

Technical Appendix 1.1: Consultation Register

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table				
Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Statutory Stakeholders				
Nikki Anderson, Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit	13/02/2018	Habitat Management	Given the scale of the proposed Development, SNH consider there could be the potential significant loss and damage to these habitats and request that a Habitat Management Plan be prepared as part of the EIA to address any mitigation and/or compensation measures that may be included in the application to ensure no overall significant loss or damage to important habitats and species. It would be the Scottish Ministers’ preference, if possible and where suitable land for habitat enhancement has been identified within the same estate as the proposed Development, that this be included as part of the application.	An Outline Habitat Management Plan will be prepared and submitted as a technical appendix to Chapter 6: Ecology of the EIAR.
		Mitigation	The mitigation measures suggested for any significant environmental impacts identified should be presented as a conclusion to each chapter. Applicants are also asked to provide a consolidated schedule of all mitigation measures proposed in the environmental assessment, provided in tabular form, where that mitigation is relied upon in relation to reported conclusions of likelihood or significance of impacts.	Each technical chapter of the EIAR will include a table of proposed mitigation measures. Chapter 10: Schedule of Mitigation will also be included as a final chapter of the EIAR which will present the consolidated schedule of mitigation measures.
		Scoping Opinion	Applicants are asked to provide a tabular summary within the EIAR covering each of the specific matters raised in the Scoping Opinion.	A consultation response table will be included as a technical appendix to Chapter 1: Introduction within the EIAR.
Ken McCorquodale, The Highland Council	04/01/2018	Development Plan Policy	Content with inclusion of text regarding the Development Plan and Supplementary Guidance and potential material considerations and identification of Wild Land Areas (WLAs) to be considered in the ES.	LVIA policy will be presented as a technical appendix to Chapter 4: LVIA of the EIAR.
		Special Landscape Areas	The distance from the site boundary to Locy Lochy and Loch Oich SLA needs to be reviewed. THC would also like to see the discussion of Ben Alder, Laggan and Glen Banchor SLAs.	Distances to be reviewed and addressed in Chapter 4: LVIA. Consideration of the SLAs identified by THC to be addressed in Chapter 4: LVIA.
		Battery Storage	Prefer to see inclusion of battery storage and note its removal from the development description.	Proposals for battery storage were considered during at the draft Scoping Layout stage; however, due to a number of commercial uncertainties this option has not been progressed in further design iterations.
		Historic Environment	Approved of method presented in the Scoping Report and that appropriate sources have been identified to inform the site's characterisation. THC satisfied with the approach of using a targeted walkover, limited to areas of greater potential on the more favourable lower slopes and along watercourses. The ES chapter should follow THC's Standards for Archaeological Work.	Chapter 5: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage will present the baseline and assessment. THC's Standards for Archaeological Work will be referred to in the methodology section of this chapter.
		Flooding and Drainage	Some parts of the site are within the 1 in 200 year flood zone of the larger watercourses e.g. Allt Coire Iain Dig and River Spey. Flood risk consideration should be given to smaller watercourses on site also. Request that an FRA is undertaken to ensure flood risk is minimised. Agreement that it is unnecessary to undertake a Drainage Impact Assessment and this can be submitted at the detailed design stage. ES to include drawing of watercourses, existing and proposed access tracks and information on proposed watercourse crossings. Avoid culverting where possible. Any culverts to be designed to accommodate 1 in 200-year flow. Avoid development in the floodplain. Adopt a 50 m buffer from watercourses.	A Watercourse Crossing Schedule will be prepared and included as an appendix in the EIAR which will address culvert volumes. All watercourse crossings (culverts/bridges) will be designed to accommodate a 1 in 200-year return period peak flow. A minimum 50 m buffer distance between turbine locations and watercourses had been adopted. A 75 m buffer has been maintained between the infrastructure and the adjacent Monadhliath SAC and SSSI blanket bog.

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
		Environmental Health	Operational noise unlikely to be an issue. Wind farm to meet ETSU standard of 35dB LA90. Noise assessment to be provided in line with ETSU-R-97. Background noise survey not required as long as it can be demonstrated that the noise levels will meet the 35 dB LA90 limit. 35 dB LA90 limit must be achieved for cumulative noise. Construction traffic noise assessment is required. EHO has no PWS records in the area of development. Applicant to undertake a site survey.	The results of the noise assessment will be presented in Chapter 9: Noise of the EIAR. A Private Water Supply Survey has been completed and found that there were no PWS were found within 250 m of any infrastructure associated with the proposed development.
		Transport Planning	Agree that a TA should be provided. Clarification requested regarding access options for the site and which route regular construction traffic will take. Agree that operational traffic can be scoped out. TA needs to justify why decommissioning traffic is not addressed in the EIAR. Challenge suggestion that the CTMP could manage cumulative impacts of construction traffic. Eastern option from the A86 - need to clarify proposed river crossing for abnormal loads. U2104 Laggan-Garvamore - TA needs to set out how construction traffic from the east would be prevented from using this road. Western option - B862 is popular tourist route. Concerns raised about parts of the route which are in poor condition. Mitigation of route to be clearly identified in TA and the potential environmental impacts associated with any works considered. Areas of temporary and permanent parking to be clearly identified. Mitigation measures to be clearly set out (THC points to South Loch Ness Road Improvement Strategy). Welcome the intention to provide a Framework Construction Travel Plan and an abnormal load assessment. Appendices provided setting out in detail what the Transport Assessment should include.	The Scoping Report included an eastern and a western access option. The final design will use the western access option. Consideration has been given to decommissioning traffic. Traffic associated with decommissioning would include HGVs, LGVs, abnormal loads and private cars and the number of vehicle trips associated with decommissioning would be significantly less than those associated with construction. At this stage it is not possible to quantify decommissioning traffic volumes as the precedent for decommissioning has not yet been established. It is also not possible to quantify the effect of decommissioning traffic as the baseline conditions will change over the planning permission period. A transport assessment will be undertaken and presented in Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport of the EIAR. The consideration of suitable mitigation options will also be presented in this chapter and a Framework Construction Travel Plan and an Abnormal Load Assessment will be included as technical appendices to this chapter. TA needs to justify why decommissioning traffic is not addressed in the EIAR and provide estimated trip generation. (Note that Transport Scotland consider it acceptable to scope out decommissioning traffic). Western option - B862 - Mitigation of route to be clearly identified in TA and the potential environmental impacts associated with any works considered. Proposed parking areas (permanent and temporary to be identified). Consideration of suitable mitigation options. WYG to be instructed to pick up transport issues.
Liz McLachlan, Scottish Natural Heritage	29/01/2018	Key issues summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Impacts on the adjacent Cairngorms National Park.Impacts on Wild Land Area (WLA) 20 Monadhliath, WLA 19 Braeroy - Glenshirra - Creag Meagaidh and WLA 14 Rannoch - Nevis - Mamores – Alder.Predicted collision risk impacts on the golden eagle population of NHZ10.Impacts on carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat The scoping report includes all the topics we would consider need to be covered by the EIA.	

