

Volume 4 Technical Appendix 6.1: Consultation Matrix

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Responses

The Harestanes West Windfarm EIA Scoping Report was submitted to the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU) in March 2023. The ECU distributed the Scoping Report and requested scoping opinions from the stakeholders and consultees listed in Table 1, below.

Table 1 Scoping Responses

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
Statutory Consultees					
Energy Consents Unit	Carolanne Brown Case Officer	ECU00004778 Carolanne.Brown@gov.scot	Scoping Opinion Letter response (via email) dated 03.11.23	<p>With regard to consultees that did not respond, it is assumed that they have no comment, however each would be consulted again in the event that an application for section 36 consent is submitted subsequent to this EIA scoping opinion.</p> <p>EIA Report (EIAR) to consider in full all consultation responses.</p> <p>Scottish Ministers are satisfied with the scope of the EIA set out in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The application will be required to clearly set out the generation station(s) that consent is being sought for. For each generating station details of the proposal require to include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scale of the development (dimensions of the wind turbines, solar panels, battery storage); Components required for each generating station; and Minimum and maximum export capacity of megawatts and megawatt hours of electricity for battery storage. <p>The applicant is to contact Scottish Water (via EIA@scottishwater.co.uk) and make enquires to confirm whether there are any Scottish Water assets which may be affected by the development and includes details in the EIAR of any relevant mitigation measures to be provided.</p> <p>This applicant should investigate the presence of any private water supplies which may be impacts by the development. Details of supplies identified should be included in the EIAR and an assessment of potential impacts, risks, and mitigation.</p> <p>Peat landslide hazard and risk assessment to be undertaken as part of EIA process. The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessments: Best Practice Guidance for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (Second Edition) should be followed and clear justification provided is a PLHRA is not required.</p> <p>Historic Environment Scotland advised an appropriately scaled ZTV is used to identify heritage assets.</p> <p>Noise Assessment should be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards as detailed in Chapter 8 of the scoping report. The noise assessment report should be formatted as per Table 6.1 of the IOA "A Good</p>	<p>The EIA Report has considered all consultation responses received via the EIA scoping process.</p> <p>Note the proposed Development no longer includes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) but Chapter 3 Proposed Development have included the relevant details for the scheme.</p> <p>This has been undertaken, although the Scottish Water EIA email address is no longer in use so a reply was not received. Consultation with Scottish Water has taken place, see details below. Details have been reported in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>This has been undertaken and has been reported in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>This has been undertaken and will has been reported in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Information to inform the settings assessment has been included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise.</p> <p>The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) has stated there would be concerns over the present reserved noise budget being reached at 0.336bn rms. A noise budget has been allocated to regulate the development of wind turbines within a 50km radius of the Eskdalemuir Seismological Recording Station array.</p> <p>The applicant is to keep up to date with the information provided by the Eskdalemuir Working Group and contact the DIO to discuss possible mitigation measures. Enquires to be directed to Temeeka.Dawson@gov.scot.</p> <p>The LVIA in Chapter 4 of the scoping report required to include a Night-time Assessment with agreed viewpoints to consider the effects of aviation lighting and mitigation of the effects.</p> <p>A full ornithological assessment should be made following discussion between the applicant and NatureScot.</p> <p>When considering proposed borrow pits as a source of on-site aggregate, it is essential to include them in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR). The EIAR should provide detailed information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location, Size, and Nature: Exact location, dimensions, and characteristics of the borrow pits. • Depth of Excavation: Comparison between the proposed depth and the actual topography and water table. • Drainage and Settlement Traps: Planned drainage systems and settlement traps to manage water flow and sediment. • Turf and Overburden Management: Methods for removing and storing turf and overburden for future site reinstatement. • Restoration Profile: Detailed plans for restoring the site after excavation is complete. <p>Additionally, the EIAR must assess the impact of these borrow pits on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust Emission • Blasting Activities • Water Quality and Hydrology <p>The assessment should adhere to the guidelines in 'Pan 50: Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings'.</p> <p>Further engagement is required between parties regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys; • Management plans; • Peat; • Radio links; • Finalisation of viewpoint • Cultural heritage; • Cumulative assessments; and <p>Ministers are kept informed of relevant discussions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures suggested to be presented as a conclusion to each chapter</p>	<p>This has been undertaken and has been reported in Chapter 13 Noise of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The matter of Eskdalemuir has been addressed in Chapter 14 Other Issues of the EIA Report.</p> <p>NatureScot and Dumfries and Galloway Council have been consulted on the approach to night-time assessment and agreed viewpoints, and the assessment included in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the EIA Report. – see correspondence noted.</p> <p>A summary of consultation held with NatureScot is presented below. Ornithological impacts have been assessed in Chapter 9 Ornithology of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The proposed Development does not involve the creation of new borrow pits; instead, it is proposed that suitable aggregate is won from existing borrow pits on the Site currently operated by Forestry and Land Scotland (FLS). Appropriate details have been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The ECU has been kept informed of consultations undertaken for the proposed Development. A summary of effects including information on mitigation measures have been included in Chapters 7 to 14 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>A Schedule of Commitments in tabular form has been included in Chapter 15 of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Consolidated schedule of mitigation measure are to be provided in tabular form.</p> <p>Recommended that advice regarding the requirement for an additional scoping opinion be sought from Scottish Ministers in the event no application has been submitted within 12 months from the date of this opinion.</p> <p>Applicant is to engage with ECU at the pre-app stage and before proposals reach design freeze.</p> <p>EIAR summary to be provided in tabular form of where within the EIAR each of the specific matters raised in this scoping opinion has been addressed.</p> <p>EIAR and associated documentation to be divided and appropriately named, separating file sizes no more than 10Mb, for upload onto the Energy Consents Portal.</p>	<p>Further consultation with the ECU took place in May 2024.</p> <p>An updated version of this table forms part of the EIA Report to address this request.</p>
NatureScot	Dylan Desilva Operations Officer	dylan.desilva@nature.scot	Scoping response letter dated 17.04.2023 emailed to ECU	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact NatureScot is satisfied with the proposed viewpoints and scope of potential receptors</p> <p>Ornithology At current stage Castle Loch, Lochmaben SPA and Ramsar site, Upper Solway Flats and Marshes PSA and Ramsar site cannot be scoped out from the assessment due to presence of Pink-footed geese.</p> <p>If no assessment is undertaken, EIA must indicate why there is not anticipated effect on this species.</p> <p>Similar clarification on whether wildfowl are to be scoped in/out is required.</p> <p>NatureScot is in agreement with principals outlined in paragraph 184. Until full ornithological assessment is received, the suitability of mitigation for ornithological interests cannot be decided at this stage.</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement High standard of mitigation and habitat management plan to be produced alongside the EIA.</p>	<p>A Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) screening to accompany the EIA Report has included these elements and assessed impacts on these designated sites and associated qualifying features (i.e. pink-footed goose). All impacts on designated sites and target species are has been assessed within the ornithology chapter.</p> <p>An Outline Habitat Management Plan/Biodiversity Enhancement Plan has been included as part of the EIA Report.</p> <p>See above regarding oHMP/BEP.</p>
SEPA	Simon Watt Senior Planning Officer	planning.south@sepa.org.uk Ref: 8705	Scoping response letter dated 24.04.23 emailed to ECU	<p>General The following information must be submitted with the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peat depth survey, table detailing re-use proposals • Peat conditions assessment • Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers map and assessment of impacts. Demonstrate proposed infrastructure avoid impacts on highly groundwater dependant habitats • Engineering works within and near the water environment map and assessment • Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures <p>Site Specific Overall SEPA is satisfied with the proposed scope of the assessment and design of the site.</p>	<p>These have been reported in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>A Schedule of Commitments in tabular form has been included in Chapter 15 of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Peat probing surveys should be in line with Peatland Survey – Guidance on Developments on Peatland (2017) and supported by a peat condition assessment.</p> <p>Existing tracks should be reused and / or upgraded where possible.</p> <p>Maps are to be based from a range of OS 1:10,000 to more detailed scale in sensitive locations. Maps must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent infrastructure • Tracks • Excavations • Buildings • Borrow pits • Pipelines • Cabling • Site compounds • Laydown areas • Storage areas • Other built elements <p>Existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded.</p> <p>Layout should be designed to minimise new works on undisturbed ground.</p> <p>Cabling must be laid in ground already disturbed.</p> <p>A comparison of the environmental effects of alternative locations of infrastructure elements maybe be required.</p> <p>Engineering activities which may have effects on the water environment Site layout must be designed to avoid impacts on the water environment.</p> <p>Where engineering activities in or impacting on water environments cannot be avoided the applicant must include justification and map showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposed temporary or permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses. • A minimum buffer of 50m around each loch / watercourse. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions • Detailed layout of all proposed mitigation including cut off drains, location, number and size of settlement ponds. <p>Water abstractions or dewatering volumes and timings of groundwater abstractions and related mitigation measure must be provided in tabular form.</p> <p>Further advice on best practice guidance are available here.</p> <p>Guidance on design of water crossing can be found at Construction of River Crossings Good Practice Guide</p> <p>Advice on flood risk can be found at Flood Risk Standing Advice.