AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

Red John Pumped Storage Hydro Scheme

Volume 5, Appendix 4.4: Consultation Tracker

ILI (Highlands PSH) Ltd.

November 2018

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Sarah Young	Catherine Anderson	Catherine Anderson	Catherine Anderson
Graduate EIA Consultant	Associate Director	Associate Director	Associate Director

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	November 2018	Submission	CA	Catherine Anderson	Associate Director

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendix 4.4 Consultation Tracker

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This appendix has been produced to support Chapter 4: Approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (Volume 2). Table 4.1 contains the consultation feedback received on the Development since the submission of the Scoping Report (Appendix 4.2) in September 2017 and sets out where in the EIA Report the comments are addressed.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
01.1.01	ECU	30/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Subject to specific comments below, the Scottish Ministers expect the EIA report which will accompany any application for the proposed development to include full details showing that all the advice, guidance, concerns and requirements raised by each consultee in the correspondence attached at Annex 2 to this opinion, have been addressed.	Noted
01.1.02	ECU	30/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (CAR) In the case of a generating station in respect of which a controlled activity, within the meaning of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005, will be carried on, the Scottish Ministers shall, before granting a consent under section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989, obtain and have regard to the advice of the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) on matters relating to the protection of the water environment and have regard to the purposes of Part 1 of the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003. The proposed development will require an authorisation from SEPA under CAR. The ECU encourages applicants to twin-track applications for consent under section 36 and CAR to ensure that CAR requirements can be accommodated more easily when proposals are at their most fluid. Scottish Ministers will not issue any section 36 consent in respect of a hydro development until the CAR licence has been approved and issued.	The Applicant can confirm that an application for a CAR license will be made after the submission of the Section 36.
01.1.03	ECU	30/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Water Rights for Hydro-Electric Generating Stations in Scotland In Scotland, Schedule 5, Section 10(5) of the Electricity Act 1989 allows for a person who holds a generation licence under section 6(1)(a) to be authorised by Scottish Ministers to abstract and divert from any watercourse or loch and to use such water as may be necessary for the purposes of constructing or extending a generating station wholly or mainly driven by water, and of operating that generating station after construction or extension. Such authorisation shall be by order and shall provide for the compulsory acquisition by the person of such rights, as regards the abstraction, diversion and use, as may be specified in the order; and the order may contain such incidental, consequential and supplementary provisions as the Scottish Ministers thinks necessary or expedient. Should an Acquisition of Water Rights Order be required, it is advised that this is applied for at the same time as the application for section 36 consent in order to avoid protracted consultation timescales.	The Applicant can confirm that an application for the acquisition of water rights will be made after the submission of the Section 36.
01.1.04	ECU	30/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	It should be noted that to facilitate uploading to the Energy Consents portal, the EIA Report and its associated documentation, when submitted, should be accompanied with a CD containing the EIA report and its associated documentation divided into appropriately named separate files of sizes no more than 10 MB. This will also assist SNH and other consultees.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
01.1.05	ECU	30/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	5. Mitigation Measures The Scottish Ministers are required to make a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment as identified in the environmental impact assessment. 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.	A mitigation regsiter is contained within Appendix 17.1
02.1.01	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 51: Trees and Development & Policy 52: Principle of Development in Woodland – set out the Council's support for proposals that safeguard existing woodland, but require applicants to demonstrate the capacity of the site to deliver development where woodland is present. Given that this proposal has the potential to create adverse impacts, with the presence of Ancient and Long Established woodland (please see the relevant constraints map), it will be essential to demonstrate how woodland is being safeguarded and, where it is being removed, what provisions will be made for compensatory planting. Any proposed works should also have regard to Scottish Government's Control of Woodland Removal Policy. The response in this pack from the Forestry Team provides further detail on the issues around trees and woodland. Policy 51 includes reference to the Trees, Woodland and Development Supplementary Guidance which may be of relevance.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.02	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 55: Peat and Soils – requires applicants to demonstrate that their proposal will not cause unnecessary disturbance, degradation or erosion of peat and soils. This is particularly relevant in relation to the potential spoil disposal and dredging works described in the Draft Scoping Report submitted with the pre-application meeting request. There are pockets of Carbon Rich Soil, Deep Peat and Priority Peatland Habitat (Groups 1 and 3) as indicated in the SNH Carbon and Peatland 2016 Map. As your proposals progress, you should ensure that appropriate assessment and mitigation of potential impacts on the peat and soil resource is identified. It is noted from the pre-application meeting that you are in the process of undertaking peat probing onsite.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.03	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 57: Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage – considers impacts on natural, built and cultural heritage designations and features. These are split into three categories of importance: international, national and local/regional. The following key features will require survey work and assessments: - Loch Ashie SPA and SSSI - Loch Ruthven SAC, SPA, SSSI and Ramsar - Caisteal an Dunriachaidh Scheduled Monument within the site and several other Scheduled Monuments in proximity to the site - multiple Historic Environment Records within the site - Listed Buildings in proximity to the site - Aldourie Designed Landscape around 1 km NW of the site, Dochfour Designed Landscape around 3 km NW of the site - Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area, described in the Assessment of Highland Special Landscape Areas (whole site within SLA, not shown on constraints map)	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.04	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 58: Protected Species – safeguards European protected species and only supports development where an adverse effect is likely if there are other overriding interests. You should refer to the response from SNH for further detail about potential for impacts from the proposal on protected species.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.05	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 61 Landscape – sets out that development should reflect the character of the landscape and the special qualities identified in the relevant Landscape Character Assessment. The LCAs are a starting point to base assessment of landscape and visual impact on. It is key to set out who the visual receptors of the development are, what the landscape impacts are and how these two factors relate. This proposal sits in a potentially sensitive landscape setting, being wholly within the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area. You should refer to the response from the Landscape Officer on key landscape considerations for this proposal. The Highland Council has Visualisation Standards for Wind Energy Developments, these will be relevant to this proposal given the likely need to assess scale and distance in relation to the proposal.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.06	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 63 Water Environment – supports development that does not compromise the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Assessment of this proposal will include how the proposal relates to the River Basin Management Plan for the Scotland River Basin District and, for this proposal, the North Highland River Basin Management Plan.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.07	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 64 Flood Risk – sets out the Council's expectations in regard to floodrisk. This policy is highly likely to be relevant to the proposal. The Council's Flood Team and Scottish Environment Protection Agency responses in this pack provide further information as does the Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment Supplementary Guidance.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.08	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 67 Renewable Energy Developments – supports proposals that contribute to meeting renewable energy generation targets. This support is subject to addressing important key issues and other criteria. The Council must be satisfied that the development is located, sited and designed in a way that will not be significantly detrimental to a number of considerations as set out in the Policy. This proposal has potential to make a considerable contribution to renewable energy generation. The Onshore Wind Energy Supplementary Guidance includes a Landscape Appraisal for the Loch Ness area. Although this proposal is for pump storage hydro rather than onshore wind, there are likely to be elements of this study (e.g. Key Views, Routes and Gateways identified) that will be of relevance to Landscape and Visual Assessment of the proposal.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.09	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 77 Public Access – sets out the requirement for proposals that will affect a Core Path to retain the existing path or ensure suitable alternative provision. Drumashie Moor (IN12.05) and Kindrummond to Dirr Wood (IN12.04) Core Paths are within the site and the proposals will have to comply with this policy. The Policy also affords protection to the Public's wider access rights. There are several routes in the wider path network across the site and these should be taken into consideration. You should refer to the response from the Council's Access Officer for further detail.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.10	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy 78 Long Distance Routes – safeguards long distance routes and seeks to enhance them and their setting. There are two on the site, the Trail of the Seven Lochs and the South Loch Ness Trail. You should refer to the response from the Council's Access Officer for further detail. The relevant Core Paths, Long Distance Routes and Wider Path Network Routes are shown in the relevant constraints map.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.11	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposal outlines two Options, A and B which both include Headponds with banking rising above the existing ground level, Option A – to a max of 30.2m and Option B to a Max of 43m above existing, in addition to headrace, powerhouse, tailrace, spillway, access and other associated infrastructure. Whilst it is difficult to fully anticipate the likely effects of the development on the degree of information currently available, it is clear that for either option the headpond alone would be a significant intervention in the existing landscape.	Noted, the Planning Statement provides fruther detail on compliance with this policy
02.1.12	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The application site lies wholly within the Loch Ness and Duntelchaig Special Landscape Area, and as such, key characteristics, qualities and sensitivities are outlined in the 'Assessment of Highland Special Landscape Areas' found at https://www.highland.gov.uk/directory_record/712044/special_landscape_area_citations	Noted
02.1.13	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Overview – this area is dominated by the vast linear feature of Loch Ness and its dramatic landform trench, flanked by steep, towering wooded slopes that leads to undulating moorland ridges and a contrasting remote interior plateau of upland lochs, small woods and rocky knolls.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.14	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Key Landscape and Visual Characteristic – the striking, linear landform trench containing Loch Ness offers a dramatic sequence of landscape elements along its 23 mile length. The horizontal water's surface combines with adjacent steep slopes to create a simple and distinctive profile of contrasting planes and edges. To the east of Loch Ness an undulating moorland plateau characterised by rocky knolls and small-scale woods and forests, and peppered with upland lochs, creates an intricate landscape mosaic which contrasts strongly with the adjacent simple drama of the Great Glen.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.15	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Special Quality: Contrasting Intimate Plateau – an undulating moorland plateau of rocky knolls flanked by small-scale woods and forests, patches of pastures and sporadic farmsteads, and interspersed with a sequence of tranquil lochs, that creates an intimate mix of landscape elements of changing visual interest.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.16	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Sensitivity to change – both sides of Loch Ness are sensitive to the introduction of built development which would intrude on views up and down the loch and also across the loch. The area is sensitive to any development which would require significant modification to the landform of the Great Glen and surrounding moorland plateau. Not only could this be highly visible upon the glen sides slopes and affect the apparent bounding edge of the glen, but it could also affect the sense of openness and wildness within the moorland parts of this part of the SLA.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.17	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	From these it is clear that the simplicity of the landscape composition of Loch Ness and the Great Glen is highly valued, as is the landscape around Loch Duntelchaig, for its own characteristics, for its contrast with the adjacent landscape of Loch Ness and for its contribution to views across the loch. In addition to the SLA, the Headpond Options sit within the Flat Moorland Plateau with Woodland LCT, in proximity to Farmed and Wooded Foothills and the broad, Streep Sided Glen.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.18	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Key Characteristics of the LCTs are set out in the Landscape Character Assessment documents. In view of the nature of the earthworks required for the construction of the headponds, following aspects are highlighted. **Flat Moorland Plateau with Woodland:** - a predominantly horizontal skyline, with a general lack of features of known scale resulting in it being often difficult to determine distance or relative size. - a simple landscape with little diversity and where it is often difficult to orientate oneself. - a strong perception of remoteness. **Farmed and Wooded Foothills:** - typified by low rocky hills with complex and irregular landform of steep sided slopes, rocky ridges and peaks. - generally open upper slopes - offering extensive and panoramic views which convey a sense of exposure. - boundary with the Flat Moorland Plateau with Woodland area marked by conifer plantations. **Broad Steep Sided Glen:** - long even skylines create a very strong sense of linear enclosure If it is to be possible to successfully integrate a headpond into the landscape and visual environment, a high degree of mitigation by design will have to be achieved.	Noted, a description of the baseline character and composition is provided in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual, and the associated appendices
02.1.19	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Assessment of impact must include any impacts arising from the 'realignment' of the C1064.	This is contained with Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.20	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The full extent of disturbance and excavation is difficult to determine from the information available, but as the applicants clearly understand all impacts arising from such works stand to be assessed for LVIA impacts.	This is contained with Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual
02.1.21	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The final form of the infrastructure required at the side of Loch Ness is also not fully clear, and a Visitor Centre is mooted within the presentation. And impacts from these stand to be assessed.	The above ground infrastructure is shown on Figure 2.4. Following consultation feedback, no Visitors Centre is included within the design of the Development
02.1.22	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Post operationally it is indicated that the dam would stay in place. At first consideration this seems as though it would create an extraordinary landscape feature, so it will be useful to see what the decision process is that leads to retention of earthworks rather than reinstatement.	This is shown in the Visualisations provided in Volume 4. Chapter 11: Landscape and Visual outlines how the Embankment and Landscape Embankment have been designed to naturalise the slopes of the Development. Further detail is included in the chapter and also in design evolution section of Section 3: Alternatives
