> <li>• The proposal to widen the existing forestry track could have significant impacts on the setting of the cairn and should be considered throughout the planning and EIA assessment stages. HES notes that significant, indirect impacts upon the setting of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Balmalloch, chambered cairn (SM2503)</li> <li>- Cairn Kinna, two cairns 960m ESE of Corrafeckloch (SM1008)</li> <li>- Sheuchan's Cairn, chambered cairn, Highlandman's Rig (SM1041)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The EIA should provide a full consideration of any potential impacts expected to arise on the setting of these monuments as a result of the Proposed Development.</li> <li>• Further impacts upon any other heritage assets should be identified through ZTV analysis. Wireframes and photomontages should be provided to assist the assessment.</li> <li>• HES have offered to provide more detailed comments on draft visualisations once they are available.</li> <li>• HES advise that new policy guidance has been published and comes into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2019 when it will replace the existing Historic Environment Policy Scotland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further discussion will be held to determine an appropriate study area.</li> <li>• Potentially significant effects associated with the widening of existing forestry track in relation to the setting of the specified Scheduled Monuments will be fully detailed within the EIA Report.</li> <li>• Impacts upon other heritage assets will be identified through ZTV analysis. Wireframes and photomontages will be provided.</li> <li>• HES will be consulted on draft visualisations.</li> <li>• The new HES policy will be referred to throughout the relevant topic chapter.</li> </ul>
Dumfries and Galloway Council	13/05/2019	<p><b>Archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that at 150m, turbines are likely to have a widespread visibility within 10km of the site. A potentially wide effect on historic character can be anticipated and should be assessed. Recommend that nationally significant sites (Scheduled Monuments, Inventory Designed Landscapes, A-listed buildings and unscheduled sites considered by the local authority to be of national significance) out to 10km should be assessed, as well as regionally significant Non-Inventory Designed Landscapes and Archaeologically Sensitive Areas. Regionally significant historic assets out to 5km should also be included. Promoted heritage sites along the Southern Upland Way should also be assessed where they fall within the ZTV.</li> <li>• State that the potential for indirect effects on the following Designated monuments within a 10km boundary should be undertaken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cairnderry cairn (HS ref SM1007);</li> <li>- White Cairn (SM1048); and</li> <li>- Loch Maberry Castle (SM1991).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Council Archaeologist should be consulted to agree the final list of assets to be assessed for setting effects in the EIA.</li> <li>• Request that the Council's Historic Environment Record be provided with the final gazetteer of sites in digital format, along with corresponding GIS datasets for the location and extent of any identified assets, as well as the extent of the walkover.</li> <li>• Note that the designated Scheduled Monument of Cairnderry Cairn lies immediately adjacent to the forestry access road from the A714. The designated area runs right up to the western boundary of the road itself. Any proposed alteration to the entry off the A714 must avoid direct impacts on the cairn itself, and any road improvement schemes be confined to the eastern side of the existing forest road. State that mitigation will be required.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size of the study area will be confirmed by the project archaeologist in agreement with consultees and viewpoints will also be confirmed.</li> <li>• Data will be provided to DGC to supplement the HER.</li> <li>• Requirement to protect Cairnderry Cairn noted.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection in principal.</li> <li>Recommend consulting Transport Scotland and the South of Scotland Timber Transport Officer.</li> <li>Recommend any future application identifies the full extent of proposed off-site road accommodation and mitigation works including passing place provision, carriageway strengthening, widening and alterations to road boundaries all along any proposed access routes and the potential impacts on utility services lying within the public road boundary.</li> <li>All accommodation works must be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority in consultation with the Roads Authority and will require appropriate permits and consents to have been issued.</li> <li>Proposals for all accommodation works should be supported by swept path tracks.</li> <li>Where public road boundaries are to be altered either for the formation of temporary accesses or for accommodation works, these should be reinstated in their original position at the conclusion of construction works (unless prior agreements have been secured with the Planning and Road Authorities).</li> <li>Recommend preparation of a TMP that should information on projected traffic movements associated by programme month and vehicle type, details of all proposed mitigation measures, agreed and excluded access routes, enforcement measures (driver code of conduct and disciplinary action) and details of measures to ensure that no stacking of delivery vehicles occur on any part of the public road network. The TMP should acknowledge that co-ordination phasing may be required to mitigate against any cumulative traffic impact associated with other schemes using the road network.</li> <li>In the event that suitable and sufficient aggregate not be available from onsite Borrow Pits, any future submission/ES should include details of tonnages and vehicle movements so that the potential impact of importing aggregate from elsewhere via the public road network be assessed;</li> <li>Note that a Section 96 agreement will be required to ensure the immediate execution of any repairs and will be required to meet the cost of above average maintenance to the public road network arising from the concentration of heavy traffic associated with this development.