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
		Designated Sites	<p>Monadhliath SAC/SSSI: the condition of the blanket bog within both the SAC and SSSI is currently unfavourable. One of the pressures identified by the condition monitoring is trampling. Displacement of deer from the wind farm site onto the SAC/SSSI could therefore adversely affect this feature. Deer Management Plan will need to be prepared and included in the EIAR. Must take into consideration deer management on neighbouring land to ensure objectives are complimentary.</p> <p>-River Spey SAC/SSSI: There is connectivity between the proposed wind farm and this designated site as they are within the same water catchment. All potential impacts should be assessed in the EIA Report and mitigation measures to be included as necessary. If the applicant is able to commit to undertaking all construction work in accordance with SEPA's good practice guidelines, then any adverse impacts on the SAC/SSSI should be avoided.</p> <p>-Cairngorms National Park: The proposed development site is also adjacent to the Cairngorm National Park and an assessment of the impacts of this proposal on the Special Qualities of the National Park should also be included in the EIA Report.</p> <p>There are other designated sites within 10km of the proposed development. However, based on the information presented in the Scoping Report, we do not consider that they will be affected either directly or indirectly. Consequently, we agree these other sites can be scoped out of the EIA.</p>	<p>A Deer Management Plan will be included as a technical appendix to the EIAR, which will take into consideration deer management on neighbouring land to ensure objectives are complimentary.</p> <p>The SACs/SSSIs will be considered in Chapter 6: Ecology. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will also be prepared and included as a technical appendix to the EIAR and will set out measures for pollution control and water quality management.</p> <p>Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will provide an assessment of the Cairngorms National Park.</p>
		LVIA	<p>-Scope and Methodology: Some of the guidance documents quoted are now out of date and include SNH Wild Land Descriptions 2017. Comments provided regarding the proposed approach to sensitivity, magnitude and significance rating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cumulatives: THC should be consulted to obtain the most up to date cumulative information.CNP: SNH recommends that the draft special quality assessment be used in discussions with us and the Park Authority. This draft has been shared with the Applicant (at the meeting of 7 December 2017).Wild Land: The three WLAs which require further assessment are WLA 20 Monadhliath, WLA 19 Braeroy.Glenshirra - Creag Meagaidh and WLA 14 Rannoch - Nevis - Mamores – Alder. Although visibility of the proposal extends into WLA 15 Cairngorms we do not expect that the impacts on this area, over 15km from the proposal will result in significant effects and any effects on wildness within the National Park would be considered within the assessment of the Parks Special Landscape Qualities, (two of which cover wild land and wildness). We are broadly in agreement with the proposed study areas for the three WLAs to be assessed.Viewpoints: We are content with the viewpoint list provided and can confirm that the draft wirelines have aided our understanding of the likely landscape and visual effects of the proposal. A key issue is the relationship between the Stronelairst wind farm and the Glenshero proposal and how they are seen together, in terms of design, this will be an important factor in determining the additional effects on the landscape. No further viewpoints are anticipated to be required to inform our advice on the proposal unless the design changes substantially in which case we may require additional viewpoints to include locations where visibility is not currently predicted.	<p>The guidance documents will be reviewed, and updated list included in Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The list of cumulative developments to be considered will be agreed with THC and ECU.</p> <p>The presence of Stronelairst Wind Farm has been a key design consideration. The Gatecheck Report provides a summary of design evolution and this will also be reported in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives of the EIAR.</p>
		Peat	<p>Around one third of the turbines currently proposed lie within Class 1 areas on the Carbon Peatland Map. An assessment of the impact of this proposal on this resource should be made and the survey results used to inform the design and layout process. The applicant should demonstrate through the EIA Report and draft Construction Method Statement that a wind farm can be built on this site without significant loss and damage to these fragile and priority habitats and other sensitive areas (e.g. blanket bog and deep peat).</p> <p>The EIA Report should also contain details of any mitigation measures which have been incorporated to ensure the protection of the carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Peat is mentioned in the Scoping Report in the context of the Hydrology and Hydrogeology section, including in relation to the preparation of a Peat Slide Risk Assessment, the requirement for which we endorse. We also strongly recommend early engagement with SEPA with regard to excavated peat reuse and disposal.	<p>Phase 1 peat probing has been completed for the site and the results shared and with SEPA. The results of the peat probing have been used to inform the design. Consideration of potential effects on the habitats will be provided in Chapter 6: Ecology. In addition, a Peat Management Plan, Peat Slide Risk Assessment, Carbon Calculator and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystem Assessment will also be prepared and submitted as technical appendices in the EIAR. In addition, an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be provided as technical appendix to the EIAR.</p>