02.1.23	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Attached is a document that details generally how the Council would like Visual Impact Assessments to be carried out.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.24	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The scoping report outlines the proposal to submit a detailed noise assessment for both the construction and operational phases. Elevated levels during construction are to be expected but provided the best practicable measures are taken to minimise noise, the impact should be within acceptable levels. Generally, the most important aspect for construction noise is to keep to normal working hours and avoid week-ends, evenings and early mornings.	Baseline noise surveys have been undertaken and the results provided in Chapter 16: Noise & Vibration. Working hours are outlined in Chapter 2: Project and Site Description
02.1.25	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Environmental Health Officers are happy with the proposal to assess operational noise in terms of BS 4142. As suggested in the report, it is advisable for the consultant to liaise with Environmental Health on the way this standard should be applied. One such aspect is the implementation of any penalties for noise characteristics. As per the pre-app request, it was advised that the usual standard noise condition for this sort of noise source i.e. - “Noise should not exceed NR 20 when measured or calculated within the bedroom of any noise-sensitive premises with windows open for ventilation purposes.” OR “The operating noise Rating level should not exceed the Background noise level by more than 5dB(A) including any characteristics penalty. Terms and measurements to be in accordance with BS 4142: 2014 Methods for Rating Industrial & Commercial Sound. “	Section 16.3 of Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration provides the methodology
02.1.26	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Environmental Health confirms they are happy with the proposed noise monitoring locations. The exact siting should be chosen to be representative of the locations at which any condition would apply which would usually be the garden or patio or another external amenity area. If there are any site specific noise sources that might affect the measurement this should be noted and included in the assessment report.	Noted
02.1.27	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Environmental Health are happy with the proposals for the assessment of vibration however, to clarify, the target outcome should be for vibration from this development to be noticeable at any noise sensitive property.	Noted
02.1.28	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Archaeology The methodology as set out in the scoping report is acceptable. The appropriate sources of data have been identified in order to inform the site characterisation and the method of whole project and of cumulative impact assessment is appropriate. The ES chapter will need to follow Highland Council Standards for Archaeological Work. The Standards are available at http://www.highland.gov.uk/downloads/file/1022/standards_for_archaeological_work.	Noted
02.1.29	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Transport Planning will be looking for the traffic impacts of this development to be contained within a Transport Assessment (TA) supporting the EIA, with the principles of the scope covering that set out in the attached note and produced in accordance with the below linked Local Guidelines: - Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments (Section 2.2) - Guidance on the Preparation of Transport Assessments	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.30	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The TA will need to come forward with preferred routing arrangements to and from the site and the assessment done on that basis. We'd be happy to comment on a scope for the TA once the routing arrangements have been established and a draft scope produced.	Noted
02.1.31	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Cumulative impacts from other developments in the area will need to be taken account of within the TA. We note that Table 3.6 lists a series of developments taken from Highland Council Planning Portal. Highland Council Planners would be best-placed to clarify the status of these developments and whether there are any other developments that need including. We note that the final list of cumulative developments will need to be formed after the preferred routing arrangements to the development have been established. However, we would expect cumulative developments to also include traffic from developments that may not be in the proximity of the site, but will be generating their own construction traffic on the routes this development proposes to use. This can include other power-generation schemes in that part of the Highlands. The proposed list of cumulative developments should be identified within the TA Scoping and agreed with Highland Council prior to commencing the TA.	The cumulative list of projects is outlined in Section 4.5.18 of Chapter 4: Approach to EIA. This has been assessed as relevant in each chapter
02.1.32	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We agree with your assumptions that the likely largest traffic impacts from a development of this type will result during the construction and possibly decommissioning of the development, with operational traffic impacts likely to be low. However, we would expect the TA to identify the proposed routing and access arrangements for operational traffic, plus any mitigation needed on the road network to safely accommodate it	Noted
02.1.33	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We note that a desktop exercise has been done that concluded Highland Council do not hold historic records of traffic data for the roads identified in the study area. The proposals for traffic data gathering to inform the TA should be set out and agreed through the TA scoping exercise.	Noted
02.1.34	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Re. the statement about using 'Low' growth assumptions from NRTF, this should again be justified through the TA scoping exercise.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.35	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We welcome the statements about looking into opportunities for on-site batching and sourcing of materials needed for the build. If such approaches are possible, this should limit the amount of vehicle movements needed in and out of the site. However, its currently not clear to what extent such on-site sourcing and re-use will be possible. If this information won't be known at the time of developing the TA, the assessment will need to test the implications of different scenarios, including a worst case scenario that may be no excavated material being deemed suitable for re-use and needed to be taken off-site. The justification for the establishment of different scenarios for testing should be set out through the TA scoping exercise.	Noted
02.1.36	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Access to the site is still being investigated, with consideration being given to using combinations of the following local roads in the area: □ B862 Dores Road □ B851 Errogie to Culloden Moor Road □ B861 Culduthel Road □ C1064 Inverness to Ashie Moor Road □ C1076 Loch Ashie to Brin Road □ C1068 Daviot to Dunlichity Road □ U1084 Darris Road	Construction traffic routes are outlined in Section 15.5.2-16.5.19 of Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.37	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Once the route(s) for accessing this site have been identified, we'd expect the TA to identify the location, type and scale of any mitigation needed to allow them to be used for construction access purposes, whilst also keeping them safe and usable by others. It should be noted that the routes identified are popular tourist routes, whilst also providing key connections for communities east of Loch Ness. Although there have been some improvements in recent years, funded in part by contributions from other developments in the area, there are still sections of these routes that would struggle to accommodate large and heavy construction traffic, whilst also remaining safe for use by tourists and people from the local communities in the area. The condition of some of those roads is also poor and we'd want to ensure they remain safe and usable for all, both during their use by construction traffic and after the works had been completed. Some of the routes identified are also included in the National Cycle Network Route 78, which the TA should take into consideration when assessing the impacts of this development on the transport networks in the area.	Construction traffic routes are outlined in Section 15.5.2-15.5.19 of Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.38	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The B851, B861 and B862 are covered by the South Loch Ness Road Improvement Strategy that identifies aspirations for improving them going forward. Should the final proposals identify use of any of these routes for either construction or ongoing operational access purposes, we'd recommend that discussions are held with Council Officers involved in developing and delivering the South Loch Ness Road Improvement Strategy to identify the likely mitigation needed and possible methods for getting that mitigation delivered.	Construction traffic routes are outlined in Section 15.5.2-15.5.19 of Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.39	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We welcome the proposals for off-road access tracks for the movement of plant and material linked with the works. This should help to limit the impacts of construction traffic on the local roads within the works area. We also welcome the suggestion of marshals being used to manage the points where construction traffic will cross the public road. However, we'll expect the TA to give some indication of what other traffic management arrangements will be used at these conflict points, such as signage, road markings, gating arrangements, proposals for keeping the public road clean and free of dirt and debris etc. For clarity, we would expect general priority of movement to be kept in favour of the public road and the traffic using those roads.	The Construction Traffic Management Plan in Appendix 15.1 outlines these points
02.1.40	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Depending on the scale of any mitigation works needed to the road networks proposed for accessing this site and their location with regards to the surrounding environment, it is possible that the impacts of those road mitigation measures may need to be considered within the EIA. Certainly the need for any such assessment should be justified within the EIA.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.41	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	One possible proposal that may require specific consideration in the EIA is if Option B comes forward requiring the realignment of the existing C1064. We would not support closure of that route until a suitably designed alternative was implemented and available for all road users. The standards for designing such a route would need to adhere with our published Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments, with any proposals needing to be agreed through a formal Road Construction Consent application. Any designs should maintain the continuity of the C1064, avoiding the need to give-way when travelling along it, whilst also avoiding protracted re-routing and the creation of excessive gradients. This could involve changes to that shown towards the northern tie-in with the existing C1064. It is likely that most improvements needed to the public road network to permit safe access to and from your site will be left in-place as lasting improvements for general users of those roads. However, should there be unacceptable safety, operational or maintenance issues with the implemented improvements, The Council may require them either to be removed or changes implemented once their need for construction purposes has ended.	The realignment of the C1064 would be in place prior to any closure of the old alignment. This would also be early part of the construction phase
02.1.42	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	With regards to the routing of abnormal loads, the TA will need to evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed route for moving such vehicles to and from the site, including any mitigation needed to accommodate their movement. This could include a full survey of the route and the provision of Trial Runs to prove the route is achievable and/or to establish the extent of works required to facilitate transportation.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.43	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposed point(s) of access from the public road into the site will need to be identified, together with sufficient justification for their adequacy to accommodate the likely types and volumes of traffic anticipated. We will be looking for dimensioned drawings showing the intended form of the junction(s) and the scale of any improvements needed to establish them.	Points of access on public roads are shown on Figures 2.24 and 2.25
02.1.44	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Achievable clear visibility distances out of any access should be demonstrated and their adequacy justified, both in terms of the nature of public road they're taking access from and the prevailing speeds of traffic using that road. Any accesses should also take suitable steps to prevent surface water run-off or any loose material from the private access tracks, including mud and construction materials, from being brought onto the public road. Any gates on accesses should also be set back sufficiently to avoid a vehicle needing to wait in the public road.	Points of access on public roads are shown on Figures 2.24 and 2.25
02.1.45	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	It is likely that The Council will be seeking an agreement under Section 96 of the Roads (Scotland) Act to cover any potential extraordinary expenses in repairing local roads that may be damaged by vehicles associated with this development. We'll be looking for any such agreement to be supported by a suitable financial guarantee, usually in the form of a Road Bond, to cover the likely costs of such repairs.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.46	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Any changes needed to structures on the publicly adopted local road network to accommodate the proposed construction traffic for this development will need to go through the Councils' Technical Approval procedure as described within Section 3.1.7 of the current Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments. These Guidelines recommend early engagement with The Councils' Structural Engineering Team to help ensure that all necessary approvals are in-place prior to works commencing. The point of contact is Norman Smart Norman.Smart@highland.gov.uk.	Noted
02.1.47	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The document states that maximum embankment heights for both headpond options will be significant (30.2m for Option A and 43m for Option B). It is not clear what the likely heights of such structures will be in the vicinity of the public road network. However, we will want comfort that such structures have been adequately designed and their implementation will not change the ground conditions that support those local public roads (eg surcharging, changes to groundwater levels, new springs etc). These issues should be taken up with the Council Structures Team to determine what level of information they will need to determine if the proposals will or will not adversely impact the public road network.	The above ground infrastructure is shown on Figure 2.4. Cross sections in relation to the realigned C1064 are shown on Figure 2.21
02.1.48	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Transport Scotland should be approached about any impacts or alterations needed to structures on the Trunk Road Network.	Noted
02.1.49	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	All temporary and permanent parking provision or loading and unloading requirements for the construction and operation of this facility will need to be provided for off the publicly adopted local road network.	Noted
02.1.50	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Given the scale of workforce anticipated at this site (up to 300 people at the busiest times), the TA should clarify the proposed location and scale of staff parking provision, justifying the adequacy of the proposed approach. This should include setting out any measures to manage staff movements to and from the site to limit the number of single occupancy vehicles needing access on a daily basis.	An indicative arrangement for Compound 1 is shown on Figure 2.19
02.1.51	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	It is noted that the documentation provided refers to possible conversion of temporary compounds to permanent visitor centres for educational and tourism purposes. If such features are to form part of a planning application, the arrangements for accessing, servicing and parking at such facilities should be set out in the TA.	Following consultation feedback, no Visitors Centre is included within the design of the Development
02.1.52	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan should be provided in the TA, setting out how the construction activities of this development, including access to and from the site, will be managed to limit their impacts on other road users and the communities on the proposed access route(s).	A framework Construction Traffic Management Plan is provided as Appendix 15.1
02.1.53	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We would expect the routing of construction traffic to wherever possible avoid existing communities such as Dores. Where this cannot be avoided, we would look for the TA to clarify what traffic management arrangements will be established to avoid or limit any adverse impact on the day-to-day operation of those communities.	Construction traffic routes are outlined in Section 15.5.2-15.5.19 of Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.54	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan should also set out how feedback from local community groups will be sought and fed into the development and ongoing delivery of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	A framework Traffic Management Plan is provided as Appendix 15.1. Communication engagement and liaison is outlined in Section 3.3 of the Construction Environmental Management Plan