</li> <li>Where an access route crosses bridges and culverts, the applicant will require to get approvals (in respect of those structures) from the Council's Engineering Design Bridges and Structures Unit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council notes that the policies identified in table 4.1 all relate to the South Ayrshire Council LDP. In terms of Dumfries and Galloway Council's adopted LDP, an assessment of the following additional policies would be welcomed: Policy HE1: Listed Buildings, HE3: Archaeology and HE6: Gardens and Designed Landscapes. Further National Policy on the cultural environment (as outlined in the Council archaeologist response) would also be welcomed.</li> </ul> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the Council considers that that the structure of the scoping report is clear and sets out a prudent approach to the topics that may give rise to significant effects and should be fully examined in the forthcoming EIA Report.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Scotland and South of Scotland Timber Transport Officer will be consulted</li> <li>Any offsite works will be identified in the EIA report.</li> <li>Swept path analysis will be undertaken.</li> <li>A TMP will be prepared.</li> <li>Further consultation will be undertaken with DGC's Engineering Design Bridges and Structures Unit as require.</li> </ul> <p><b>Planning</b></p> <p>All relevant policies will be considered in the EIA Report.</p> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>



Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
SEPA	17/04/2019	<p><b>Site Specific Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise that the EIA addresses the following key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications.</li> <li>Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers.</li> <li>Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.</li> <li>Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals.</li> <li>Map and table detailing forest removal.</li> <li>Map and site layout of borrow pits.</li> <li>Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures.</li> <li>Borrow Pit Site Management Plan of pollution prevention measures.</li> <li>Map of proposed waste water drainage layout.</li> <li>Map of proposed surface water drainage layout.</li> <li>Map of proposed water abstractions including details of the proposed operating regime.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Advise that all maps must be based on an adequate scale (e.g. from OS 1: 10,000 to a more detailed scale in more sensitive locations).</li> <li>Each of the maps must detail all proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent site infrastructure, including all tracks, excavations, buildings, borrow pits, pipelines, cabling, site compounds, laydown areas, storage areas, and any other built elements.</li> <li>Recognise that areas of the proposed site lie within an established Sitka Spruce plantation and advise that the use of 'forestry wastes' will only be supported by SEPA when these uses are considered to be beneficial for habitat creation. Depending on the scale of the 'forestry works' the applicant may choose to submit their plans as a dedicated Chapter in the EIA.</li> <li>Satisfied that the key environmental issues and potential impacts relevant to SEPA's areas of interest have been identified and will be carried forward for further assessment within the EIA Report.</li> <li>State that existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded wherever possible. The layout should be designed to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed ground.</li> <li>Note in the scoping report that flood risk may be an issue on parts of the site and will therefore expect sufficient detail to be provided in the EIA which will ensure that the site activities will not exacerbate the existing flood risk extent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise that the most cost effective and environmentally sound methodology for dealing with peat and its potential constraints is the promotion of the avoidance principle, especially in regards to Class 1 Priority Peatland.</li> <li>State that peat disturbance should be minimised and full details on the proposed reuse of peat. SEPA will not support activities which it considers to be disposal. All of these matters should be addressed within the Peat Management Plan.</li> <li>Highlight that authorisation is required under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) to carry out engineering works in or in the vicinity of inland surface waters (other than groundwater) or wetlands.</li> <li>State that management of surplus peat or soils may require an exemption under The Waste Management Licensing (Scotland) Regulations 2011. Any proposed crushing or screening will require a permit under The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012.</li> <li>State that consideration of other environmental licences may be required for any installations or processes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Site Specific Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All maps will be produced to the required specifications and will include the information set out within the response.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held on the decision to prepare a dedicated forestry chapter.</li> <li>Existing infrastructure will be re-used and upgraded where possible</li> <li>The required information on flood risk at the Site will be provided within the relevant EIA Chapter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Peat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The avoidance principle will be employed, where possible.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held on the design of the development to ensure that peat disturbance is kept to a minimum.</li> <li>A Peat Management Plan will be produced.</li> <li>The relevant legislation will be followed throughout the preparation of the EIA Report.</li> <li>The requirement for other environmental licenses will be explored.