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
		Ornithology	<p>The bird survey work proposed in the Scoping Report should be sufficient to assess the potential impacts on bird interests subject to it being undertaken in accordance with our guidance.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the predicted level of impact on golden eagle.</p> <p>Population Viability Assessment for NHZ10 requested to be included in the EIAR.</p> <p>Suggest removal of 10 turbines in the east to reduce collision risk.</p> <p>Age of the birds observed is important to establish (adults/juveniles collision risk could be higher; young/immature birds collision risk could be lower and not significant).</p> <p>PAT Model: The way the model has been presented appears to show an unrealistic concentration of activity around the nest site itself. This issue has been raised in the past with MacArthur Green in relation to Argyll casework. We understand Mark Trinder was due to check their work, in particular the R-value. A more defined/detailed scale bar for the levels of use would also help in interpreting the PAT model.</p> <p>Establish why there was a lower level of activity in the east of the site during 2016.</p>	Potential effects on ornithology will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIAR. This will include the results of the modelling.
		Protected Species	We are content that the list of surveys included in Scoping Report should pick up the notable protected species with the exception of wildcat. There is suitable wildcat habitat on site and therefore we strongly recommend this species is also surveyed. Due to the mobile nature of these animals an absence of presence during survey does not automatically translate to mean they are not present on site. We therefore recommend that if suitable habitat is present then a species protection plan should be included in the EIA Report which details what mitigation and other action will be taken should a protected species or their resting place be found during construction.	Subsequent consultation was undertaken with SNH regarding wildcat and it was agreed that wildcat surveys were not required (email from Liz McLachlan to Rafe Dewar dated 19/02/18).
		Other Terrestrial Habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the NVC and Phase 1 surveys should be presented in the EIA report. The NVC survey should cover the development site, the new access track and a suitable buffer and include all Annex 1 and BAP Priority Habitats and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE). Despite the high altitude of much of the site, no reference is made in the Scoping Report to montane habitats. Any loss or damage to montane habitats through the construction of a wind farm would be inappropriate. This should be taken into account in the design of the proposal and any significant loss and/ or damage to montane habitats should be avoided. In addition to mapping, describing and assessing the value of, and the potential impact on, habitats, the EIAR should record, and describe measures to avoid impacts on nationally rare and scarce plant species. -A Habitat Management Plan should be prepared as part of EIAR to address this and should include any mitigation and/or compensation measure required to ensure no significant loss or damage to important habitats and species. The EIA Report should also fully consider the potential natural heritage impacts of vehicle movements, track creation and modification along the full length of the proposed routes, including those outside the development area. It is not clear from the scoping report whether tree felling will be required as part of the proposed development, in particular along the access route. If tree felling will be required, we recommend that the applicant contacts FCS at as early a stage as possible to discuss the Control of Woodland Removal policy and the implications it may have on the development. All permanent and temporary habitat loss and modification should be quantified in the EIA Report to inform mitigation measures. 	<p>Assessment of effects on terrestrial habitats including GWDTE will be presented in Chapter 6: Ecology. An Outline Habitat Management Plan will also be prepared and included as a technical appendix in the EIAR.</p> <p>No felling is proposed as part of the proposed development.</p>
		Access and Recreation	With reference to the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, the applicant should pay due regard to the potential use of the area for recreation by the general public when designing and planning the proposed development. Regard should be given not only to the proposed development site but also the proposed access routes and additional tracks, which may increase the perceived recreational value of the area. Access should not be restricted unless necessary for health and safety or other overriding reasons. Where access needs to be restricted at any time, clear signage following the Scottish Outdoor Access Code branding guidelines is recommended.	An Outline Access Management will be prepared and included as Technical Appendix to Chapter 2: Development Description.
Urszula Szupczynska,	19/12/2017	Listed Buildings	Impacts on Garvamore Barracks (A Listed Building) should be included in the EIAR together with potential cumulative effects.	Chapter 5: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage will present the assessment, which will include an assessment of potential cumulative effects.