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.55	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	1. Identify all public roads affected by the development. In addition to transporting abnormal loads, this should also include routes to be used by local suppliers and the workforce.	Construction traffic routes are outlined in Section of Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation
02.1.56	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	2. Set out the existing nature and condition of these public roads, including: - The road name and number, where applicable. - Road widths, including any pinch points. - The nature of their horizontal and vertical alignments, including any known steep gradients. - The location, size and condition of existing passing places on single track roads. - An assessment of the carriageway strength including, where necessary, construction depths and road formation where there is likely to be significant proposed impacts. This may include the need for non-destructive testing and sampling as required to determine the carriageway construction and strength. This work should be undertaken by a suitably capable and qualified consulting engineer acceptable to the Council. - The location and nature of any structures either spanning or supporting the roads, including a description of their nature (e.g. bridge, culvert etc.), any width, height or weight restrictions and where necessary, an assessment of their load carrying capability. This work should be undertaken by a suitably capable & qualified consulting engineer acceptable to the Council. - The nature and quantum of properties serviced by the roads. In addition to the quantum of residential properties, specific recognition should be made of any schools, businesses or other community facilities serviced by these roads. - The nature and quantum of existing traffic flows on these roads, taking account of seasonal variations and tourism impacts. This should include reference to how often the roads are used by school or commercial bus services, refuse vehicles and whether the routes are used by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation, with reference to relevant Figures and associated appendices