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<p><b>Hydrology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) construction site licence will be required for management of surface water run-off from a construction site, including access track which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is more than 4 hectares;</li> <li>Is in excess of 5km;</li> <li>Includes an areas of includes an area of more than 1 hectare or length of more than 500m on ground with a slope in excess of 25°.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Advise that Applicant to consult SEPA's Sector Specific Guidance: Construction Sites (WAT-SG-75) for further details. Strongly recommends the applicant engages in pre-CAR application discussions with a member of the regulatory services team in the relevant SEPA office as Site design may be affected by pollution prevention requirements. Below these thresholds, the applicant is required to comply with CAR General Binding Rule 10 which requires that all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that the discharge does not result in pollution of the water environment.</li> <li>State that the site must be designed to avoid impacts upon the water environment. Where watercourse crossings, watercourse diversions or other engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment cannot be avoided then the submission must include justification of this and a map showing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All proposed temporary or permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses.</li> <li>A minimum buffer of 50m around each loch or watercourse. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse and drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works.</li> <li>Detailed layout of all proposed mitigation including all cut off drains, location, number and size of settlement ponds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>State that if water abstractions or dewatering are proposed, a table of volumes and timings of groundwater abstractions and related mitigation measures must be provided.</li> <li>Watercourse crossings must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flows, or information provided to justify smaller structures.</li> <li>If the development could result in an increased risk of flooding to a nearby receptor, then a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted in support of the planning application. Highlights that SEPA's Technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders outlines the information required for submission as part of a Flood Risk Assessment. States that Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) Flood Risk Standing Advice for Engineering, Discharge and Impoundment Activities should also be referred to.</li> <li>An assessment of Groundwater Dependent Ecosystems should be carried out and a map provided showing that all potential GWDTEs are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of excavations deeper than 1m. A detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment should be undertaken if these buffers cannot be accommodated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Forestry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information detailing forest removal is requested with SEPA requesting that key holing must be used where possible to avoid significant quantities of waste material.</li> <li>The EIA Report should assess the potential effects of forestry felling on water quality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Borrow Pits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEPA request that maps detailing the location, size, depths and dimensions of borrow pits as well as sections and plans setting out the restoration process should be included. Justification for each borrow pit location should also be included.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pollution Prevention</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A schedule of mitigation supported by the above site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques, regulatory requirements, ECOW responsibilities, site inspections and monitoring.</li> </ul> <p><b>Life extension, repowering and decommissioning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals for life extension, repowering and/or decommissioning must demonstrate accordant with SEPA Guidance on the life extension and decommissioning of onshore wind farms.</li> <li>The submission needs to demonstrate that there will be no discarding of materials that are likely to be classified as waste as any such proposals would be unacceptable under waste management licensing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Hydrology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All relevant policies and guidance will be considered in the EIA Report.</li> <li>The specified information, where relevant will be included within the related EIA topic chapters.</li> <li>The specified legislation will be adhered to within the EIA Report,</li> <li>Detailed information on site design and mitigation measures to avoid impacts on the water environment will be included within the relevant topic chapter.</li> <li>If relevant, a table detailing water abstractions and timings will be provided.</li> <li>A Flood Risk Assessment will be prepared in support of the planning application. All required information will be provided.</li> <li>Further discussion on the assessment of GWDTE will be carried out in order to determine if this is required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Forestry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on forestry strategy will be detailed within the relevant topic chapter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Borrow Pits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Borrow pit maps and justification will be provided within the EIA Report.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pollution Prevention</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A schedule of mitigation measures will be set out within the relevant topic chapters.</li> </ul> <p><b>Life extension, repowering and decommissioning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All specified guidance will be referred to within the EIA Report.</li> <li>The EIA Report will demonstrate that there will be no discarding of waste material.</li> </ul>
<b>Non-Statutory Consultees</b>			
Barrhill Community Council	01/05/2019	Confirmed no comments.	Noted.