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table				
Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Historic Environment Scotland				
Susan Haslam, SEPA Dingwall	19/12/2017	Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map and assess all activities in or impacting the water environment including buffers, flood risk and details of any CAR applications. Map and assess impacts on GWDTE. Map and assess impacts on groundwater abstractions and buffers. Peat depth survey and table detailing reuse proposals. Map and detail forest removal. Map of borrow pit locations. Borrow pit site management plan. Map of propose surface water drainage layout. Decommissioning statement. 	
		Design	Happy to see the use of a 50 m watercourse buffer. Minimise the amount of track and reuse track where possible. Would like to see compact arrays.	A 50 m buffer has been applied to watercourses and the minimisation of track and reuse of track has been applied, where possible.
		Peat	A good Stage 1 peat probing exercise has been undertaken. Further probing needed around some of the turbines T4, T22, T24, T33 T40. Additional probing will be required where development is in or near deep peat (>1m). No further probing required in areas where existing results suggest peat is shallow.	The Phase 1 peat probing has been completed for the site and Phase 2 peat probing is underway. The results will be presented in the EIAR.
		Restoration	Identify potential peatland areas for restoration to mitigate peat disturbance and include in draft HMP. Propose consideration of the following: wetland habitat restoration; peatland restoration; removal and control of non-native species in the catchment; and actions to improve WFD water bodies.	Areas for restoration currently being identified by MacArthur Green with input from RES and an Outline Habitat Management Plan will be included in the EIAR.
		GWDTE	SEPA does not accept that the M16 habitat is not significantly groundwater dependent at this site. Happy to consider this issue again, if additional information is provided to suggest the habitats are not groundwater dependence but, in its absence, we would wish to see highly groundwater dependant habitats avoided and suitable mitigation measures put in place to minimise impacts on any moderately groundwater dependant habitats.	Subsequent consultation was undertaken with SEPA regarding this point and a response was received stating that SEPA is content that in this setting, M16d is unlikely to be highly groundwater dependent. SEPA would still like to see the habitat avoided in the first instance however, it accepts that if this is not possible, infrastructure can progress into these areas with suitable mitigation i.e. floating of the road/appropriate drainage (email from Susan Haslam to Claire Hollingsworth dated (27/02/18)).
		Flood Risk	As long as crossing are bottomless culverts or traditional style bridges designed to accommodate the 1 in 200 year and other infrastructure is located away from watercourses SEPA does not require detailed information on flood risk to be provided.	A Watercourse Crossing Schedule will be provided as a technical appendix to Chapter 2: Development Description.
		CDEMP	No requirement to provide one in the EIAR but refer to the requirements outlined in SEPA's guidance on Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management included with their response.	An Outline CEMP will be provided as a technical appendix and will include reference to relevant SEPA guidance on Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management.
Liz McLachlan, SNH on behalf of CNPA	29/01/2018	CNP	Due to the location of the proposal being wholly outside CNP, the current casework agreement between SNH and CNPA has been applied.	No action required.
Katherine Donnachie, CNPA	31/01/2018		Previously responded to a draft scoping report. This related to a larger scheme in terms of numbers of turbines. Their overall views remain largely the same as to issues to be scoped and the current scoping report highlights the key areas from our perspective.	
		Access	As noted in the scoping report access roads may pass through the National Park – this is to be further considered. It should be expressly noted that the policies of the Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan 2015 will need to be fully considered as part of the policy background and the visual and landscape impact of the access track and any associated improvements/works fully considered and assessed with any submission.	<p>The access track to the site no longer passes through any land with the CNP boundary.</p> <p>Potential effects on the CNP will be considered in Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p>

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
		Viewpoints	Viewpoints have been agreed with the Applicant under separate correspondence from SNH and we are content with the choice of viewpoints.	An assessment of the viewpoints will be presented in Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
		Impacts	As per our attached scoping comments we have concerns regarding the potential impacts on the National Park and these should be fully considered as per our comments and any mitigation clearly set out. This includes: policy, special landscape qualities of CNP, impacts on wild land areas and wildness, impacts on landscape character, impacts on visual sensitivities, cumulative effects, sequential visual effects, viewpoints, all graphics should show the boundary of CNP, grid connection, access, lighting, alternatives, assessment methodology.	Potential effects on the CNP will be considered in Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
Non Statutory				
Martin McKinnon, Forestry Commission	14/12/2017	Forestry	Acknowledge that there are no proposals to remove forestry as a result of the wind farm. Suggest management of forestry by coppicing is not appropriate in an upland setting. FCS advise a condition on any planning permission that should any future felling required so as not to affect the performance of the propose development would be subject to SG's Control of Woodland Removal Policy and that compensatory planting be undertaken. Any road widening resulting in forestry loss would also be subject to this policy. Generic scoping opinion response requests provision of a chapter on woodland felling.	There are no felling proposals as part of the proposed development therefore forestry will not be considered in the EIAR.
Emily Bridcut, Marine Scotland	15/12/2017	Fisheries & Water Quality	Recommendations that the following are undertaken: <ul style="list-style-type: none">site characterisation surveys of the water quality and fish populations within watercourses likely to be impacted;an integrated hydrochemical, macroinvertebrate and fish monitoring programme before, during and after construction; andconsider the potential cumulative impacts of the present development and adjacent developments.	Spey Fishery Board has been commissioned to undertake a fish survey the results of which will be included in Chapter. Results of the survey will be included in EIAR Chapter 6: Ecology together with appropriate mitigation measures. Consideration of cumulative effects will also be considered in Chapter 6: Ecology.
John McDonald, Transport Scotland	14/12/2017	Site Access	Transport Scotland requests a swept path analysis of the A86(T) access junction be carried out, and, advise that any proposed amendments to the trunk road junction would require to be discussed and agreed with Transport Scotland. These will require to comply with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	The site access will be described in Chapter 2: Development Description and the consideration of potential effects will be addressed in Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport. The Transport Assessment will be included as technical appendix to Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport.
		Abnormal Load Route	Transport Scotland agree with the proposed methodology for the abnormal load route assessment set out in the scoping report.	
		Traffic Increases	It is considered acceptable to scope out operational and decommissioning traffic. The TA will focus on impacts on the A82(T) and the A87(T) which we assume would form part of the delivery route to site, and, will seek to provide a robust (worst case) assessment of impacts and effects associated with the proposed development. Transport Scotland request that potential trunk road related environmental impacts (associated with increased traffic during construction) such as driver delay, severance, pedestrian amenity, safety etc should be considered and assessed where appropriate (i.e. where Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines for further assessment are breached).	
		Noise/ Vibration /Air Quality	Given the distance of the nearest trunk road to the site and the temporary nature of increased traffic levels, it is considered unlikely that there will be any significant impact on trunk road receptors in terms of noise, air quality or vibration. Transport Scotland, therefore, does not require any assessment of these effects to be included within the EIAR.	
Brian Davidson, Fisheries Management Scotland	01/12/2017	Fisheries	The Spey District Salmon Fishery Board should be consulted as the project falls within their area.	The Spey Fishery Board were contacted as part of the Scoping process - their response is provided below.