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.1.57	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	3. Identify the anticipated impacts from the proposed development, including any cumulative impacts from other developments likely to be happening at the same time as your development. These impacts should include: The quantum of existing and new traffic impacting on these roads, including: o numbers of light and heavy vehicles o numbers of abnormal loads o profiles of anticipated new traffic movements throughout the duration of the works Any impacts to existing carriageways, structures, verges or other aspects of these public roads. This should include information on swept paths and gradient analysis where the passage of traffic could be problematic. The location of any new or changes to existing accesses off these public roads to be used for accessing this development. This should include the extent of existing visibility from each of these accesses onto the public roads. Any impacts or restrictions needing to be imposed on existing road users. Any impacts or restrictions needing to be imposed on adjacent properties or local communities serviced by these public roads.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation, with reference to relevant Figures and associated appendices
02.1.58	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	4. Set out the proposed mitigation measures needed to tackle the anticipated impacts set out above. This should include: The location and nature of any carriageway widening or strengthening. Visibility improvements at access points and along the public roads forming access routes. The location and nature of any strengthening or widening needed to existing structures. The provision of new or enhanced passing places on single track roads. Road safety measures to manage the impacts of any identified road safety concerns. Traffic management proposals for the construction and ongoing operation of the facility.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation, with reference to relevant Figures and associated appendices
02.1.59	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	5. Any residual effects on the road network and its users following implementation of the proposed mitigation and any actions proposed associated with those residual effects.	This is included within Chapter 15: Traffic & Transportation,with Table 15.15 which provides the summary of residual effects
02.1.60	The Highland Council	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	From the Council's point of view, the biggest challenge will be the visual impact, not just from the immediate vicinity where it will be vital to make sure the new loch sits well, and looks as natural as possible, within the pattern of waterbodies in that area, but also from further afield, from across Loch Ness and the hills above it and also the A82 trunk road as a key tourist route. This will be a complex and challenging proposal. While the potential output would make a sizable contribution to energy targets, Scottish Government policy, advice and guidance is clear that a balance must be struck between meeting our energy challenge and safeguarding our environment.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
02.2.01	The Highland Council	24/09/2018	Gate Check Response	I can confirm that having undertaken a review of the Gatecheck Report that The Highland Council have no comments to make at this time.	Noted
02.2.02	The Highland Council	24/09/2018	Gate Check Response	It is considered that the developer has, to this point, taken into consideration issues raised by The Highland Council and other statutory consultees and third parties; and that the developer has engaged appropriately with The Highland Council.	Noted
03.1.01	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Designated Sites - Loch Ashie Special Protection Area (SPA) and Loch Ruthven SPA, both designated for Slavonian grebe, are in close proximity to the site. Consideration should be given to potential impacts on this species	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Section 36 application
03.1.02	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Invasive non-native species - There are a number of invasive non-native species present in Loch Ness and we would expect the applicant to provide mitigation measures in any application to ensure the spread of these species is not exacerbated by this proposal. Further information on non-natives can be found on our website at http://www.snh.gov.uk/protecting-scotlands-nature/nonnative-species/	An assessment of non-native invasive species is included in Chapter 6: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology, with a risk assessment provided in Appendix 7.2
03.1.03	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Woodland Removal - We note that approximately 41% of the development site contains woodland and that woodland clearance will be required as part of the proposed development. We recommend that the applicant contacts Forestry Commission Scotland at an early a stage to discuss the Control of Woodland Removal Policy and the implications it may have on the development.	We can confirm that the Applicant has liaised with the Forestry Commission and had a site visit onsite. Please see Chapter 10: Forestry for more details
03.1.04	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) - We support the proposal to include an LVIA in the EIA. We recommend that the EIA Report explains the design process used to select the final layout and assesses any alternatives considered and how landscape and visual mitigation has been incorporated.	Chapter 3: Alternatives outlines the design evolution of the Development which outlines how landscape and visual, and other environmental features, have been incorporated into the design of the Development
03.1.05	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We advise that the following viewpoints be added at this stage for consideration: 1. Urquhart Castle for tourist impacts. We are unclear why a 5km buffer has been added but presumably there will be visibility from here. 2. The viewpoint layby on the A82. We are not sure what tree coverage is like but visualisations should be obtained after leaf fall to capture a “worst case” scenario 3. A visualisation from the water to reflect the path of the Jacobite Cruises and other vessels and which has been used as a viewpoint for other developments. Again this will assess impacts on tourists. 4. Lochend to include residential amenity.	A Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) was provided at Scoping Stage and then refined for consultation. Consultation has been undertaken with the landscape officer of THC to agree viewpoints and the methodology to be utilised for the landscape and visual assessment. Landscape representation was made during the Pre-Application Advice meeting held on the 27th September 2017 and this continued post-scoping to finalise the viewpoint locations when Option B Headpond was confirmed.
03.1.06	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Visualisation should comply with the standard detailed in the following guidance: https://www.snh.scot/sites/default/files/2017-07/A2203860%20-%20Visual%20representation%20of%20wind%20farms%20-%20Guidance%20-%20Feb%202017.pdf	Volume 4: Visualisations have been prepared in line with THC and SNH requirements