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
Cree Valley Community Council	08/04/2019	<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State that Kilgallioch Windfarm is in Dumfries and Galloway as opposed to South Ayrshire as stated in Scoping Report (N.B. SR stated "SPR currently owns and operates five windfarms in the South Ayrshire administrative boundary, namely Arecleoch, Dersalloch, Glen App, Kilgallioch and Mark Hill". As Kilgallioch does fall partly within the S.A administrative boundary and the D&amp;GC, wording in SR considered to be accurate).</li> <li>State the EIA must include an investigation into the effects of the windfarm in relation to additional surface water run-off which may potentially increase flood risk within the River Cree catchment.</li> <li>Note that the public road from Bargrennan to Straiton, located adjacent to the site, has not been mentioned and that this road is used frequently by the local community and tourists.</li> <li>State that the Cairnryan Port is not a feasible alternative compared to the George V Docks.</li> <li>Object to Newton Stewart being described as a "settlement".</li> <li>State that the delivery of any Community Benefit Package or Shared Ownership Scheme must be a condition within any consent which is granted and note that they wish to see the failure in the delivery of the Community Benefit Package (in regards to Kilgallioch Windfarm) form a material consideration when evaluating the socio-economic impact of the Clauchrie development.</li> </ul>	<p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further discussion will be held in relation to the effects of the windfarm on increased surface run off within the River Cree catchment.</li> <li>The effects on users of the Bargrennan to Straiton road will be considered in the EIA Report where necessary.</li> <li>The location of turbine delivery will be considered further by SPR.</li> <li>SPR will commit to provision of community benefit at a level to be confirmed.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Landscape and Visual Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State that the Challoch viewpoint should be the midpoint of the Barnkirk Road; Challoch is the very lowest point in the area.</li> <li>The summit of the Merrick which is within the Cree Valley Community is the most significant viewpoint and must be given a considerable weighting in the evaluation.</li> <li>The views of the Galloway Mountain Rescue Team should also be considered. Their members have both an affinity with and a vast knowledge of the Galloway Hills.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Landscape and Visual Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The viewpoints will be confirmed through further consultation.</li> <li>The Galloway Mountain Rescue team will be consulted,</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State that the effects of peat disturbance upon the hydrology of the River Cree must be considered and that peat disturbance during clear felling should be considered.</li> <li>Mitigation measures must be put in place to reduce run off and subsequent impacts upon the ecology of the River Cree during periods of heavy rainfall.</li> <li>Do not agree that operational effects upon hydrology should be scoped out.</li> <li>Note that the guidance will not provide detailed information and knowledge on the River Cree catchment and will subsequently fail to evaluate the effect of the development upon downstream flooding.</li> <li>Recommend that the flood studies carried out by Dumfries and Galloway Council are considered.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects of peat disturbance during clear felling upon the hydrology of the River Cree will be considered within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Mitigation measures will be put in place to reduce subsequent impacts upon the River Cree during periods of heavy rainfall.</li> <li>Flood assessment studies carried out by Dumfries and Galloway Council will be considered within the EIA Report.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not agree with the proposed survey approach and state that effects on the salmon population in the High Cree must be considered as well as all fish species.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fish surveys will be undertaken.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree that the study area and assessment method are acceptable.</li> <li>Note that the turbine delivery would pass through the main street of Newton Stewart, with the consultee stating that this would be unacceptable.</li> <li>Recommend that additional passing places are constructed along the A714 to prevent congestion.</li> <li>Requests a meeting to discuss a more appropriate route and methodology.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Turbine delivery routes will be assessed in the EIA Report and consideration will be given to the requirement for additional passing places on the A714.</li> <li>SPR will consult further with Cree Valley CC.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the River Stinchar is located 3km to the north of the Site.</li> <li>Advise that the River Cree District Salmon Fishery Board and the River Cree Hatchery and Habitat Trust should also be consulted.</li> <li>Note that the impacts associated with loss of wilderness may have a substantial impact upon tourism and the subsequent impacts upon the economy of the Cree Valley should be considered.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The River Cree District Salmon Fishery Board and the River Cree Hatchery and Habitat Trust will be consulted.</li> <li>Impacts upon tourism and economy of the Cree Valley will be considered within the</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
			relevant topic chapter.