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Roger Knight, Spey Fishery Board	16/01/2018	Fisheries and Designated Features	<p>River Spey and its tributaries are an SAC and SSSI. SAC qualifying interests are for Atlantic salmon, otter, sea lamprey and freshwater pearl mussel.</p> <p>The Spey Fishery Board has already been involved in pre-development monitoring of juvenile fish stocks around the proposed area of development of Glenshero.</p> <p>The Board also has extensive experience of monitoring wind farm developments, which has been garnered over the last fifteen years. The Board is particularly concerned about the establishment of infrastructure at the proposed Glenshero site, as well as the sites chosen and methods that might be employed for crossing any water bodies at this site.</p> <p>The Board therefore requests it is closely consulted on and actively engaged with the method statements and SUDS plans that may be proposed for the establishment of infrastructure and water crossings at Glenshero, both before any construction takes place and during it, if and when it is approved.</p> <p>Grateful for your assurance that these concerns will be addressed during the scoping and planning processes.</p>	<p>An Outline CEMP will be prepared and included as a technical appendix to Chapter 2: Development Description. The CEMP will set out standard construction practices including pollution control measures. An assessment of potential effects will be presented in Chapter 6: Ecology together with any additional mitigation that is required above that contained in the outline CEMP.</p> <p>A Fishery Survey has been completed by the Spey Fishery Board (October 2017) the results of which will be included in the Chapter 6: Ecology.</p>
Paul Atkinson, BT	24/11/2017	Telecommunications	<p>The wind farm proposal has been studied with respect to EMC and related problems to BT point-to-point microwave radio links.</p> <p>The conclusion is that, the Project indicated should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio networks.</p>	No action required.
Civil Aviation Authority - Airspace				No response received.
Joan McGrogan, Crown Estate Scotland	09/01/2018	Crown Estate	Confirmed that the assets of Crown Estate Scotland are not affected by this proposal.	No action required.
Kalie Jagpal, Defence Infrastructure Organisation	07/12/2017	Aviation	<p>The MOD has no objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Request turbines are fitted with aviation lighting. All turbines to be fitted with 25 candela omni-directional red lighting or infrared lighting with an optimised flash pattern of 60 flashes/minute of 200 ms to 500 ms at the highest practical point.</p> <p>Final turbine locations to be provided to MOD.</p>	Chapter 2: Development Description will include a summary of the proposed lighting strategy for the turbines.
Joint Radio Company				No response received.
NATS Safeguarding	06/12/2017	Aviation	The proposed development does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.	No action required.
Darrell Stevens, RSPB Scotland	10/01/2018	Designated Sites	Areas of the development site contain several designated sites: Monadhliath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Creag Meagaidh SSSI, SAC and Special Protection Area (SPA).	The site is wholly outwith designated sites.
		Birds of conservation concern	<p>The area supports at least 15 species of particular conservation concern: black grouse, black-throated diver, curlew, dotterel, dunlin, greenshank, golden eagle, golden plover, hen harrier, lapwing, merlin, peregrine falcon, ring ouzel, snipe and twite.</p> <p>The potential effects of the development on all of these sites and species, and associated mitigation, should be fully considered and discussed in the EIA report.</p> <p>The EIA should consider phasing, timing of operations, and access routes as well as the development footprint and construction works, in order to minimise the impacts on the bird interest in the area.</p>	Potential effects on ornithology will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIAR.

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
David Gibson, Mountaineering Scotland	28/11/2017	LVIA	<p>LVIA: Proposes alternative VPs for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meall na h-Aisre. Gairbeinn. Carn na Saobhaidhe, further north in the Monadhliath, is also a Corbett. While the impact may be attenuated by distance, there are otherwise no viewpoints at all in this direction. <p>Consider that both of these corbetts are likely to experience substantial impacts.</p> <p>The following VPs could be dropped:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crag na Doire Duibhe is infrequently climbed and at a similar angle and intermediate in distance to Dun da Lamh fort (Vpt 11) and Carn na Caim (Vpt 20) or Meall Chuaich (Vpt 9). Depending on the final location of Viewpoint 18 (see below), either Viewpoint 19 or Viewpoint 20 would add little further information to the assessment. Viewpoint 18 (Meall Cruaidh) is climbed less frequently than the main summit of the ridge west of Loch Ericht on which it lies – The Fara. The ZTV suggests that both Meall Cruaidh and The Fara would have similar visibility of Glenshero so it would be logical to select the latter since it is the more frequented location. <p>Wild Land: Monadhliath WLA the focus should be on elevated locations east and west of Glen Markie (e.g. Carn Odhar na Criche to Geal Charn). Beinn Bhreac Mhor referred to in the same section is the one north of Strath Dearn (NH6719) – the only one we can see locally - it is not in the Monadhliath WLA. Carn na Saobhaidhe, which we have suggested above as a viewpoint, although also outwith the WLA, is closer to the proposed site and markedly closer to the WLA boundary.</p>	Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will include a summit assessment which will be provided as a technical appendix in the EIAR.
		Cultural Heritage	Notes that shielings are present on higher ground.	Potential effects on archaeology and cultural heritage will be presented in Chapter 5.
		Employment	Impacts on tourism-related employment should be included in the assessment.	<p>On top of Chapter 10: Socio-economics, a standalone socio-economic report will be prepared and included with the planning application documents. The report will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment of the direct and indirect economic effects associated with the development and construction of the proposed development; assessment of the direct and indirect economic effects associated with the operation of the proposed development; review and assessment of any potential tourism effects assessment of wider socio-economic effects, for example, benefits arising from shared ownership; and the wider context of how the proposed development supports other investment in the Highlands.
Rebecca Williams, Scottish Water	18/12/2017	Drinking Water Protected Areas (DWPA)	The proposed development falls within the drinking water catchment within which Scottish Water abstractions from the River Spey are located (the Laggan and Aviemore boreholes). Scottish Water abstractions are designated as DWPAs under Article 7 of the Water Framework Directive. It is therefore essential that water quality and water quantity in this area are protected.	Water quality and quantity protection measures will be presented in the outline CEMP which will be included as technical appendix in the EIAR.
		Boreholes	<p>Proposed turbines are located in the headwaters of the Allt Coire Iain Oig and Feith Talagain burns which join the River Spey at a distance of approximately 10 km upstream of the Laggan boreholes. There is a section of the site approximately 2.5 km upstream of the boreholes which appears to be the access track.</p> <p>With regard to the Aviemore boreholes, these are located a significant distance downstream from the proposed development (approx. 30 km). The proposed development represents a low risk to the Laggan boreholes and the Aviemore boreholes. Nevertheless, it is important that the applicant notifies Scottish Water of any pollution incidents that may impact surface water drainage in the River Spey water supply catchment.</p>	