</p> <p>Cross must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability flows with appropriate allowance for climate change or provide information to justify smaller structures.</p>	<p>These have been reported in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>This has been undertaken where practicable.</p> <p>Appropriate drawings and maps has been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>This has been undertaken where practicable.</p> <p>Consideration of the design evolution has been included in Chapter 2 Site Description and Design Evolution of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Appropriate details has been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details has been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>If works could result in an increased risk of flooding to nearby receptors, a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted. Further guidance can be found at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) Flood Risk Standing Advice for Engineering, Discharge and Impoundment Activities. <p>Disturbance and re-use of excavated peat and other rich soils Where proposal are on peatland or carbon rich soils the following should be submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout plans showing permanent and temporary infrastructure, with extent of excavation require and application of mitigation hierarchy outlined in NPF4 policy 5 d. Plans should be overload on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peat depth survey showing peat probe locations and a distinct colour coded depth category annotated at a usable scale. Peat depth survey showing interpolated peat depths Peatland condition mapping NVC habitat mapping Outline Peat Management Plan Outline Habitat Management Plan <p>In accordance with NPF4 policy 5, the submission should demonstrate that proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid peatland in near natural condition Minimise the total area and volume of peat disturbance Avoid peat > 1m depth Minimise impact on local hydrology <p>Application should include peat probing information to inform the site layout and demonstrate that above has been achieved. Minimum requirements can be found in the Peatland Survey – Guidance on Developments on Peatland (2017).</p> <p>The Peatland Condition Assessment guide should be used to identify peatland in near natural condition</p> <p>The Peat Management Plan should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on peatland condition Information demonstrating avoidance and minimisation of peat disturbance. Excavation volumes of acrotelmic, catotelmic and amorphous peat. These should include a contingency factor to consider variables such as bulk Proposal for temporary storage and handling Reuse volumes in different elements of site reinstatement and restoration. All peat disturbed by the development can be used in site reinstatement or peatland restoration. Plans to restore and / or enhance the site into a functioning peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration <p>Disposal of peat is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Appropriate details will be included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report and the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment.</p> <p>Details has been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details has been included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>All effort should be made to reduce handling and temporary storage of peat. Catotelmic peat is preferred to be re-used in its final location immediately after excavation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catotelmic peat should be kept wet and immediately covered by vegetated turves • Re-use of catotelmic peat in verge reinstatement, re-profiling / landscaping, spreading, mixing with mineral soils or use in bunds is not supported • Faces of cut batters should be sealed to reduce water loss of the surrounding peat habitats. <p>The Outline Habitat Management Plan should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for reuse of disturbed peat in habitat restoration, if relevant. • Details of restoration to compensate for the area of peatland habitat directly and indirectly impacts by the development. • Outline proposals for peatland enhancement in other areas of the site. • Monitoring proposals. <p>The applicant should demonstrate that they have identified locations where the addition of excavated peat will enhance the wider site into a functional peatland system capable of achieving carbon sequestration. The following is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location plan of proposed peatland re-use restoration area(s) showing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Size of individual proposed peat re-use areas ○ Total area to be restored • Evidence to demonstrate the area is appropriate for peat re-use and can support carbon sequestration with consideration of an appropriate hydrological setting and baseline peatland condition in the form of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Photographs ○ Aerial imagery ○ Surveys • If proposed re-use restoration areas are out with the ownership of the applicant, information is to be provided to demonstrate agreement with the landowner, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commencement of works ○ Proposed management measures to ensure the restored areas can be safeguarded <p>Overview of the procedural and technical requirements for peatland restoration can be found at Nature Scot's technical compendium of peatland restoration techniques.</p> <p>Disruption to Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) National Vegetation Classification survey which includes the following information should be submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A map demonstrating all GWDTE are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of 	<p>Details will be included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>An Outline Habitat Management Plan/Biodiversity Enhancement Plan has been included as part of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details have been included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details have been included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the minimum buffers cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and / or quantitative risk assessment will be required. <p>For further advice refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems.</p> <p>Existing groundwater abstractions Application submission must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A map demonstrating all existing groundwater abstractions are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it. If the minimum buffers cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. We are likely to seek conditions securing appropriate mitigation for all existing groundwater abstractions affected. <p>Refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstraction and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems for further advice on minimum information requirements.</p> <p>Forest removal and forest waste A site layout which avoids large scale felling is preferred to avoid large amounts of waste material which can affect local water quality.</p> <p>Borrow Pits The following should be submitted for each burrow pit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map showing the location, size, depth and dimensions. Map showing stocks of rocks, overburden, soils and temporary and permanent infrastructure including tracks, buildings, oil storage, pipes and drainage, overlain with all lochs and watercourses to a distance of 250 metres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A site specific proportionate buffer needs to be achieved The site specific buffer must be drawn around each loch of watercourses proportionate to the depth of excavations and at least 1m from access tracks. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimension of the loch or watercourse, drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works. Justification for the proposed location of the borrow pits must be provided and evidence of the suitability of the material to be excavated for the proposed use, including any risk of pollution caused by degradation of rock. Ground investigation report giving existing seasonally highest water table including sections showing the maximum area, depth and profile of working in relation to the water table. Site map showing cut-off drains silt management services and settlement lagoons to manage surface water and dewatering 	<p>Details have been included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Noted, the proposed Development does not propose clear-felling of forestry. Details have been included in a Forestry Appendix for the EIA Report.</p> <p>The proposed Development does not involve the creation of new borrow pits; instead, it is proposed that suitable aggregate is won from existing borrow pits on the Site currently operated by Forestry and Land Scotland (FLS). Appropriate details have been included in Chapters 3 Proposed Development and 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>discharge. Cut-off drawings must be installed to maximise diversion of water from entering quarry works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map showing the location of pollution prevention measures such as spill kits, oil interceptors, drainage associated with welfare facilities, recycling and bin storage and vehicle washing areas. The drawing notes should include a commitment to check these daily A site map showing where soils and overburden will be stored including details of the heights and dimensions of each store, how long the material will be stored for and how soils will be kept fit for restoration purposes. Where the development will result in the disturbance of peat or other carbon rich soils then the submission must also include a detailed map of peat depths (this must be to full depth and follow the survey requirement of the Scottish Government's Guidance on Developments on Peatland - Peatland Survey (2017)) with all the built elements and excavation areas overlain so it can clearly be seen how the development minimises disturbance of peat and the consequential release of CO2. Sections and plans detailing how restoration will be progressed including the phasing, profiles, depths and types of material to be used Details of how the rock will be processed in order to produce a grade of rock that will not cause siltation problems during its end use on tracks trenches and other hardstanding. <p>Pollution prevention and environmental management</p> <p>Proposals for life extension, repowering and / or decommissioning must demonstrate accordance with SEPA Guidance on the life extension and decommissioning of onshore wind farms.</p> <p>The submission must demonstrate how the hierarchy of environmental impact has been applied and include justification for not selecting lower impact options when life extension is not proposed.</p> <p>A schedule of mitigation supported by the above site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pollution prevention and construction techniques Regulatory requirements Daily responsibilities of ECoW How site inspections will be recorded and acted upon Proposals for a planning monitoring enforcement officer. <p>For further information refer to Guidance of Pollution Prevention and water-off from construction sites.</p> <p>Submission needs to demonstrate there will be no discarding of materials that are likely to be classified as waste. For further guidance see Is it waste – Understanding the definition of waste.</p>	<p>The proposed Development does not involve life extension or repowering.</p> <p>A Schedule of Commitments in tabular form have been included as Chapter 15 of the EIA Report. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan has been included as a Technical Appendix to the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details for waste and materials management during the construction and operation of the proposed Development has been include in Chapter 3 Proposed Development.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	Sam Fox Case Officer	Samuel.fox@hes.scot Phone No: 0131 668 6890 Case ID: 30064798	Scoping response letter dated 16.05.23	Assessment of impacts on the historic environment should be undertaken by a suitably experienced heritage professional.	The assessment of impacts in the EIA Report have been undertaken by competent experts working for Headland Archaeology Ltd.