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
03.1.07	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Fisheries - We can find no reference in the scoping report to assess the impact of the proposal on fish or fisheries. We advise that an assessment of the current/ existing fisheries interests should be undertaken. The level of detail required in relation to this will depend on the final site option and the watercourses affected. If the final design has an impact on existing water bodies or water course we advise that an electrofishing survey to identify fish species present would be required. Should any salmonids be present in the watercourses then a further survey of the salmonid population will be required to establish the exact limit to migration within the catchment and assess the impact that the proposal will have upon nursery habitat for salmonids. Any relevant mitigation measures would need to be identified in the EIA Report.	A desk based assessment has been undertaken and is included in Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
03.1.08	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We recommend that any fisheries surveys required are done in consultation with the Ness District salmon Fisheries Board.	A desk based assessment has been undertaken and is included in Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
03.1.09	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We request that each chapter of the ES is saved to a separate pdf file with a maximum size of 10MB in order to make the file sizes manageable.	Noted
03.1.10	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	1 Guidance for assessing impacts on the natural heritage There are a variety of guidance and advice notes for developments available on our website, covering topics such as landscape, birds and protected species. We would expect the applicant to follow the latest guidance as published on our website via http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/ .	Noted
03.1.11	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	2 Service Level Statement (SLS) We refer the applicant to our Service Level Statement (SLS), which sets out the level of engagement they may expect from us during the planning process. The SLS is available on our website via http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/our-approach-to-renewables/managing-applications/.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
03.1.12	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat has been identified in Scottish Planning Policy as a nationally important mapped resource. The area of this development is mapped (http://www.snh.gov.uk/docs/A2009248.pdf) as Class 2 for carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat, i.e. - Most of the vegetation cover indicates priority peatland habitats - All soils are carbon-rich soil and deep peat We therefore advise that an assessment should be made of the impacts of the proposal on carbon rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat (not just a review of peat depth data as suggested on p31). The assessment should describe the overall size and scale of resource including the type of peatland likely to be affected, quantify the loss of any of that resource as well as any loss of function of the habitat, whereby the peat, or peatland habitat, is likely to be lost or significantly degraded as a result of the development. It should also describe the frequency of drains and peat cutting, the presence of plant species indicating peat formation capability and/or lack of disturbance, any areas of natural surface pattern, and whether or not there is any invasion by woodland or scrub. It should also detail whether the development footprint contains any of the following: - an abundance of Sphagnum-rich ridges, - ridges of Sphagnum – Betula nana, - hummocks of S.fuscum or S. austinii - Peat mounds - Hollows of Sphagnum or bare peat The overall effect of the above Scottish Government policies and initiatives is an expectation that developments will be no less than neutral in their impacts on peat and areas of peatland habitat. Mitigation and compensation measures to achieve that should be integral to any planning application affecting the peatland resource and should be presented as a Peatland Management Plan.	Noted
03.1.13	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	4. Protected Species – birds and mammals We support the proposal to survey all protected birds and mammal species as described in the Scoping Report. Due to the mobile nature of mammals survey work should be undertaken within 12 months of the submission date of any application which comes forward and should extended to include any off site work that may impact on protected species. For example bat surveys should be completed for any bridges that are to be upgraded or re-pointed as a result of this development, and appropriate licenses obtained where applicable. All surveys should follow the latest agreed methodologies. Results and any possible mitigation measure should be provided in the EIA Report and if necessary in a confidential annex.	Noted
03.1.14	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We support the proposal to undertake a new Phase 1 and NVC Survey of the site. However, it should be noted that it is not just the land directly affected by works which may be impacted upon, but also a buffer zone which may be indirectly affected by, for example, alterations to hydrology, vehicle movement compaction or land to be managed as part of compensation or mitigation of the proposal.	A Phase 1 Habitat Assessment has been undertaken and this is included as Appendix D of the Scoping Report (Appendix 4.2 of the EIA Report). A NVC survey has been completed and is included as Appendix 6.1 of the EIA Report