VisitScotland	04/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise that the Applicant should consider the findings from the VisitScotland Visitor Experience Survey (2015/2016)</li> <li>Note the importance of the UNESCO Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere and advises that the Applicant considers the impacts of the proposed development.</li> <li>Recommend that research from the Scottish Government on the impact of wind farms on tourism is given full consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration will be given to the Scottish Government on the impact of wind farms within the relevant topic chapter.</li> </ul>
British Horse Society	08/05/2019 09/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that there is equestrian interest in the area and provided a copy of 'Wind Turbines and Horses – Guidance for Planners and Developers'.</li> <li>Noted opportunities for provision of equestrian access as a safe off-road alternative for walking, riding and carriage driving and offered to discuss access provision. further</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Marine Scotland	27/03/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights the known acidification issues within the area.</li> <li>Suggests that the Galloway Fisheries Trust and the Cree District Salmon Fishery Board are consulted.</li> <li>Advise that the Applicant refers to the <a href="#">generic scoping and monitoring guidelines</a> provided by Marine Scotland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Galloway Fisheries Trust was consulted (see comments below).</li> <li>Advice provided by Marine Scotland will be taken into consideration.</li> </ul>
Scottish Water	27/03/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection to the proposed development and advise that there is no public Scottish Water, Waste Water infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed development but recommend contact be made with the Scottish Water Asset Impact Team to confirm this.</li> <li>Confirms that there are no drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources within the area which may be affected by the proposed Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Scottish Water impact team will be contacted.</li> </ul>
RSPB Scotland	30/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that a HMP is developed and that it should aim to deliver net biodiversity gain as part of the project.</li> <li>Confirm that it is acceptable to scope out potential impacts upon the Glen App and Galloway Moors SPA and SSSI, the Bogton Loch SSSI and Merrick Kells SSS.</li> <li>Confirm that the ongoing surveys and those carried out to date (December 2018) are acceptable and that the approach to the ornithological assessment is appropriate and no further species need to be identified.</li> <li>Reiterate that low conservation value species can be scoped out of further assessment.</li> <li>Note that the proposed mitigation is appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Habitat Management Plan will be developed and will aim to deliver net biodiversity gains.</li> </ul>
Galloway Fisheries Trust	24/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the proposed development could impact upon a number of watercourses within the Cree catchment and that the site access route will cross a number of significant Cree tributaries.</li> <li>Highlights the existing acidification problems associated with extensive conifer afforestation and the drainage of deep peat within the upper Cree Catchment. The subsequent acidification has impacted on wild fish populations. Note that large scale conifer felling and the disruption of peat soils would be expected to further deteriorate water quality and increase acidification.</li> <li>State that monitoring for changes in pH will require careful design as pH levels will fluctuate depending on factors such as river flows and seasonality. GFT advise that spot sampling may not be adequate and constant water quality monitoring equipment would be required.</li> <li>Request the opportunity to comment on any water quality monitoring plan based on extensive experience in monitoring acidification throughout Galloway.</li> <li>Strongly disagree with the conclusion in 7.3.3.2.9 that no fish surveys are required. The consultee highlights that at least 8 significant watercourses which could experience impacts associated with the proposed development and state that it is essential that an up-to-date baseline wild fish survey is carried out for the scoping. Consider that the risk of impacts upon fish populations from reduced water quality and construction of crossing points will require a detailed baseline fish survey.</li> <li>Note that some salmon stocking takes place in the Fardin and Clauchrie Burn further downstream from the development site.</li> <li>GFT have offered to provide comments on proposed baseline fish survey methodology and survey site locations.