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
			emailed to ECU	<p>The assessment should meet the requirements of National Planning Framework 4, the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland and associated Managing Change Guidance Note.</p> <p>Additional guidance can be found in the Cultural Heritage Appendix to the EIA Handbook.</p> <p>The proposed development has the potential for significant adverse impacts on the fabric and setting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poldivan Bridge, cairn 730 ENE of (SM38) • Several scheduled monuments • A-Listed buildings • Gardens and Designed Landscapes <p>Further information is required before the proposed development can be considered to not have significant effects on assets.</p> <p>Mitigation by design is recommended to reduce effects on assets. May involve changes to the development layout. At this stage and from the information provided, the effectiveness of mitigation measures cannot be determined.</p> <p>Further guidance on national policy can be found in 'Managing Change in the Historic Environment'.</p> <p>Technical advice is available on the Technical Conservation website</p> <p>Scheduled Monuments The design of the proposed development should avoid direct impacts on the scheduled monument of Poldivan Bridge Cairn 730m ENE of (SM638).</p> <p>It is recommended the design of the proposal avoids any direct impacts on this nationally important asset, in line with national policies and efforts are made to minimise any impacts on the setting of this asset.</p> <p>Any direct impacts on this asset is likely to require schedule monument consent administered by HES.</p> <p>Based on current information HES is unlikely to grant consent for works within the scheduled area.</p> <p>The following have been identified outwith the proposed development boundary which have the potential for setting impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gawin Moor, cairns and field system, Auchencairn (SM2262) • Auchencairn, cairn 500m NNE of (SM1040) • Shaw's Moor, cairnfield and ring-cairn S of Hospital Wood (SM5919) • Shaw's Moor,cairnfield and ring-cairns SE of Hospital Wood (SM5920) • Mullach, fort (SM 657) • The Belt, fort, High Townhead (SM644) <p>Based on the information provided at this stage it is not possible to confidently identify a further list of scheduled monuments which might receive significant impacts.</p>	<p>Further consultation has been undertaken by the project team with HES to refine the scope of the assessment of setting. The assessment has been included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The proposed Development design and redline boundary has been amended to eliminate the risk of direct impacts on Poldivan Bridge Cairn.</p> <p>Further consultation has been undertaken by the project team with HES to refine the scope of the assessment of setting. The assessment has been included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>HES is able to provide advice on the scoping in or out of monuments as the assessment and design of the development progresses.</p> <p>Listed buildings & inventory gardens and designed landscapes It is recommended that the applicant consider all listed buildings and garden and designed landscapes within their proposed study area that fall with an appropriately scaled ZTV for significant setting impacts.</p> <p>The following category A-listed buildings lie within 5km of the proposals and should be carefully assessed in the EIA Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wallacehall Assessment Centre (LB3953) Blackwood House, Former stables (LB10244) Auldgirth Bridge (LB3966) West Galloberry Farm Steading and Horsemill (LB10218) Amisfield House (LB17232), Amisfield Tower (LB17233) & Amisfield Garden Walls (LB17234). <p>It is recommended the EIA consider the impact of the development on the setting of the following nationally important Inventory gardens and designed landscapes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dalwinston (GDL131) Drumlanrig (GDL143) Raehills (GDL322) <p>It is recommended that the applicant consider setting impacts on the Cowhill Tower Inventory garden & designed landscape (GDL00109).</p> <p>Scoping Report It is recommended that an appropriately scaled ZTV is used to identify heritage assets which have the potential to receive impacts to their setting in the first instance, rather than a specific radius. The assessment should consider views towards a heritage asset from a third location in which the development might be visible, even where that asset falls outside the ZTV.</p> <p>It is recommended the direct and indirect effects on heritage assets within the Inner Study Area be scoped in during the decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The assessment outlined in section 9.7.3 of the Scoping report is expected to consider the views towards a heritage asset from a third location in which the development might be visible even where the assets falls outside the ZTV.</p> <p>The EIAR is expected to assess the cumulative impacts of existing, consented, and proposed wind developments in the near vicinity on cultural heritage assets.</p> <p>Scoping Report (section 9.6.2) indicates that mitigation is likely to include avoidance of identified areas of constraint in the design phase, as well as fencing off/marketing out areas of constraint for avoidance during the construction and decommissioning phase. Although this does not specifically refer to scheduled monuments, we would recommend that this should be undertaken to avoid accidental damage to the scheduled monument of Poldivan Bridge, cairn 730m ENE of (SM638).</p>	<p>Further consultation has been undertaken by the project team with HES to refine the scope of the assessment of setting. The assessment has been included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Information to inform the settings assessment has been included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Further consultation has been undertaken by the project team with HES to refine the scope of the assessment of setting. The assessment has been</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Visualisations Visualisations should be provided for any heritage asset within HES's remit where a significant effects is identified. If wireframes for these heritage assets can be provided at an early stage this may assist with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identification of significant effects • Scoping out monuments • Identifying potential mitigation options by design • Identifying whether wireframes will be sufficient for detailed assessment of impacts in the EIAR • Identifying whether photomontages, will be required. <p>HES is able to provide further advice on visualisation as the iterative design for the development progresses and would be useful if initial wireframes can be provided as early as possible</p>	<p>included in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p>
Dumfries and Galloway Council	Andrew Nicholson, Archaeologist	andrew.nicholson@dumgal.gov.uk	Scoping response letter dated 03.05.2024 emailed to Robert Duncan	<p>Agreed with the proposed study areas and methodology and the baseline descriptions and welcomed the proposed mitigation measures on the understanding that site specific recommendations may be required.</p> <p>Stated that a heritage asset (MDG6502) referred to in the Scoping Report in paragraph 316 is assessed by the HER as being of regional importance instead of low importance as stated in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Stated that there are three heritage assets recorded on the HER within the Whitestanes Moor ASA which are of national importance instead of just one as shown on Figure 9.2 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Stated that there are three cairns recorded on the HER as being located to the south-west of SM2262 at Gawin Moor rather than the two shown on Figure 9.2 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Proposed that the Category A Listed Amisfield Tower, set within a non-designated inventory landscape should be included for assessment as it has extensive all round views.</p> <p>Noted that there are a cluster of non-designated cairns in the vicinity of Auchencairn Cairn SM10540 which may not necessarily be clearance cairns; as such, SM10540 may be part of a complex of burial cairns instead of being an isolated feature.</p>	<p>The outer study area used in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report has been extended beyond 10 km from the proposed turbine locations as stated in paragraph 307 of the Scoping Report. This has allowed for assets which are particularly sensitive to change within their settings over distances beyond 10 km to be identified in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment and considered as appropriate.</p> <p>A regional (medium) level of importance as been assigned to this asset as per the HER assessment.</p> <p>Each of these assets have been identified and have been considered in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Each of these assets have been identified and have been considered in Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The asset was considered as part of the Stage 1 Setting Assessment.</p> <p>The presence of nearby cairns in the vicinity of SM10540 and the possible relationship between these assets has been considered in the Stage 1 Setting Assessment.</p>
Non-Statutory Consultees					
MOD	Teena Oulaghan Safeguarding Manager	Ref: DIO10058454 Telephone: 07970 170934 Teena.oulaghan100@mod.gov.uk	Scoping response letter dated 05.05.23	<p>Safeguarding concerns on the proposed development's impact on the Eskdalemuir Seismological Recording Station and the potential of turbines creating a physical obstruction to air traffic movements.</p> <p>Physical obstruction</p>	