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
03.1.15	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We would expect surveys to extend to the proposed access route and new tracks. The ES 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 outwith the development area. The applicant may find the "Constructed Tracks in the Scottish Uplands" (available from our website publications pages, via http://www.snh.org.uk/pdfs/publications/heritagemanagement/constructedtracks.pdf) provides useful advice on track creation and maintenance in upland area. The Forestry Commission's "Forests and Water Guidelines" (4th edition) (available from http://www.forestry.gov.uk/PDF/fcgl002.pdf/$FILE/fcgl002.pdf) also provides useful advice on water crossings and working in forests.	The survey areas are outlined in each of the species specific reports contained within the Appendices.
03.1.16	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The importance of habitat types should be analysed, and that the amount of habitat lost will be quantified, we recommend that habitat mitigation measures, including any areas of restoration are described in a dedicated Habitat Management Plan. Further guidance on what to include in Habitat Management Plans can be found on our website (http://www.snh.gov.uk/planning-and-development/renewable-energy/onshore-wind/general-advice-and-information/)	Noted
03.1.17	SNH	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	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 (http://www.outdooraccessscotland.com/branding/).	Noted
03.2.01	SNH	02/10/2018	Additional Consultation - INNS RA	I can confirm that the Risk Assessment addresses our concerns raised in our scoping response of 31 October 2017 in relation to Invasive Non Native Species (INNS).	The Applicant acknowledges this response and welcomes the conclusions
03.2.02	SNH	02/10/2018	Additional Consultation - INNS RA	We are supportive of the closed loop system design which will prevent any spread of aquatic INNS within the catchment and subject to the provision of an agreeable Biosecurity Management Plan being produced prior to any construction the spread of terrestrial INNS should be minimised as well.	The Applicant acknowledges this response and welcomes the conclusions
03.3.01	SNH	05/10/2018	Gate Check Response	I can confirm we have had a variety of pre-application communications with the applicant. Subject to the level of detail being presented in the EIAR being as described in the Gatecheck Report and the information we requested at scoping in relation to fish impacts also being included then we should have sufficient information to assess the proposal.	Noted. Regarding the requirement for fish surveys, we can confirm that a desk study has been undertaken and this is contained within Chapter 8: Aquatic Ecology (Volume 2) of the EIA Rerport.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.01	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Thank you for consulting us on the above development by way of your email received on 10 October 2017. We have had useful early engagement with the developer but had hoped that they would have used our earlier written advice to you to help produce a focussed finalised version of the scoping report. Nonetheless we note the comments in your email that they will take into consideration the advice we have already provided. Our site specific advice is below; unsurprisingly it is very similar to our last response to you of 28 September 2017. We have also provided our generic advice for scoping windfarm developments in the attached appendix.	The Applicant has continued to engage with SEPA through the pre-application process
04.1.02	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We would very much welcome early sight of the habitat and peat survey work before it is formally submitted as part of the application. This will allow us to give early and focused advice on the proposals. In this case we would also welcome further engagement on the material balance assessment to ensure that excavations are minimised and suitable uses are found for all the material.	Both the NVC and peat survey reports have been shared with SEPA in advance of the Sectiom 36 submission. Chapter 3: Alternatives outlines how the Development has evolved including the reuse of material. The Materials Management Appraisal provides additional detail on how suitable material has been incorporated into the design of the Development, the likely volumes, opportunities for reuse and type.
04.1.03	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 1 of the attached Appendix (site layout): • For a development of this scale it is especially important to ensure that detailed layout plans submitted at the application stage are provided for all elements of the development. The plans submitted with the application must detail all the temporary or ancillary works such as laydown areas, rock and peat storage areas and site compounds, which we presume will be extensive for a development of this size. The application submission should include plans which show above and below ground infrastructure separately. •The assessment should specifically consider whether there are opportunities to minimise overall impacts from the development by collaborative working and sharing infrastructure with Scottish Water who also have existing and planned works in this area.	The drawings which are associated with Chapter 2 provide details of the indicative arrangements and layouts of the Development. Limited information is known about the Scottish Water pipeline project but discussions are ongoing, and a cumulative assessment is included within the EIA Report
04.1.04	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 2 of the attached Appendix (CAR requirements) and Section 3 and Appendix 6.1 of the scoping report: • We are aware of the following invasive non-native species in the Ness catchment - Flatworm (Phagocata woodworthi), Freshwater shrimp (Crangonyx pseudogracilis) and Nuttall's Waterweed (Elodea Nuttallii). • If option A is to be pursued then an assessment of the environmental significance of the loss of the two lochs and change in proposed catchment is required.	Option A was not chosen as the Headpond orientation
04.1.05	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 3 of the attached Appendix (other water impacts): • We note that the existing access track from one of the compounds to the road through the forest requires upgrading. For the avoidance of doubt the assessment should provide information on the extent of all upgrading works. • We note that access between the construction compounds and different work areas will change throughout the construction periods. The application should identify proposed corridors for these routes, taking into consideration local sensitivities. • Detailed drawing of the potential temporary wharf in Loch Ness should be provided accompanied by as assessment of effects on the water body.	Noted, this information is shown on the drawings associated with Chapter 2

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.06	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 4 of the attached Appendix (peat): • We welcome the proposal for a Peat Management Plan. All excavated peat must be re-used on site with no permanent storage or disposal allowed. Floating track should be used to reduce the volume of excavated peat. • The Plan should consider proposals for peatland restoration works on the site, including for example, restoration of any redundant tracks or historic peat cuttings. Such works could also help compensate for loss of GWDTE.	An outline peat management plan has been included in Appendix 5.3 of the EIA Report
04.1.07	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 5 (GWDTE) and Appendix 6.1 of the scoping report we are generally content with the habitat survey proposals outlined in Appendix 6.1.	Potential effects on GWDTEs are outlined in Chapter 6: Terrestrial Ecology and the NVC report in Appendix 6.1
04.1.08	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 8 of the attached appendix (borrow pits) and rock and overburden excavation generally as outlined in the scoping report: • In view of the extensive volume of excavated material being produced we do not expect the development to include additional borrow pits. • The information requirements outlined in section 8.2 of the appendix should be provided insofar as they are relevant to the excavation works proposed. • The proposals outlined in section 2.5.6 and to some extent section 2.6.33 of the scoping report and related figures for a “soil disposal area” would not be acceptable as they would represent a licensable landfill operation and as such should not be included in the application. However there will be a requirement for temporary material storage and as the land take for this is likely to be significant they should be shown in the application. Storage locations should be as close to the excavated area as possible and avoid local sensitivities such as watercourses. • We expect the application to be supported by an assessment of the amount of overburden and rock that will be generated and expected quality, based on intrusive site investigations. This should be accompanied by detailed proposals either for justifiable re-use on site (our preference) or use or disposal elsewhere. The application submission will need to include a detailed map of where and how rock or other material will be re-used on site, including volumes and depths. Any waste materials will need to be removed from the site and disposed of to a suitably licenced facility or made use of via a suitable waste management exemption. • We understand that there may be significant transportation issues with removal of any of the material from the site so, although not an issue directly within our remit, we recommend that the assessment includes information on transport implications.	A Materials Management Appraisal (Appendix 5.2) provides information on the type, volume and likely sources and resues of material on site
04.1.09	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 7 (forest waste) we are content that this information can be provided in the proposed Materials Management Appraisal.	A Materials Management Appraisal (Appendix 5.2) provides information on the type, volume and likely sources and resues of material on site