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
		Scottish Water Assets	All Scottish Water assets potentially affected by the development should be identified, with particular consideration being given to access roads and pipe crossings.	
Douglas Keith, Visit Scotland	10/01/2018	Tourism	<p>Request for a Tourism Impact Statement to be produced.</p> <p>Visit Scotland would strongly recommend any potential detrimental impact of the proposed development on tourism - whether visually, environmentally and economically - be identified and considered in full. This includes when taking decisions over turbine height and number.</p> <p>Visit Scotland would also urge consideration of the specific concerns raised above relating to the impact any perceived proliferation of developments may have on the local tourism industry, and therefore the local economy</p>	Potential impacts on views and setting to be considered in the LVIA and the Cultural Heritage assessments, which will be reported in chapters 4 and 5 respectively of the EIAR. Effects on tourism will be considered in chapter 10 and the standalone socio-economic report (the scope of which is outlined above).
Helen McDade, John Muir Trust	17/01/2018	Turbine Model	Raised a query regarding the proposed turbine height of up to 135 m and a rating of 4.2 MW.	Chapter 2: Development Description will include a summary of the proposed turbine parameters which be used in the EIAR.
		LVIA	<p>The Trust agrees that the main Wild Land Areas (WLAs) to be considered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">WLA19 Braeroy – Glenshirra-Creag Meagaidh;WLA20 the Monadhliaths; andWLA14 Rannoch-Nevis – Mamores-Alder.	Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment present an assessment of effects on potential receptors from the proposed development.
		Cumulative LVIA	Consider the 10 km radius for including cumulative wind farms too small and that at least a 35 km radius should be used.	
		Wild Land Methodology	<p>The Report states that “The methodology utilised for the WLIA in respect of the effect of the proposed development will follow SNH’s currently (sic) Guidance, but with cognisance of the SNH consultation Draft Guidance”. The Trust agrees with the use of the SNH current Guidance in this way. The draft SNH 2017 Guidance has not been progressed following consultation and so the current Guidance (updated 2014) should be used.</p> <p>The WLIA should not artificially divide the WLAs into smaller units which the assessor regards as more or less wild but consider the WLA as a whole. Of course, within the WLA the significance of an impact will vary according to the particular site.</p>	
		Peat	<p>Adequate peat probing should be undertaken for such a varied site.</p> <p>There is a common misconception that peat can be removed from a construction site and then laid down elsewhere and regarded as being “re-instated”. Once living peat is dug up, it is no longer living and can only be regarded as consisting of the components of peat. So the assessment should not include reference to re-instating peat in this way.</p>	The results of the peat probing will be included in the EIAR together with a Peat Management Plan in line with SEPA guidance as a technical appendix to Chapter 2: Development Description.
Scottish Wildlife Trust				No response received
BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding (Aberdeen)	06/12/2017	Aviation	This proposal is located outwith our consultation zone. We have no comment to make and need not be consulted further.	No action required
Anne Phillips, Highlands and Islands Airport	12/01/2018	Aviation	<p>HIAL calculations show that, at the given position and height, this development would not infringe the safeguarding surfaces for Inverness Airport and most of the area is in shadow of terrain from the airport’s radar.</p> <p>In the unlikely event that the radar is affected, the developer has stated in their report that they would enter into a radar mitigation contract to provide a technical solution to any potential interference.</p> <p>It would be useful if this could be identified, or discounted, before the wind farm is built.</p>	No action required