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
			emailed to ECU	<p>The development falls within the Tactical Training Area 20 (TTA 20T) has the potential to introduce a physical obstruction to low flying aircraft operating in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aircraft may operate as low as 30.5 meters above ground level <p>Eskdalemuir Seismological Recording Station The proposed development site falls within the statutory consultation zone of the seismological recording station at Eskdalemuir.</p> <p>Research has confirmed the wind turbines of the current design generate seismic noise which can interfere with the operational functionality of the array and as an asset that contributes to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.</p> <p>There is no noise budget available in respect of this Section 36 application. Therefore the MOD must object to his application due to the unacceptable impact the proposed development would have on the array.</p> <p>If the development is able to overcome the stated impacts, the MOD would require that conditions are added to any consent issued requiring that the development is fitted with aviation safety lighting and that sufficient data is submitted to ensure that structures can be accurately charted to allow deconfliction.</p> <p>The MOD would require as a minimum the development be fitted with MOD accredited aviation safety lighting in accordance with the Air Navigation Order 2016.</p> <p>The MOD should be consulted and provided with adequate time to carry out assessments and provide a formal response in the event of amendments submitted for approval.</p>	<p>Consideration of Aviation impacts have been included in Chapter 14 Other Issues of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Fitting MOD accredited aviation safety lighting to the turbines should mitigate the impact on military low flying aircraft, and this has been confirmed through further MOD consultation.</p> <p>The matter of Eskdalemuir have been addressed in Chapter 14 Other Issues of the EIA Report.</p>
NATS	Sarah Allen	Ref: SG35082	Scoping response letter dated 12.04.23 emailed to ECU	<p>Predicted Impact on Lowther RADAR (all turbines apart from 9,11, & 12) Theory described in Appendix A and turbine specific propagation profiles has determined that the terrain screening available will only adequately attenuate the signal for turbines T9 T11 and T12 and therefore the other 10 turbines are likely to cause false primary plots to be generated. A reduction in the radar's probability of detection for real aircraft is anticipated.</p> <p>En-route operational assessment of RADAR impact Users of the RADAR are consulted to ascertain whether the anticipated impact is acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prestwick Centre ATC – Unacceptable Military ATC – Acceptable <p>En-route Navigation Aid Assessment No impact is anticipated on NATS's navigation aids.</p> <p>Enroute Radio Communications Assessment No impact is anticipated on NATS's radio communications infrastructure</p> <p>Conclusion The proposed development has been deemed to be unacceptable</p>	<p>Consideration of Aviation impacts has been included in Chapter 14 Other Issues of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Modelling confirms the impact on Lowther Hill radar. Consultation with NATS is required to agree a suitable technical mitigation.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
Glasgow Airport	Kirsteen MacDonald		Scoping response letter dated 18.04.23 emailed to ECU	This proposal is located outwith Glasgow Airport's consultation zone. No comments to make and need not be consulted further.	Noted, no action required.
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	Ian Hutchinson Safeguarding Manager	ihutchinson@glasgowprestwick.com Telephone: 01292 511038	Scoping response letter dated 28.03.23 emailed to ECU	The proposed development will have no effect on Glasgow Prestwick Airport 's primary surveillance radar(s) due to terrain shielding and is clear of the Airport's Instrument Flight Procedure routings and ILS Safeguarding Area. No further comment or valid objections to make to this proposal.	Noted, no action required.
Galloway Fisheries Trust	Jamie Ribbens Senior Fisheries Biologist	jamie@gallowayfisheriestrust.org Telephone: 01671 403011	Scoping response letter dated 11.04.23 emailed to ECU	<p>The proposed development covers a number of important fish supporting water courses which are mostly tributaries of the Water of Ae.</p> <p>The Annan an important salmon and sea trout fishery.</p> <p>The river and it burns support a range of protected fish species including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlantic salmon • Sea trou • European eels • Brook lampreys <p>It is disappointing of the limited mention of fish in the scoping report and that only habitat survey are suggested.</p> <p>Baseline fish and aquatic invertebrate surveys should be undertaken to understand present fish species and their densities. This should follow the 2021 Marine Scotland Guidance – Monitoring watercourses in relation to onshore wind farm developments.</p> <p>The baseline fish survey is important for the EIAR, highlighting sensitivities that should be considered when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing roads • Silt control methods • Water quality monitoring points • Water crossing designs • Timing work works • Fish Monitoring Plan which should cover pre, during and post construction phases. <p>New water course crossing must ensure fish is protected. If instream works are planned in a watercourse supporting trout / salmon this should avoid taking place between October and May to protect spawning redds. Fish rescue by electrofishing should take place prior to instream works in fish supporting water courses.</p> <p>Galloway Fisheries Trust request the opportunity to comment on any proposed Habitat Management Plan for the site in relation to improving the habitat for aquatic ecology especially for fish</p> <p>Riparian tree planting, use of native deciduous species could assist in addressing future concerns with climate driven increases to water temperatures.</p>	<p>Fisheries surveys have been undertaken for the proposed Development and will be reported in Chapter 8 Ecology.</p> <p>These proposals have been included in Outline Habitat Management Plan/Biodiversity Enhancement Plan to accompany the EIA Report.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Points & Potential issues of concern and interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access track layout in relation to the proximity to sensitive fish habitat (e.g. spawning habitat); • The number of watercourse crossings (new and upgraded); • The location of new and upgraded watercourse crossings; • New and upgraded watercourse crossing type, design, and structure, including information relating to the installation of each crossing point (e.g. maintaining the existing gradient, maintaining fish access at all water heights etc.); • Construction information for new tracks (including layby locations), trackside drainage plans and designs especially in relation to increased run off rates; • Turbine base locations; • Turbine base excavation and associated run off from loose ground; • Peat depth information in relation to water quality, peat slides or ground slips; • Borrow pit locations; • Changes to instream hydrological conditions and flush zones; • Exacerbated erosion and/or elevated levels of suspended silt to watercourses during construction activities; • Water quality monitoring information; • Pollution to watercourses in the form of silt pollution; • Pollution to watercourses in the form of chemical pollution; • Reduction in quantity and quality of instream habitat; • Adverse changes to instream morphology; • Direct mortality of fish species; • Mitigation measures to protect fish population and their habitats from the impact from all of the above; • Timings of specific works such as new track building, new watercourse crossing installation, upgrading of existing watercourse crossings; • Mitigation measures to protect watercourses, fish and their habitats – that which is built in to the design of the development and any additional mitigation • measures which will be employed if required. 	
Nith District Salmon Fishery Board (NDSFB)	Fishery Director	Telephone No: 01387 267 222	Scoping response letter dated 29.04.23 emailed to ECU	<p>The land footprint of the proposed Harestanes West Wind Farm is located on the eastern edge of NDSFB's jurisdiction and it does include the water catchments of the Dollard Glen and Garroch Race, the Pennyland Moor and Dalswinton Common. Accordingly, these water catchments should be included in any fish/aquatic invertebrate surveys to monitor for any adverse impacts in the water environment. Due to its proximity to the wind farm site, NDSFB considers that the catchment of Loch Ettrick should also be included. This body of water straddles the catchments of the water of Ae and the Nith and does include fish in some of the minor tributaries which convey water to the loch.</p> <p>It is worth reiterating the purpose of conducting aquatic surveys in advance of any construction works to build a development such as a wind farm in a sensitive environment. The information gained from the surveys can guide construction method statements and establish a baseline of data preconstruction. Repeat surveys during the construction phase can assess any potential adverse impacts and allow for rectification timeously to ensure any impact is minimal. Final post construction surveys permit an assessment of overall impacts in the aquatic environment.</p>	Fisheries surveys have been undertaken for the proposed Development and have been reported in Chapter 8 Ecology .