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.10	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In relation to section 9 (pollution) we can confirm that from our perspective an outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Waste Management Plan and Dust Management Plan need not be provided with the application. This is on the understanding that (1) the proposed Materials Management Appraisal will address all aspects of material management (minimisation, handling, processing, reuse on site, reuse off site and if required disposal) and any related waste management, (2) detailed site plans are submitted which demonstrate how impacts on the environment have been minimised through design and (3) all mitigation is detailed within a suitably robust schedule of mitigation. This approach will hopefully help streamline the overall information and assessment requirements.	An outline Construction Environmental Management Plan has been prepared and is contained within Appendix 3.1
04.1.11	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Please see our website for further information above the Reservoirs Act 2011.	Noted
04.1.12	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	This appendix sets out our scoping information requirements. There may be opportunities to scope out some of the issues below depending on the site. Evidence must be provided in the submission to support why an issue is not relevant for this site in order to avoid delay and potential objection.	Noted
04.1.13	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	If there is a delay between scoping and the submission of the application then please refer to our website for our latest information requirements as they are regularly updated; current best practice must be followed. We would welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft submission. As we can process files of a maximum size of only 25MB the submission must be divided into appropriately named sections of less than 25MB each.	Noted
04.1.14	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	All maps must be based on an adequate scale with which to assess the information. This could range from OS 1: 10,000 to a more detailed scale in more sensitive locations Each of the maps below must detail all proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent site infrastructure. This includes all tracks, excavations, buildings, borrow pits, pipelines, cabling, site compounds, laydown areas, storage areas and any other built elements. Existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded wherever possible. The layout should be designed to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed ground. Cabling must be laid in ground already disturbed such as verges. A comparison of the environmental effects of alternative locations of infrastructure elements, such as tracks, may be required.	Noted
04.1.15	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposed hydro scheme will require an authorisation from us under CAR. It is likely that the CAR application will be subject to a derogation (exemption under the Water Framework Directive) assessment and third party consultation which could result in amendments to the scheme. We therefore encourage applicants to twin-track applications for consent under planning and CAR to ensure that CAR requirements can be accommodated more easily when proposals are at their most fluid.	The Applicant can confirm that an application for a CAR license will be made after the submission of the Section 36.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.16	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Should the applicant choose not to twin-track their applications then the following details must be included in the planning submission to allow us to provide an indication of the potential consentability of the proposal under CAR: a) The location and design of the intakes and outfalls and their impact upon the morphology of the water environment. b) Compensation flow. c) Fish passages. d) Other relevant CAR or planning applications or consents for abstractions/hydro schemes. e) Sensitive water uses, water dependent species (including bryophytes) and ecosystems.	The Applicant can confirm that an application for a CAR license will be made after the submission of the Section 36. The scope of the CAR has been discussed with SEPA
04.1.17	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	See Planning guidance on hydropower developments to assist in meeting these information requirements. More detailed guidance on CAR can be found on our hydropower web page.	Noted
04.1.18	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Other elements of the scheme must be designed to avoid impacts upon the water environment. Where activities such as watercourse crossings, watercourse diversions or other engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment cannot be avoided then the submission must include justification of this and a map showing: a) All proposed temporary or permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses. b) A buffer of at least 10m drawn around each loch or watercourse. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse and drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works. c) Detailed layout of all proposed mitigation including all cut off drains, location, number and size of settlement ponds.	Chapter 2: Project and Site Description provides detailed information of drainage and watercourse crossings. An indicative arrangement of access tracks are shown on Figures 2.22 and 2.20, with an indicative arrangement of Compound 1 shown on Figure 2.21 which demonstrates the buffers which have been applied to watercourses.
04.1.19	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	If water abstractions or dewatering are proposed, a table of volumes and timings of groundwater abstractions and related mitigation measures must be provided.	No water abstractions are anticipated with the main dewatering activities being undertaken in Loch Ness
04.1.20	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Further advice and our best practice guidance are available within the water engineering section of our website. Guidance on the design of water crossings can be found in our Construction of River Crossings Good Practice Guide.	Noted
04.1.21	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Refer to Appendix 2 of our Standing Advice for advice on flood risk. Watercourse crossings must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flows, or information provided to justify smaller structures. If it is thought that the development could result in an increased risk of flooding to a nearby receptor then a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted in support of the planning application. Our Technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders outlines the information we require to be submitted as part of a Flood Risk Assessment. Please also refer to Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) Flood Risk Standing Advice for Engineering, Discharge and Impoundment Activities.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.22	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Scottish Planning Policy states (Paragraph 205) that "Where peat and other carbon rich soils are present, applicants should assess the likely effects of development on carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions. Where peatland is drained or otherwise disturbed, there is liable to be a release of CO2 to the atmosphere. Developments should aim to minimise this release."	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey. The alignment of the C1064 has been routed to avoid the larger areas of peat
04.1.23	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The planning submission must a) demonstrate how the layout has been designed to minimise disturbance of peat and consequential release of CO2 and b) outline the preventative/mitigation measures to avoid significant drying or oxidation of peat through, for example, the construction of access tracks, drainage channels, cable trenches, or the storage and re-use of excavated peat. There is often less environmental impact from localised temporary storage and reuse rather than movement to large central peat storage areas.	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey. The alignment of the C1064 has been routed to avoid the larger areas of peat
04.1.24	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The submission must 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 (including peat storage areas) overlain to demonstrate how the development avoids areas of deep peat and other sensitive receptors such as Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems.	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
04.1.25	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The submission must include: A table which details the quantities of acrotelmic, catotelmic and amorphous peat which will be excavated for each element and where it will be re-used during reinstatement. Details of the proposed widths and depths of peat to be re-used and how it will be kept wet permanently must be included.	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
04.1.26	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	To avoid delay and potential objection proposals must be in accordance with Guidance on the Assessment of Peat Volumes, Reuse of Excavated Peat and Minimisation of Waste and our Developments on Peat and Off-Site uses of Waste Peat.	Noted
04.1.27	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Dependent upon the volumes of peat likely to be encountered and the scale of the development, applicants must consider whether a full Peat Management Plan (as detailed in the above guidance) is required or whether the above information would be best submitted as part of the schedule of mitigation.	Given the extents of peat found, an outline peat management plan is included within Appendix 5.3
04.1.28	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Please note we do not validate carbon balance assessments except where requested to by Scottish Government in exceptional circumstances. Our advice on the minimisation of peat disturbance and peatland restoration may need to be taken into account when you consider such assessments.	No carbon calculations have been undertaken
04.1.29	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	GWDTE are protected under the Water Framework Directive and therefore the layout and design of the development must avoid impact on such areas.	The design of the Development has sought to avoid sensitive environmental features, and therefore apply the mitigation hieerachy at the earliest opportunity. This can be seen in Chapter 3: Alternatives
04.1.30	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	A map demonstrating that 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 micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it.	Please see the NVC survey report in Appendix 6.1

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.31	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	If the minimum buffers above 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 GWDTE affected.	Noted
04.1.32	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Please refer to Guidance on Assessing the Impacts of Development Proposals on Groundwater Abstractions and Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems for further advice and the minimum information we require to be submitted.	Noted
04.1.33	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The submission must include: A map demonstrating that 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	Noted
04.1.34	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	If tree felling is proposed the submission must include a map with the boundaries of where felling will take place and a description of what is proposed for this timber in accordance with Use of Trees Cleared to Facilitate Development on Afforested Land – Joint Guidance from SEPA, SNH and FCS.	Please see Chapter 10: Forestry and its associated figures
04.1.35	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Scottish Planning Policy states (Paragraph 243) that “Borrow pits should only be permitted if there are significant environmental or economic benefits compared to obtaining material from local quarries, they are time-limited; tied to a particular project and appropriate reclamation measures are in place.” The submission must provide sufficient information to address this policy statement.	Noted
04.1.36	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	In accordance with Paragraphs 52 to 57 of Planning Advice Note 50 Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings (PAN 50) a Site Management Plan should be submitted in support of any application.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.1.37	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The following information should also be submitted for each borrow pit: a) A map showing the location, size, depths and dimensions. b) A map showing any stocks of rock, 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. You need to demonstrate that a site specific proportionate buffer can be achieved. On this map, a site-specific buffer must be drawn around each loch or watercourse proportionate to the depth of excavations and at least 10m 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, dimensions of the loch or watercourse, drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works. c) You need to provide a justification for the proposed location of borrow pits and evidence of the suitability of the material to be excavated for the proposed use, including any risk of pollution caused by degradation of the rock. d) A 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. e) A site map showing cut-off drains, silt management devices and settlement lagoons to manage surface water and dewatering discharge. Cut-off drains must be installed to maximise diversion of water from entering quarry works. f) A site map showing proposed water abstractions with details of the volumes and timings of abstractions. g) A site 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. h) 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	It is not proposed to have any new borrow pits with the exception of the Headpond excavation which is the main source of excavated material
04.1.38	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	One of our key interests in relation to developments is pollution prevention measures during the periods of construction, operation, maintenance, demolition and restoration. A schedule of mitigation supported by the above site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques (for example, the maximum area to be stripped of soils at any one time) and regulatory requirements. They should set out the daily responsibilities of ECOWs, how site inspections will be recorded and acted upon and proposals for a planning monitoring enforcement officer. Please refer to Guidance for Pollution Prevention (GPPs).	The CEMP outlines the roles and responsibilities of the environment team during construction which includes ECoWs. A Mitigation Register is contained within Appendix 17.1
04.1.39	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The submission must set out how decommissioning will be achieved should the proposed development be discontinued. The submission needs to demonstrate that there will be no discarding of materials that are likely to be classified as waste as any such proposals would be unacceptable under waste management licensing. Further guidance on this may be found in the document Is it waste - Understanding the definition of waste.	Section 2.16 provides information on decomissioning
04.1.40	SEPA	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The layout and the general principles for decommissioning must demonstrate waste minimisation and compliance with the above waste regulatory position.	Section 2.16 provides information on decomissioning