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Eleisha Fahy, Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays)	13/07/2018	Recreation and Cultural Heritage	The National Catalogue of Rights of Way (CROW) shows that rights of way HB30 and HB33 cross the area outlined in red on your Site Boundary plan. As there is no definitive record of rights of way in Scotland, there may be routes that meet the criteria to be rights of way but have not been recorded because they have not yet come to our notice. Rights of way HB30 forms part of General Wade’s Military Road through the Corrieyairack Pass. This route is promoted by our Heritage Paths project and described in our popular book Scottish Hill Tracks. It may be relevant to note that two other rights of way in the vicinity of the search area are also promoted for their historic interest by the Heritage Paths project and included in Scottish Hill Tracks. These are The Soft Road For The Hobbs (HB29) and the Glen Markie Track (HB31/HI109).	Noted.
			There may now be general access rights over any property under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. It is also worth bearing in mind the Core Paths Plans, prepared by the Highland Council and the Cairngorms National Park Authority as part of their duties under this Act. In particular, we understand this area is used for access to the Munro, Geal Charn, and nearby Corbetts.	Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual assesses all key rights of way as well as wider recreational access such as hill summits.
		Design	As we understand that there is very little guidance regarding the siting of turbines in relation to established paths and rights of way, the following may be helpful: Extract from the Welsh Assembly Government’s Technical Advice Note on Renewable Energy (TAN 8); Proximity to Highways and Railways. It is advisable to set back all wind turbines a minimum distance, equivalent to the height of the blade tip, from the edge of any public highway (road or other public right of way) or railway line.	The turbine are sited away from public highways and/ or railway lines. The closest is a National Rights of Way 800 m to the east of the turbines and therefore no further action is required.
		LVIA	The Society is aware of other wind farm developments/proposals in the wider area. Recreational amenity is of concern to us, so we assume that the cumulative visual impact of the proposals will be considered in due course.	Cumulative visual impact is assessed in Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual
Nuclear Safety Directorate (HSE)				No response received
British Horse Society				No response received
Scottish Wild Land Group (SWLG)				No response received
Community Councils				
Laggan Community Association				No response received
Newtonmore Community Council				No response received
Strathdearn Community Council				No response received
Stratherrick and Foyers Community Council	06/12/2017		The wind farm is not visible from the Stratherrick & Foyers Community Council area, therefore the SFCC does not have any concerns or comments regarding the wind farm itself but does have grave concerns regarding the traffic and transport routes proposed. Strongly opposed to the use of Stronelairst access track due to ongoing disturbance and inconvenience to the local community. The area has experienced disruption from Dumnaglass, Corriegarth and now the consented Stronelairst. No community benefit scheme on offer by the applicant to compensate communities.	Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport will address potential traffic effects as a result of the proposed development.

Table 1.1.1: Scoping Consultation Table				
Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Fort Augustus and Glenmoriston Community Council				No response received

Table 1.1.2: Gatecheck Response Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Statutory Stakeholders				
Ken McCorquodale, The Highland Council	23/07/2018 (Gatecheck)	Gatecheck	The application will require significant assessment against policies both of the Council – Development plan and its supplementary guidance as well as set by Scottish Ministers.	A Planning Statement will be prepared and submitted with application for consent.
		Design Evolution/ Project Description	This project has been developed from a single idea / estate, but it now presents as almost two significant wind farm projects, both of which will require to be read as extensions to the existing Stronelaig development and potential its extension via the Dell wind farm application (at appeal). The Council has previously advise on the development of the Stronelaig project which was significantly paired back – i.e. proposed turbines to its south. It would seem at first observation that this past mitigation by design will be undone by the current proposal. This will obviously be a particular consideration in any assessment by the Council.	The evolution of the site's design takes account of, and is largely predicated on, the position and design of the Stronelaig Wind Farm. The specific design response and embedded mitigation is described in Chapter 3: Design and Evolution of the EIAR. Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual assesses the effect of the proposed development on key landscape and visual receptors, and comments on the additional and cumulative effects of the development and efficacy of embedded mitigation.
		LVIA/ Design Evolution	Looking at the wirelines there remain several turbines which present quite an impact and above the skyline, which do not easily site with the rest of the array. Mitigation by design is a key element of both Council and Scottish Government policy, so I was hoping that there would be more obvious evidence of the input from the applicant's landscape advisors.	
		Gatecheck/ Infrastructure Layout	The applicant has moved away from accessing the turbine locations from the south in preference to an access from Stronelaig. They should be made aware that the access tracks currently being used by SSE (Renewables) are due to be partly decommissioned and restoration undertaken – which was already delayed in implementation from the Glendoe project. It may be that the applicant will simply take over these obligations as part of their project, but they need to be made aware of this obligation.	The EIAR assumes that the current access track between Stronelaig Wind Farm and Glenshero Wind Farm will be restored and this is described in Chapter 2: Development Description.
Liz McLachlan, Scottish Natural Heritage	29/06/2018 (Gatecheck)	Gatecheck	Having looked through the Gatecheck Report it appears our scoping comments have been taken on board and we note the following key changes to the proposals which will mitigate some of the effects highlighted in our scoping response: 1. Reduction in 5.52km of new access tracks. Main access is now utilising Stronelaig tracks thereby removing any of this development from within CNP. 2. Removal of 1 turbine 3. Repositioning of 2 turbines in response to landscape constraints 4. Revision of red line boundary to remove all development from CNP 5. Reduction in height of turbines	Noted. No action required
		Gatecheck	Subject to the necessary level of detail in relation to fieldwork methodologies, calculations etc, and the ZTV's at a scale which allows contours and other features to be clearly visible, being submitted at the application stage we should have the necessary detail for us to make an assessment of the impacts, come to a view on whether or not we agree with the applicants conclusions drawn from the results and then ultimately determine our position in relation to the overall develop.	Noted. No action required
		LVIA	The other point to note is the reference made in the Gatecheck Report, Part 3, page 10 which is attributed to JMT and which states: "The methodology utilised for the WLIA in respect of the effect of the proposed development will follow SNH's currently (sic) Guidance, but with cognisance of the SNH consultation Draft Guidance". The Trust agrees with the use of the SNH current Guidance in this way. The draft SNH 2017 Guidance has not been progressed following consultation and so the current Guidance (updated 2014) should be used." We have previously, and continue to advise that the use of the 2017 draft guidance is the best mechanism by which to identify any likely significant effects on the qualities of WLAs. The 2007 guidance referenced by JMT pre-dates the identification of the WLAs, the wild land descriptions and SPP.	SNH's current guidance and the agreed approach for the LVIA is to utilise the draft 2017 guidance and the published WLA descriptions. The Wild Land Impact Assessments are provided in Technical Appendix 4.5 of the EIAR, which also sets out the methodological approach adopted.