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				Provided the appropriate aquatic surveys are undertaken within the NDSFB jurisdiction as described above the NDSFB has no objections to this development.	
British Telecom (BT)	Laura Taylor National Radio Palnner	Ref: WID13062 radionetworkprotection@bt.com	Scoping response letter dated 11.04.23 emailed to ECU	The turbine locations indicated in Section 2.2 Table 2.1 page 10 of the Scoping Report should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network. BT Requires 100m minimum clearance from any structure to the radio link path. Once micro-siting allowance is determined and / or the proposed locations change contact BT for reassessment.	
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Ed Tooth Conservation Officer	Ed.tooth@rspb.org.uk	Scoping response letter dated 16.05.23 emailed to ECU	RSPB agrees there is no connectivity between the proposed Development and the Castle Loch, Lochmaben SPA and Ramsar site and Upper Solway Flats and Marches SPA and Ramsar site and that these designations can be scoped out of the EIAR. RSPB agrees the range of completed surveys are sufficient and appropriate. It is not clear whether RSPB has been contacted in relation to consultation with respect to the ornithology assessment. It is recommended data from RSPB is sought by the applicant. RSPB does not believe further species or designated sites need to be considered in the assessment. RSPB agree with the species to be scoped out of the assessment. RSPB recommends all turbines are sited at least 750m from Black Grouse leks and a specific Breeding Bird Protection Plan is produced for Black Grouse to ensure lekking and breeding birds are not disturbed. Appropriate buffer distances and restrictions on construction activities during the lekking season should be included where applicable. RSPB is unable to find detail on proposals for biodiversity enhancement as part of the proposed development in light of the area for Black Grouse in Dumfries and Galloway. Further information ensuring the Black Grouse population is protected and enhanced is welcome. Wader populations in the same area could also be targeted for biodiversity enhancement works. In the recently adopted NPF4, Part (a) of Policy 3 (Biodiversity) requires that development proposals contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, and where possible, integrate nature-based solutions. Any potential impacts, including cumulative impacts, on biodiversity, nature networks and the natural environment should be minimised through careful planning and design. Furthermore, part (b) of Policy 3 states where development requires an Environmental Impact Assessment, proposals should only be supported where it can be demonstrated the proposal will conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity so they are in a better state than without intervention. RSPB encourages the applicant to demonstrate how they will meet these requirements.	Noted. Noted. RSPB data was received in January 2024 and has been presented within a confidential appendix to the ornithology chapter . A second data request was carried out in late July 2024 in order to obtain data to cover the entire access track route. Noted. Noted. An outline Breeding Bird Protection Plan has included within the ornithology chapter . This has included appropriate mitigation to ensure that sensitive receptors are protected from disturbance for example. Biodiversity enhancements for a range of species has been considered within the ornithology chapter, OHMP/BEP . An Outline Habitat Management Plan/Biodiversity Enhancement Plan has been included as part of the EIA Report.
Nuclear Safety Directorate (HSE) / Office for Nuclear Regulation	Vicki Enston	ONR-Land.Use-planning@onr.gov.uk	Scoping response letter dated 04.04.23	Office for Nuclear Regulation makes no comment on this proposed development as it does not lie within a consultation zone around a GB nuclear site.	

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
			emailed to ECU		
Marine Scotland	Emily Bridcut Senior Onshore Renewables Energy Fish Adviser	Emily.bridcut@gov.scot	Scoping response letter dated 28.03.23 emailed to ECU	Marine Scotland advise their scoping guidelines are included with the scoping opinion. Marine Scotland advise that Annex 1, the MSS-EIA checklist within their standing advice is completed prior to submission of the EIAR.	Annex 1 has been included as a Technical Appendix to Chapter 8 Ecology .
Scottish Water	Ruth Kerr Development Services Analyst	Ref: DSCAS-0084119-4L8 Phone No: 0800 389 0379 planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk	Scoping response letter dated 31.03.23 emailed to ECU	<p>Assets Impact Assessment The applicant must identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets and contact our Asset Impact Team via the Customer Portal for an appraisal of the proposals.</p> <p>The applicant should be aware that any conflict with assets identified will be subject to restrictions on proximity of construction.</p> <p>Written permission must be obtained before any works are started within the area of Scottish Water's apparatus</p> <p>Drinking Water Protected Areas A review of Scottish Water's records indicates there are no Scottish Water drinking catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.</p> <p>Surface Water Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into their combined sewer system. There may be limited exceptional circumstances where Scottish Water would allow such connections such as connection for brownfield sites only, this will require significant justification from the applicant taking account various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges.</p> <p>To avoid cost and delays where a surface water discharge Scottish Water's combined sewer system is anticipated, the applicant should contact Scottish Water at soon as possible with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request.</p>	<p>Scottish Water were contacted in early August 2024 to identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets. Scottish Water advise to submit a new asset impact enquiry request would be submitted at a later stage than EIA submission and therefore will not form part of the hydrology EIA Chapter. As noted in the consultation response, there are no Scottish Water drinking catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>No surface water connections to Scottish Water's system are required for the proposed Development.</p>
The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority Planning Team	planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk	Scoping response letter dated 14.04.23 emailed to ECU	The proposed development site is located outside of the define coalfield. The Coal Authority have no further comments.	
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	Wind Farm Team	Ref: WF207761 Contact link https://breeze.jrc.co.uk/tickets/view.php?id=30157	Scoping response letter dated 29.03.23 emailed to ECU	<p>This proposal is cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by the local energy networks.</p> <p>JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and the data you have provided. However, if any details of the wind farm change, particularly the disposition or scale of any turbine(s), it will be necessary to re-evaluate the proposal.</p>	

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments Received/ Issues Raised	Action Required/Taken
				JRC advised to seek re-coordination prior to submitting a planning application, as this will negate the possibility of an objection being raised at that time.	
MET Office	Tim Allot Upper Air Observations	metofficesafeguarding@metoffice.gov.uk	Scoping response letter dated 29.03.23 emailed to ECU	The proposed development is beyond the 20km consultation zone radius of any Met Office radar. Therefore the MET office have no comments on the proposal and do not need to be consulted further.	Noted, no action required.
Scottish Forestry	Doug Howieson Conservator	Doug.howieson@forestry.gov.scot Telephone No: 0131 370 5262	Scoping response letter dated 17.04.23 emailed to ECU	There is no mention of compensatory planting for lost woodland in the scoping report. Scottish Forestry would like this to be included Scottish Forestry can only agree that the operation and decommissioning of the windfarm has no impact upon the felling structure, and therefore out of scope, if there is evidence provided around adjacent 'non development' felling that may or may not be requested by the developer; which is often requested to minimise disruption to wind flow, beforehand.	Compensatory planting details have been included in a Forestry Appendix to the EIA Report. It is not proposed to clear-fell the Site to accommodate the proposed Development.
Community Councils					
Closeburn CC	Emma Hodgson/Mike Steele	Mike Steele mike.steelebsas@yahoo.co.uk	Community Council meeting 03/10/24t	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queried how Community Benefits funds would be administered. Raised concerns around how the development will impact views from Closeburn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents were assured by the project team that the Harestanes West Windfarm would pledge £5,000/mw and SPR has liaised with the local community shortly before construction on the most appropriate mechanism to administer these funds. The project team has provided rationale for the placement of turbines, making efforts to relocate them from the east to minimize visual impact. It was noted that the design remains flexible and will evolve. Stakeholders have been engaged in 2024 with Public Information Days to showcase the updated design.
Kirkmahoe CC	Jean Muir	Jean Muir kccemail18@gmail.com	Community Council meeting 18/10/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents had voiced concerns regarding AIL and construction traffic through their village. Concerns were raised around grid connection route and the visual impacts if we were to use metal power pylons to connect to the grid. Queried the use of Community Benefit fund in the local area. <p>Following information has been requested and forwarded on to the council members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overhead Line connection for Harestanes West wind farm to BR Route - SP Energy Networks https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/userfiles/file/HAR_2021_Figure_11.2_Proposed_Construction_Access_Routes.pdf https://www.scottishpowerrenewables.com/userfiles/file/HAR_2021_Figure_11.1_Proposed_Abnormal_Load_Access_Route.pdf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was confirmed by the project team that Kirkmahoe is not along the access route for this development. Residents were assured that we would be utilising a wooden pole overhead line and provided details on SPEN proposed connection route via email following the meeting. Residents were assured by the project team that the Harestanes West Windfarm would pledge £5,000/mw and SPR has liaised with the local community shortly before construction on the most appropriate mechanism to administer these funds.