</li> <li>Highlight the presence of the remains of a freshwater pearl mussel shell from previous survey work. Furthermore, pearl mussel surveys may be required in relation to instream works (i.e. culvert placing) in water courses which are large enough and a suitable habitat to support freshwater pearl mussels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential impacts of the proposed Development upon the watercourses within the Cree catchment will be assessed.</li> <li>Mitigation measures to limit the disruption of peat will be detailed within the relevant topic chapter.</li> <li>An up to date wild fish baseline and consideration of potential impacts upon wild fish populations associated with the proposed Development will be set out in the relevant topic chapters.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held with GFT to determine methodology and site survey locations.</li> <li>Further discussion will be held on pearl mussel surveys.</li> </ul>
NATS Safeguarding	01/04/2019	Confirmed no conflict with safeguarding criteria and no objection to the proposal in relation to safeguarding.	Noted.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	10/04/2019	DIO has no objections to the proposal.	Noted.

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
Transport Scotland	09/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the preparation of an Abnormal Loads Assessment Report but highlight that any proposed amendments to the trunk road network will need to be discussed and agreed upon with Area Managers.</li> <li>No comments on the access point for the proposed development.</li> <li>Satisfied with the proposed scoping out of traffic and transport impacts at both the operational and decommissioning phases.</li> <li>Note that where environmental impacts have been investigated but found to have little or no significance, the assessment should report back on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work that has been undertaken (e.g. Transport/ Noise Assessments);</li> <li>What this has shown (i.e. what impact has been identified); and</li> <li>Why is it not significant.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any proposed amendments to the trunk road network will be discussed in advance with the responsible Area Managers.</li> <li>The EIA Report will set out the assessment information requested by Transport Scotland.</li> </ul>
Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays)	03/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a map of routes relevant to the proposed development.</li> <li>Highlight that rights of way SKC3 and SKC5 are within the proposed developable area and as a result are likely to be affected. Rights of Way SKC4 and DW36/ SKC36 lie within the wider site boundary.</li> <li>Note that the areas forestry is used recreationally by mountain bikers.</li> <li>State that the scope of Chapter 12: Socio-economics overlooks the presence of onsite rights of way and promoted recreational routes.</li> <li>Highlight that the surrounding forestry is used for recreational purposes and forms a key part of the public access network which is already promoted.</li> <li>Note that there are opportunities for enhancement of the public access network as part of the proposed Development.</li> <li>Suggest that advice from the Welsh Assembly Government's Technical Advice Note on Renewable Energy (TAN 8) may be helpful in relation to the proximity to the proposed Development to highways and railways.</li> <li>Anticipates that the EIA Report will provide confirmation of the separation distance between turbines and identified onsite public access networks.</li> <li>Notes that right of way DW36/SKC36 are likely to experience visual impacts and anticipate that the management of the site track layout and the impact upon the public access network will be included within the EIA Report.</li> <li>Note that effects upon recreational visual receptors will be considered within the LVIA. Anticipates that more viewpoints will be included within assessment to assess impacts upon users of the directly affected rights of way and other areas of the public access network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A map of routes relevant to the proposed Development will be provided and included within the relevant topic chapter.</li> <li>Information and potential impacts upon Rights of way SKC3 / SKC5 / DW36/ SC36 will be assessed.</li> <li>The assessment will consider onsite rights of way and promoted recreational routes.</li> <li>Potential opportunities for the public access network as part of the proposed Development will be considered.</li> <li>The EIA Report will detail the separation distance between wind turbines and onsite public accesses.</li> <li>The final list of viewpoints will be confirmed with consultees.</li> </ul>
Joint Radio Company	26/03/2019	JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and data provided within the Scoping Report.	Noted.