Table 1.1.2: Gatecheck Response Table

Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Urszula Szupczynska, Historic Environment Scotland	12/7/2018 (Gatecheck)	Gatecheck	Having reviewed the submitted report, I can confirm that we are broadly content that the details given reflect our advice regarding the EIA process for this development. We consider that we have been appropriately consulted at scoping stage, and that the proposed cultural heritage assessment is appropriate for our requirements. We also note the changes made to the design and layout of the proposed development and that the overall number of turbines proposed has been reduced.	Noted. No action required
Susan Haslam, SEPA Dingwall	13/07/2018 (Gatecheck)	Peat	We have agreed the requirements of the second phase of probing (which we understand has now been completed) and as long as the finalised layout avoids deep peat where possible, and where not possible avoids the deepest peat found in the immediate survey area, then the layout submission is likely to be acceptable to us. We highlight the need for information on volumes of peat disturbed, temporary storage and reuse options as outlined in our scoping response.	Avoiding deep peat was a key consideration throughout the design process. The process is presented in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives of the EIAR. Peat information will be presented in TA2.5: Peat Management Plan; TA2.8: Phase 1 Peat Probing Report; and TA2.9: Phase 2 Peat Probing Report
		GWDTE	The developers approach of us reaching agreement on groundwater dependence of habitats at this early stage is especially useful. There are a couple of issues which we are still discussing but it is hoped that these can be addressed shortly. As long as the finalised layout avoids habitats that have been determined to be groundwater dependant and puts in place adequate mitigation for indirect effects the submission is likely to be acceptable to us.	Subsequent consultation was undertaken with SEPA regarding GWDTE. Avoiding sensitive habitats was a key consideration in our design process. The process is presented in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives of the EIAR.
		Hydrology	We welcome the buffers outlined in the gatecheck report and as long as the submission includes that crossing are designed following best practice guidance then it is likely to be acceptable	Current best practice guidance has been followed and watercourse crossing design is presented in TA2.2: Watercourse Crossing Design.
		Design and Alternatives	Our scoping response highlighted our concerns regarding a layout which makes use of a large number of spurs and this is still a feature of the development layout to be put forward now. We have discussed this further with the developer and they have generally been able to provide us with some comfort regarding other options pursued and why they have been discounted. We would expect the EIA report to address this issue when consideration alternative layouts.	Alternative layouts and reasons for choosing the current layout are discussed in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives of the EIAR.
		Borrow pit	There is very little about borrow pits in the gatecheck report and we refer you and the developer to our scoping response in this regard. Good information on borrow pit location, scale and design is still unfortunately often missing from large scale planning submissions, and it would be hoped that this will be avoided in this case.	Information on borrow pits is presented in TA2.3: Borrow Pit Assessment.
		Gatecheck	In conclusion we can confirm that insofar as can be determined from the information submitted 1. We are content with the applicant's approach and intended methodology to the EIA and 2. The intended final design and layout is acceptable if it takes into consideration the advice outlined above The findings of recent survey peat work and subsequent GWDTE discussions, may result in the need for minor amendments.	Noted. No action required
Katherine Donnachie, CNPA	13/7/2018 (Gatecheck)	Gatecheck	We can confirm that the applicants' approach as set out in the Stage 1 Gatecheck report is acceptable to us.	Noted. No action required
		LVIA	As previously advised, any assessment of the impact on the Cairngorms National Park as may be contained in proposed Chapter 4 Landscape and Visual Assessment must contain a specific assessment of impacts on the special landscape qualities of the National Park including wildness. As previously noted we are happy to provide advice in this regard. This information is essential for us to consider the proposals in relation to the policies of the National Park Partnership Plan 2017-2022 which is a material planning consideration. In particular this Plan sets out under policy 3.3 that large scale wind turbines are inappropriate outside the Park where they significantly adversely affect its landscape character or special landscape qualities.	Technical Appendix 4.4 contains an outline of the key special qualities of the National Park, along with an assessment of predicted indirect effects on these qualities.
		Viewpoints	All viewpoints previously identified by us should be assessed in the LVIA	Agreed final viewpoints were assessed in Technical Appendix 4.7.
		Design and Alternatives	As highlighted in our scoping response consideration of alternatives should be included within the submission.	Consideration of alternatives is discussed in Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives of the EIAR.

Table 1.1.2: Gatecheck Response Table				
Consultee Organisation	Date	Topic	Consultee Response	Applicant Response
Non-Statutory				
Emily Bridcut, Marine Scotland	13/7/2018 (Gatecheck)	Fisheries & Water Quality	<p>The report notes the importance of salmon, trout, eel and lamprey within the River Spey SAC and in the interest of these fish populations we reiterate our advice provided in our response to the scoping report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">to carry out up to date fish population and water quality surveys to assess the likely significant impacts associated with the proposed development and to provide appropriate site specific mitigation measures;to establish an integrated hydrochemical, macroinvertebrate and fish monitoring programme to be carried out before, during and after construction; andto consider the potential cumulative impacts on the water quality and fish populations of the present proposal and adjacent developments	<p>Spey Fishery Board has been commissioned to undertake a fish survey the results of which will be included in Chapter. Results of the survey will be included in EIAR Chapter 6: Ecology together with appropriate mitigation measures. Consideration of cumulative effects will also be considered in Chapter 6: Ecology.</p>