Additional consultation responses

Further to the responses received as part of the EIA scoping exercise, detailed in Table 1 above, further consultee correspondence is detailed below in Table 2.

Table 2 Harestanes West Windfarm Additional Consultation Responses

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Statutory Consultees					
NatureScot	Dylan deSilva	dylan.desilva@nature.scot	Meeting (online) 15 th August 2023	<p>Landscape Table 4.2 of scoping report missed off consideration of Nith Estuary National Scenic Area (NSA). This will be undertaken (not explicit in the Scoping Report) but it is not expected the EIA report will report any significant impacts on the NSA.</p> <p>Project team will come back to NatureScot with some suggested night-time viewpoints. At this stage, two or three area likely to be proposed.</p> <p>Ornithology Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) will be required. It will need to assess geese, a qualifying interest for designated sites within 20km of the Site. Connectivity of the Site to wildfowl that are also a qualifying interest is unlikely, but should be included in the HRA.</p> <p>Ecology A second year of bat surveys is underway, as well as habitat surveys for the Site. Surveys along the access track once a route has been selected.</p> <p>Biodiversity Enhancements SPR will prepare an Outline Habitat Management Plan (HMP) alongside a Bat Mitigation Plan to accompany the EIAR. The provisions in the HMP will be discussed and agreed with Forestry and Land Scotland (FLS) as key partner and landowner. Felling will be limited to keyholing rather than clear-felling.</p> <p>NatureScot is looking for more detail and ambition from HMPs and Biodiversity Enhancement Plans (BEPs) following the publication of NPF4. Consideration of off-site enhancement would be appropriate, and NS would be supportive of commitments to remove trees where perhaps they should not have been positioned in the past (e.g. deep/sensitive peatland habitats)</p>	<p>Landscape chapter has included assessment of the Nith Estuary NSA</p> <p>Project team has consulted with NS regarding night-time viewpoints.</p> <p>An HRA screening assessment has been included in the EIA Report and has assessed impacts on designated sites (and associated qualifying features) within 20km of the Site.</p> <p>Project team has considered these within the HMP/BEP submitted with the EIA Report.</p>
NatureScot	Dylan deSilva Operations Officer	dylan.desilva@nature.scot	Email 16.08.2024 copied to ECU & DGC	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact As stated in Scoping Report, further consultation regarding scope of cumulative assessment and night-time assessment proposed.</p>	Response received and agreed scope of both elements of the assessment.
SEPA	Emily Smith Chris Palmer Simon Watt	planning.south@sepa.org.uk Ref: 8705	Meeting (online) 28 th July 2023	<p>Peat Project team noted that there were gaps in the Phase 1 peat probing due to active harvesting. To be filled where access is permitted. There are pockets of deep peat within the Site that could provide opportunities for peatland habitat restoration.</p> <p>NPF4 Policy 5 is much more specific on how peat to be considered in proposals. SEPA accept that in heavily forested areas, it can be difficult to comply with the guidance for Phase 1 peat surveys. SEPA would be looking for peat to be avoided where possible on the Site at the design stage, rather than relying on micro-siting later on in the process.</p>	<p>EIA Report has included details of peatland habitat restoration.</p> <p>Project team has sought to avoid peat during the design process.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Flood risk Standing advice has been published in relation to flood risk. There is the potential opportunity to incorporate nature flood management measures to manage rates of flood run-off.</p> <p>Other matters</p> <p>SEPA would be happy to provide further pre-application engagement in relation to Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE), groundwater abstractions and other matters in SEPA's purview.</p> <p>Forest removal and waste to be considered in the application. SEPA recommend trying to avoid lots of material being left behind on site.</p> <p>Borrow pits: the project team will aim to source material within the Site in the first instance - minimising deliveries to the Site, and seek to agree with FLS the use of their existing borrow pits/quarries on site rather than opening new ones.</p>	<p>Project team has considered such proposals alongside peatland restoration proposals as part of the application.</p> <p>Forestry Appendix has addressed this, alongside considerations for compensatory planting and other forestry-related aspects.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	Kevin Mooney. Sam Fox	kevin.mooney@hes.scot T: 0131 651 6787 M: 0777 476 7555	Meeting (online) 22 nd September 2023	<p>Project team shared wirelines for the following selected cultural heritage receptors in the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Poldivan Bridge, cairn 730m ENE of (SM638) Gawin Moor, cairns and field system, Auchencairn (SM2262) Mullach, fort (SM 657) Drumlanrig (GDL143) Morton Castle (SM90221) <p>HES advised that the EIA should consider impacts in relation to enhancements, such as biodiversity enhancement, as part of the EIA.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the appropriate position for a photomontage from Drumlanrig Castle for inclusion in the EIA Report.</p> <p>HES would welcome the opportunity to provide further feedback on an updated design including visualisations to accompany the EIA Report in due course.</p> <p>HES queried whether the EIA will also consider other monuments identified in the EIA scoping response, such as Shaws Muir (SM5919 and SM5920).</p>	<p>Headland has issued Stage 1 that reflects latest layout and was issued to HES for consultation.</p>
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Robert Duncan Team Leader (Major Developments)	23/0658/ENQ Planning and Development Economy and Environment Dumfries and Galloway Council Militia House English Street Dumfries DG1 2HR Tel 07525 032 456	Email 2 nd May 2024	<p>Council planning team emailed to confirm it would not be providing a response to the EIA scoping consultation request from the Energy Consents Unit.</p> <p>They did in May 2024 however provide internal consultation responses from the Council's Archaeologist, Flood Risk Management Team Leader, Environmental Health Officer, and Roads Planning Team Leader. These are summarised below.</p>	<p>The individual responses from DGC internal consultees are separately presented below.</p> <p>A request for confirmation of scope of cumulative assessment and night-time assessment proposed has been issued via email to NatureScot, the ECU and Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC).</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Email robert.duncan@dumgal.gov.uk			
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Andrew Nicholson Archaeologist	23/0658/ENQ Dumfries and Galloway Council Planning (Archaeology) Environment and Infrastructure Militia House, English Street Dumfries, DG1 2HR	Email dated 3 rd May 2023 to Dumfries and Galloway Planning	<p>Overall content with the suggested study areas, the baseline descriptions and the proposed assessment methodology proposed in the EIA Scoping Report. The mitigation proposals are welcomed, on the understanding that they may require site-specific recommendations once the site survey has been undertaken.</p> <p>It is also positive to see those sites assessed by the archaeology service as meeting the criteria for designation being assessed as of high sensitivity, and for Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and non-Inventory Designed Landscapes being assessed as of medium sensitivity.</p> <p>In relation to the water channel referenced in para 316 the Closeburn/Park water management system has been the subject of papers in the Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Archaeological Society and is assessed by the HER as being of regional significance as it is the most complete surviving such system within the region.</p> <p>There are 3 HER sites of national significance within the Whitestanes Moor ASA, not the one shown on Fig. 9.2. Also 3 HER cairns to the SW of the scheduled area on Gawin Moor rather than the two shown on Fig. 9.2, see attached map.</p> <p>In addition to those sites listed in para 357 I would also suggest the A-Listed Amisfield Tower, set within a NIDL (LB17233) is also included as it has extensive all round views. In relation to Auchencairn Cairn SM10540 it should be noted that there is a cluster of undesignated cairns in the same and adjacent fields. Not all are necessarily clearance cairns, so the designated cairn could be seen as part of a complex rather than as an isolated feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email included a map extracted showing areas of archaeological interest around Auchencairn and Gawin Moor. 	This has been considered within Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Flood Risk Management Team	23/0658/ENQ Flood Risk Management Infrastructure & Transportation Dumfries & Galloway Council Cargen Tower Garroch Business Centre Cargenbridge Dumfries DG2 8PN Telephone: 01387 260303 Email: dgc.flooding@dumgal.gov.uk	Email dated 15 th May 2023 to Dumfries and Galloway Planning.	<p>No objection to the proposal, but advise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer needs to manage surface runoff from the site during and after construction. Runoff should mimic that of existing conditions and not be increased, Developer should consider the rate of runoff into the watercourses which are located within the site. Any significant increase may increase the flood risk downstream, All culverts that form part of the development should be hydrologically assessed to ensure there will be no capacity issues during peak flow e.g. 1 in 200 year + CC storm events, Developer is advised to have measures in place regarding future maintenance of drains and culverts, <p>New access tracks should in no way act as a flow route for surface water flows.</p>	This has been within Chapters 3 Project Description and 10. Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Dumfries & Galloway Council	William Jackson Environmental Health Officer	23/0658/ENQ External Tel: 01387 245978 Mobile: 07725 065 461 Email: william.jackson@dumgall.gov.uk	Email dated 26 th June 2023 to Dumfries and Galloway Planning	<p>Environmental Health have have no objections in principal. However, until a site-specific noise impact assessment has been carried out following the principles detailed in the Assessment & Rating of Noise from Wind Farms ETSU Report ETSU-R-97, 1996 we would be unable to comment fully as to the expected impacts.</p> <p>The site-specific assessment should be carried out following the principles detailed in the Assessment & Rating of Noise from Wind Farms ETSU Report ETSU-R-97, 1996 . It is acceptable that a new baseline noise survey can be scoped out on the basis that previous studies for developments in the area have appropriately characterised the baseline noise environment.</p> <p>We suggest that the proposal should be designed to meet the lower noise limits as specified in the ETSU-R-97 document, but where lower limits cannot be achieved the detailed reasons as to why this cannot be accomplished should be detailed in the ETSU-R-97 report within the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>We additionally suggest that a method statement for the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) be provided within the EIA for approval by Dumfries & Galloway Council. This should include an assessment of potentially noisy operations and outline the noise mitigation measures proposed. It is acceptable that noise limits from construction activities be set in accordance with the ABC method provided in Annex E of BS5228:2009.</p>	EIA Report, in particular Chapter 13 Noise , has been undertaken in accordance with the feedback provided.
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Roads Planning Team Leader	DGC Planning Ref: 23/0658/ENQ DGC Roads Dept Ref: 20/0658/ENQ CC Communities - Roads and Infrastructure Cargen Tower, Garroch Business Centre, Dumfries, DG2 8PN	Memo dated 23 rd June 2023 to Dumfries and Galloway Planning	<p>It appears that access and egress to this site is to be via the existing upgraded forest access at Burrance Bridge on the A701 Trunk Road, as was the agreed access for the existing Harestanes Wind Farm site. Since access is to be via the Trunk Road network it would be appropriate that Transport Scotland be consulted regarding access considerations.</p> <p>In order to regulate traffic movements during the whole construction period a traffic management plan should be submitted and agreed in writing with the Council, Transport Scotland and the Police, prior to any works commencing.</p> <p>The memo provides further detail as to the requested content and scope of the CTMP, as well as suggested wording of a planning condition.</p>	<p>Transport Scotland has been consulted on the proposed Development via the EIA scoping process.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Access, Traffic and Transport of the EIA Report has identified mitigation to be adopted during construction, including a CTMP.</p>
Dumfries & Galloway Council	William Jackson Environmental Health Officer	External Tel: 01387 245978 Mobile: 07725 065 461 Email: william.jackson@dumgall.gov.uk	Email dated 2 nd November 2023 to Conor Tickner, Hayes McKenzie in response to emailed letter with proposed method of noise assessment dated 9 th October 2023	Confirms agreement with project team's proposed approach to assessment of noise for the Harestanes West Windfarm	EIA Report, in particular Chapter 13 Noise , has been undertaken in accordance with methodology presented.
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Information Governance Team	EIR Case: 5411128 FOI request: 101000177404 Information Governance Team,	Emails dated 15 th June 2023 and 14 th June 2024 to Dumfries and Galloway	Dumfries and Galloway Council provided the Private Water Supplies data in CSV format. The council advised that the information is only for supplies which have registered with the council.	Details has been included in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils of the EIA Report.