BT	27/03/2019	Advised that the windfarm is not expected to cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	Noted.
The Coal Authority	08/04/2019	No comment.	Noted.
West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WOSAS)	28/03/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight the presence of a second Scheduled Monument immediately adjacent to the site (SM10986). There are also several non-designated sites which are of regional and potentially national importance, despite not being currently scheduled.</li> <li>Suggest that an outer study area extends to at least 10km from the turbines.</li> <li>Agree with the suggestion that the assessment considers the impact of the windfarm on the setting of undesignated assets of more than local importance that fall within the outer study area.</li> <li>Suggest there should be some assessment on the impact of the windfarm on the setting of other categories of undesignated sites, including those of regional importance, or those where wider setting would have been a significant factor in the selection of their position in the landscape.</li> <li>Suggest that consideration should be given to sites that were identified as being of potentially schedulable quality in the old Non-Statutory Register (NSR). A number of features that fall within the NRS are present both within the development area and on its immediate boundaries.</li> <li>Suggest that any walkover surveys should cover the full extent of the site, rather than targeting specific areas of disturbance as this will provide a much more comprehensive picture of the archaeological baseline.</li> <li>Agree that the range of options proposed for mitigation appears to be appropriate in order to address possible direct impacts on archaeology and the historic environment resulting from construction of the proposed Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially significant effects upon the setting and character of the specified Scheduled Monument will be detailed.</li> <li>Further discussions will be held in order to determine an appropriate study area.</li> <li>Effects upon the setting of relevant Cultural Heritage assets of regional importance will be assessed within the EIA Report.</li> <li>The NRS will be considered.</li> </ul>
Ayrshire Rivers Trust/ Ayrshire Fisheries Trust/ River Stinchar District Salmon Fisheries Board	03/05/2019	<p><b>Ecology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that an environmental baseline for freshwater fish and macroinvertebrate populations should be provided.</li> <li>Suggest that monitoring during and after construction is undertaken as part of design and mitigation. Monitoring locations within Ayrshire relate to turbines T1, T4, T7 and T2 with all remaining turbine locations falling on the watershed within Dumfries and Galloway.</li> <li>Highlight the importance of the Muck Water for juvenile salmonids and nursery habitats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline information for freshwater fish and macroinvertebrate populations will be provided.</li> <li>SPR will consider the requirement for future monitoring.</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight the importance of protecting the surrounding water courses from pollution incidents during the installation of the proposed Development.</li> <li>Note that, depending on the severity of the pollution event, there could be potential knock-on effects to substrates and habitats further down the catchment.</li> <li>Note that fine sediments and silt can result in adverse impacts upon the ecology of rivers. Fish, in particular, are vulnerable as silts and sediments can damage gills, increase rates of infection. Sediments can also reduce the amount of available habitats for refuge and spawning.</li> <li>Highlight that European eels (<i>Anguilla Anguilla</i>) are present within the Muck Water and are registered as critically endangered on the IUCN Red List.</li> <li>Disagrees with the proposed approach to not include assessment of water suitability or fish populations.</li> <li>Suggest that impacts associated with the proposed Development will be unknown if effects to the watercourse and fish populations are not monitored.</li> <li>Agree with the proposed ecological surveys for water vole, badger and otter surveys.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts on surrounding water courses will be assessed in the EIA Report.</li> <li>Mitigation measures to prevent excess silt entering surrounding water courses will be put in place during construction.</li> <li>The presence of European eels is noted.</li> <li>An assessment of water suitability and fish populations will be carried out.</li> <li>Monitoring will take place to determine the impacts of the proposed Development upon watercourses and fish populations.</li> </ul>