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Governance and Assurance, Communities Dumfries and Galloway Council, Council Offices, English Street, Dumfries DG1 2DD Drop Point: 205	Environmental Health.		
Dumfries and Galloway Council	Robert Duncan Team Leader (Major Developments)	robert.duncan@dumgal.gov.uk	Email 16.08.2024 copied to ECU & DGC	Landscape and Visual Impact As stated in Scoping Report, further consultation regarding scope of cumulative assessment and night-time assessment proposed.	Response received from DGC, see below.

Gatecheck consultation responses

The Applicant undertook the Gatecheck consultation process with the Energy Consents Unit in September and October 2024. The responses received to this process are summarised in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Harestanes West Windfarm Gatecheck Consultation Responses

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Statutory Consultees					
NatureScot	Dylan DeSilva Operations Officer	dylan.desilva@nature.scot	Email 03.10.2024 copied to ECU & DGC	No further comments	
Dumfries and Galloway Council	John Hiscox Senior Planning Officer	John.hiscox@dumgal.gov.uk	Emailed 16.08.2024 copied to ECU	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact With regard to assessment on potential night-time impacts, it is difficult to properly appreciate which of those might be the most useful without seeing draft visualisations. The proposed inclusion of night-time visualisations from Viewpoints 1,3 and 7 all seem suitable.</p> <p>It suggested that the Closeburn Viewpoint (View point 10 in the Scoping Report) should be added, to augment appraisal and understanding of potential night-time effects. The Viewpoint would look east through the Non-Inventory Designed Landscape of Closeburn Castle which may be relevant in terms of seeing lighting in its backdrop.</p> <p>Depending on visibility hubs, the Thornhill viewpoint could be utilised for assessment of night-time effects. Night-time visualisations should illustrate worst-case scenario. This would ideally be submitted alongside comparison visualisations, illustrating reduced visibility expected with mitigation applied.</p> <p>Any property identified as potentially having significant visual impacts within 2 km (RVAA Assessment) has visualisations (wirelines) prepared as well as aerial mapping identifying a directional arc of viewing towards the turbines, with annotation indicating which turbine would be closest to the receptor/property.</p> <p>Unsure why the cumulative mapping only shows 7 turbines relating to Harestanes South</p> <p>Consultation Provide clarity regarding data for consultation with Kirkmahoe CC which appears to be in the future.</p>	<p>Applicant responded that there would be no lights visible from the viewpoint at Closeburn, but there would at Thornhill, so would include that as a proxy for the receptors mentioned. It is noted about mitigation.</p> <p>This has been noted and included.</p> <p>Mistake corrected in EIA Report.</p>
Kirkmahoe Community Council	Jean Muir	kccemail18@gmail.com	Emailed 18.10.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
RSPB	Julia Gallagher Senior Conservation Officer	Julia.gallagher@rspb.org.uk	Emailed 16.08.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
Closeburn Community Council	Mike Steele	mike.steelebsas@yahoo.co.uk	Emailed 16.08.2024 copied to ECU	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact The developer is not currently including the Thornhill Upland Regional Scenic Area in their visual impact assessment. Whilst this is not a National designated area it should be included due to the importance of this area to the local population.</p>	An assessment of this RSA was scoped into the LVIA and will be in the EIA Report.