Scottish Forestry	10/05/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request inclusion of a stand-alone chapter on 'Woodland management and tree felling'.</li> <li>Noted that any permanent woodland removal must be quantified and proposals for woodland creation to compensate for this woodland loss should be provided to allow compliance with the Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy.</li> <li>Note that Scottish Forestry is the main forestry consultee in drafting a Windfarm Long-term Forest Plan; note that this should be provided as an appendix to the EIA Report.</li> <li>Note that felling operations and compensatory planting (if relevant) must be carried out in accordance to good forestry practice as defined in the UK Forestry Standard (UKFS).</li> <li>Recommend ongoing consultation throughout the EIA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on effects on forestry will be included in the EIA Report, either as a separate chapter or appendix.</li> <li>Consideration will be given to the Control of Woodland Removal Policy requirements.</li> <li>An appendix will be provided detailing the Windfarm Long-term Forest Plan.</li> <li>Further consultation with FS will be undertaken as the EIA progresses.</li> </ul>
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	17/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that appropriate radar modelling and Line of Sight analysis is carried out in order to ensure that the proposed development does not interfere with air traffic radar displays.</li> <li>States that the windfarm is within the operational range of the Glasgow Prestwick Airport radar, and if any turbines are visible to the radar, they may impact the performance of the radar displays in the airspace above the radar visible turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate radar modelling and Line of Sight analysis will be carried out to determine the potential impacts on air traffic radar displays.</li> </ul>
Mountaineering Scotland	17/04/2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cite concerns over the visual impact from The Merrick Range and the Curlywee- Lamachan group south of Glentrool.</li> <li>State that the organisation previously objected to a proposal at Balunton (9 turbines of 125m) due to adverse visual impact on the surrounding landscapes and WLA and due to cumulative visual impact associated with the Balunton windfarm being located close to other windfarm developments.</li> <li>State that the Cairnmore of Carsphairn is too far away to be used as a viewpoint and request closer viewpoints representing nearby popular hills instead e.g. the Lamachan/Curlywee group to the south east of Glentrool.</li> <li>Note that the northern end of the Merrick range at Shalloch on Minnoch is not covered, however it is recognised that this may duplicate the assessment for the Merrick.</li> <li>State that it is not clear how the effect on walkers on the Galloway hills will be assessed and note that consideration of recreational effects will only be assessed within 2km of the site.</li> <li>Note that there is variation in the study area. Paragraph 12.4.2.3 implies consideration of recreation effects will only be within 2km of the site while paragraph 12.4.4.3 states 5km.</li> <li>Assumes that hill routes and summits will be treated as notable points of focus for visitor attractions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate assessment of the potential visual impacts will be carried out.</li> <li>Further discussion and consultation will be carried out in relation to viewpoints.</li> <li>Clarification on the assessment of the effects on hillwalkers will be provided within the relevant topic chapter.</li> <li>Clarification will be provided on the correct dimensions of the study area,</li> <li>Hill routes and summits will be treated as notable points of focus for visitor attractions and appropriate assessment will be detailed within the relevant topic chapter.</li> </ul>
Barr Community Council	No response	n/a	n/a
Pinmore and Pinwherry Community Council	No response	n/a	n/a
Fisheries Management Scotland	No response	n/a	n/a
John Muir Trust	No response	n/a	n/a
Scottish Wild Land Group	No response	n/a	n/a
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	No response	n/a	n/a
Scottish Wildlife Trust	No response	n/a	n/a

Consultee	Response Date	Key Comments	Response/Action to be taken in EIA Report
Ofcom	No response	n/a	n/a
Crown Estate Scotland	No response	n/a	n/a

**Clachrie Windfarm Project Team**

**ScottishPower Renewables**  
9th Floor Scottish Power Headquarters  
320 St Vincent Street  
Glasgow  
G2 5AD

**[clachriewindfarm@scottishpower.com](mailto:clachriewindfarm@scottishpower.com)**