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>The building of 12 x 220 m tall turbines on the edge of Thornhill Uplands RSA is likely to be significant and needs to be assessed and moderated. It is requested that the Thornhill Uplands RSA is included in the EIA.</p> <p>Maps Appropriate maps including ZTV be provided for consultees.</p> <p>Mapping diagrams are difficult to interpret because of the small scale they are presented in. Online maps used fix images and one cannot zoom in to read them properly</p> <p>Noise Residents living in Closeburn Parish on the eastern side of the Nith Valley and close to the proposed site are concerned of potential noise impacts. We seek assurances noise assessments will be taken at residential properties to the turbine.</p> <p>Community Benefit and Community Share We would ask dialogue with the Developers regarding both Community Benefit and Community Share and are progressed in a timely manner.</p>	<p>ZTVs will be carried out to NatureScot standards.</p> <p>The lowest applicable noise limit in the assessment is 40 dB, as agreed with Dumfries and Galloway Council. In line with relevant policy and guidance, where predicted noise levels from the development are more than 10 dB below this (i.e. less than 30 dB), then direct noise from the development are considered to be negligible and cumulative noise levels from all wind farm developments will either be well below the noise limits, or contributions to cumulative noise levels from the development will be negligible, or both.</p> <p>Where this is the case, receptors are scoped out of the assessment. This includes the receptors around the eastern side of the Nith Valley.</p> <p>The Applicant will consult with Closeburn Community Council and relevant local stakeholders regarding Community Benefit and Community Share in due course.</p>
DIO	Teena Oulaghan Safeguarding Manager	Teena Oulaghan teena.oulaghan100@mod.gov.uk	Emailed 01.10.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	Noted. Further consultation suggested to ensure the MOD has no concerns regarding potential turbine effects on Deadwater Fell radar.
Galloway Fisheries Trust	Jamie Ribbens Senior Fisheries Biologist	Jamie Ribbens jamie@gallowayfisheriestrust.org	Emailed 27.09.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
Historic Environment Scotland	Samuel Fox Senior Environmental Assessment and Advice Officer	Samuel Fox samuel.fox@hes.scot	Emailed 03.10.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
NATS	Alasdair	Alasdair NATSSafeguarding@nats.co.uk	Emailed 27.09.2024 copied to ECU	NATS will continue to work with the developer to explore mitigation options and reach an agreement as to their delivery.	Noted. Further consultation with NATS required to agree mitigation.
Nith District Salmon Fishery Board	Jim Henderson Director	Jim Henderson jim.henderson@river-nith.com	Emailed 03.10.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
Scottish Forestry	Neil Murray Conservator	Neil Murray neil.murray@forestry.gov.uk	Emailed 01.10.2024 copied to ECU	<p>The forestry appendix should include all tracks, turbine bases cable ways, transformers, borrow pits.</p> <p>It also important to note that there are proposals for links roads to be constructed in the harestanes windfarm area, the area of permanent loss of trees from this access route should be included in the calculation.</p>	Compensatory planting details are included in this Forestry Appendix to the EIA Report.

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				Merely an observation is that this area has received considerable felling over the last years due to Storm Arwen, it now looks like the remaining section of taller trees around Windyhill rigg is also to be have a track and turbine through it which may lead to further windblow n the remaining trees, note that part of this woodland has been thinned in the past.	Consideration of windblow has factored in recent loss of trees such as from Storm Arwen.
Scottish Water	Ruth Ker Technical Analyst	Ruth Ker PlanningConsultations @scottishwater.co.uk	Emailed 01.10.2024 copied to ECU	Pleas be advised this information has been added to the case and does not affect the original planning response.	Noted. No further action required.
SEPA	Silvia Cagoni Senior Planning Officer	Silvia Cagoni Senior Planning Officer	Emailed 01.10.2024 copied to ECU	No further comments	
Ae Community Council	Tarnia Goodsell Secretary	Tarnia Goodsell	Emailed 23.10.2024 copied to ECU	<p>Community engagement arrangements/publicity On 12 June 2023 a letter via email inviting residents to a public information event on Wednesday 21st and Thursday 22nd June taking place in Dalswinton and Auldgirth, but not in Ae. At the time, Ae's community council was disestablished so we can not comment on how the events were promoted or if Ae residents attended.</p> <p>Leaflets were distributed via post, residents' feedback suggest some not arriving until the day of the event 11th September.</p> <p>Whilst the applicant had advertised in the local paper, this is not something that many residents read or use to find event information.</p> <p>The event was held 9-5 during a workday, this meant that many residents were unable to attend in person.</p> <p>Size and Visual Impact While photomontages were provided on the day, the diagrams and maps both online and at the drop-in session are presented in small scale. We ask that appropriate scale maps be provided for consultees.</p> <p>The photomontages provided show daytime views, however we understand that due to the size and scale of the turbines they will likely visible red, medium intensity (2,000 candela) lights fitted to the turbine hubs, residents have not been provided details of this.</p> <p>Construction We noted that the LVIA will not be conducted on individual properties however, residents living within 2 km of site have significant concerns regarding noise and disruption during construction and decommission period. We seek assurances that impacts during these periods be considered and made known to residents.</p> <p>We welcome the provision of an access road however, residents remain sceptical that all construction and operational vehicles will take this detour, putting pressure on an already overused road C6n.</p> <p>Noise</p>	<p>ZTVs and Visualisations will be to NatureScot guidelines. These will include some dawn/dusk photomontages within the local community.</p> <p>Construction noise will be considered in the assessment, assessed in accordance with relevant government policy and guidance.</p> <p>Noise-sensitive receptors in Ae village, Gubhill and Windyhill will be included in the operational noise assessment, including Ae Primary School.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Little information on the expected noise or the location of the noise assessment. We seek assurances that noise assessment for both operation and construction/deconstruction will be taken at residential properties closest to the turbine on Gubhill and Windyhill as well as within the Ae village.</p> <p>Cumulative effect The cumulative effect on the village of Ae, in terms of visual impact and noise impact was briefly mentioned in the report. Residents feel somewhat surrounded by turbines and that little consideration has been made for any community benefit that takes account of this cumulative effect.</p>	<p>A cumulative noise assessment will be undertaken in line with government policy and guidance, to consider the noise from all wind farms in the vicinity. The assessment will assume downwind sound propagation from all wind turbines simultaneously, as a worst-case assumption.</p>
<p>Transport Scotland</p>	<p>Iain Clement Transport Scotland Roads Directorate</p>	<p>Iain Clement iain.clement@transport.gov.scot</p>	<p>Emailed 23.10.2024 copied to ECU</p>	<p>We note that the Scoping Opinion provide on behalf of the Scottish Ministers and dated November 2023 indicates that Transport Scotland was consulted on the Scoping Report for this development but did not provide a response. Transport Scotland has no record of having been consulted on the application at Scoping Stage.</p> <p>We would like to take this opportunity at the Gatecheck stage to provide comments on the proposed methodology for the assessment of the potential impacts associated with Traffic and Transport as identified in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Assessment of Environmental Impacts. We consider the forthcoming Transport & Access Chapter being supported by a Transport Assessment report and an Abnormal Load Route Survey as well as the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan appropriate.</p> <p>Transport Scotland would wish to point out that new guidance has been published by IEMA in relation to 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic'. These Guidelines, entitled Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (July 2023), are intended to update and replace the previous 1993 IEMA guidelines.</p> <p>We request the thresholds as indicated within these new Guidelines be used as a screening process for the assessment. These specify that road links should be taken forward for further assessment where the following two rules are breached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include road links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%) • Include road links of high sensitivity where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more. <p>We note that baseline traffic count data will be obtained from the Transport Scotland live traffic count database for both the A701(T) and A175(T). In addition, National Road Traffic Forecast Low Traffic Growth Assumptions will be used to provide a common future year baseline to coincide with the expected construction traffic peak is considered appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted that any impacts associated with the operational and decommissioning phases of the development are to be scoped out of the EIA. We consider this acceptable.</p> <p>Abnormal Loads Assessment</p>	<p>Chapter 12 Access, Traffic and Transport of the EIA Report has been prepared in accordance with the July 2023 publication of the IEMA Guidelines for Traffic and Movement which was published after the preparation and submission of the scoping report.</p> <p>Preliminary abnormal load route assessment has been undertaken for turbine components of the scale proposed for the development.</p>

Scoping Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference and Contact Details	Method and Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>The Scoping Report details swept path analysis will be undertaken for the main constraint points along the route from the port of entry through to the site access junction. We consider this appropriate, we note that no indication is provided as to the number or tip height of the existing Harestanes Wind Farm turbines. Transport Scotland there seek an assessment of the A701(T) junction be provided which demonstrates the junction's capability to accommodate the 220 m height of the proposed turbines.</p> <p>Transport Scotland will require to be satisfied that the size of turbines proposed can negotiate both the selected route and the access junction and that their transportation will not have any detrimental effect on structures within the trunk road route path. Any proposed changes to the trunk road network must be discussed and approved via a technical approval process by the appropriate Area Manager.</p>	