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
04.2.01	SEPA	17/09/2018	Additional Consultation - Peat Probing	In view of the fact that it has now been shown that nearly all of the infrastructure is located on peat / carbon rich soils less than 50 cm deep I do not consider that further peat probing is required to inform the S36 application. Further peat probing would be required post-determination to define the exact routes of roads/tracks and boundaries of laydown areas.	The Applicant acknowledges this response and welcomes the conclusions
04.2.02	SEPA	17/09/2018	Additional Consultation - Peat Probing	I presume that the few additional "non-grid" points were recorded where the engineer saw pockets of deeper peat and decided to record them – if that's the case then note that in the submission to explain them.	Noted, this can be found in Chapter 5 Geology and Ground Conditions Section 5.4.19
04.2.03	SEPA	17/09/2018	Additional Consultation - Peat Probing	Out of interest what's the peat feature identified [within the Headpond area]? It clearly cannot be avoided but is it likely to be a bigger problem than it looks?	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
04.2.04	SEPA	17/09/2018	Additional Consultation - Peat Probing	I note that there is no peat probing in the area of the southern temporary compound. Looking at GIS it looks like it's open field and maybe edge woodland so I think it's unlikely to be peaty but again it would be good if the submission covered off why it's not been probed.	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
04.03.01	SEPA	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	Thank you for your consultation email which SEPA received on 12 September 2018. We received the related Gate Check Report direct from AECOM on 13 September 2018 and can confirm that we found the joint Gate Check meeting and site visit on 1 October very useful.	Noted
04.03.02	SEPA	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	The Gate Check Report, supplemented by the discussions we had at the meeting, suggests that the application should be supported by all the information we requested at the scoping stage. However without being consulted on a full draft of the application submission it is clearly not possible for us to provide a definitive view on this.	Noted
04.03.03	SEPA	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	We have had good pre-application discussions with the developer regarding a number of issues within our interests. For example, we have agreed the level of peat probing required to inform the layout design and the developer has consulted us on their Invasive Non-Native Species Risk Assessment (which we can confirm we are content with).	We note the response and the approval of the INNS Risk Assessment is welcomed. The results of the peat probing survey are contained within Appendix 5.3 of Volume 5. The INNS Risk Assessment is contained within Appendix 7.2 of Volume 5
04.03.04	SEPA	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	We would welcome further informal consultation on the Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystem survey and assessment and the proposed Material Management Appraisal prior to formal submission, if this is possible, as the results and interpretation of these are likely to be of significant interest to us.	Details of the NVC survey and identification of GWDTEs can be found in Appendix 6.1 of Volume 5. The MMA can be found in Appendix 5.1.
05.1.01	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	This letter contains our comments for our historic environment interests. That is, scheduled monuments and their setting, category A listed buildings and their settings, World Heritage Sites, and gardens and designed landscapes and battlefields included in their respective inventories. If you have not already done so, I recommend that you consult the relevant planning authority's archaeological and conservation services, who will also be able to comment on potential impacts on the historic environment. This may include heritage assets outwith our remit, such as category B and C listed buildings, and unscheduled archaeology.	The Applicant notes these comments and can confirm that further consultation has been undertaken prior to submission of the EIA Report

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
05.1.02	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	**Potential direct impacts** There are four scheduled monuments within the red line boundary for the scheme: Caisteal an Dunriachaidh, fort 1520m N of Achnabat (SM 11817) • Achanabat, cairn 960m N of (SM 11799) • Achnabat, hut circle 1065m N of (SM 11828) • Achnabat, hut circle 815m NNE of (SM 11827) From the information and figures submitted with the draft scoping report it appears that there will not be any direct physical impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed scheme. However, we note that the scoping report at section 9.4.1 states that there are likely to be significant physical impacts on all four scheduled monuments in both options A and B. It is not entirely clear to us at this stage why direct impacts are being predicted. Further comments are included in the attached annex.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessment contained within Chapter 13
05.1.03	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	**Potential setting impacts** There are also a number of heritage assets within our remit in the vicinity of the proposed scheme whose settings have the potential to be adversely impacted by it. The annex to this letter gives details of a number of assets which appear likely to experience impacts. This list should not be treated as exhaustive, and is only intended as a reference to those assets which at this stage appear most likely to be impacted.	Noted
05.1.04	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	We welcome that cultural heritage has been scoped into the environmental impact assessment (EIA). We are generally content with the overall methodology set out in the scoping report, however we do have a few comments to make. We note that section 9 of the scoping report refers to a 3km study area for assessing setting impacts, however there is no explanation of why this particular limit has been set and the ZTV's provided cut off at 5km so it is not possible to identify if sites beyond this point may potentially receive setting impacts. A fixed radius of search can miss sensitive assets at greater distances and we therefore recommend using a wider ZTV in the first instance to identify the potential for setting impacts.	AECOM has undertaken consultation with HES to confirm the location of viewpoints required for photomontages. This consultation was by email, and the final viewpoint locations were confirmed on the 21st August. In addition, AECOM has undertaken telephone and email consultation with the Highland Council archaeologist (HCA) in relation to SI works undertaken as part of the design works and in relation to the viewpoint requirement for the photomontages. In late May a telephone consultation was held to discuss the project and the photomontage requirement, and the HCA confirmed she was happy for HES to take a lead on locations, but that she was happy with the proposals to date. Viewpoint photography has been agreed with HES and photomontages included in Volume 4 Visualisations
05.1.05	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	We welcome that our Managing Change in the Historic Environment guidance note is included in the references at the end of Section 9 of the scoping report and we strongly recommend its use when assessing potential setting impacts.	Noted
05.1.06	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	There is no reference to any visualisations being provided to help support the assessments of impacts and effects. We strongly recommend that visualisations such as photomontages are provided to demonstrate the effects of the proposals on the setting of assets. Further detailed comments are provided in the attached annex.	See response to 05.01.06
05.1.07	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Our website provides general information on a number of issues the applicant may find helpful. This includes our role in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, advice about pre-application consultations and general recommendations about the Scoping and Environmental Statement stages.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
05.1.08	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Historic Environment Scotland consider that it may be possible to accommodate a pumped storage hydro scheme at this location but, based on the information provided so far, it appears that the proposals have the potential to raise significant concerns for our interests. There is the potential for significant adverse impacts on the setting of historic environment assets within the site and around it. In order to address these issues, amendments or alterations to the layout may be required, subject to information provided during the assessment. The list below is not considered to be exhaustive, and we would recommend that a wider search is undertaken of the surrounding area for potential impacts in the first instance. It is important to note that some assets have settings that are particularly sensitive to impacts, and the likely sensitivity of the setting should be used to help determine which sites are assessed in more detail in the EIA Report.	A setting assesment is contained within Chapter 13
05.1.09	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	We note that section 9.4.1 of the scoping report suggests that there are likely to be significant physical impacts on all four of the scheduled monuments within the proposed development boundary from both Options A and B. As noted above it is not clear to us from the drawings and information provided at this stage as to how these direct physical impacts would occur.	See response to 05.01.06
05.1.10	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	From the drawings provided neither headpond for Option A nor B would appear to directly impact on any of the scheduled monuments, although we note the very close proximity of the headpond in Option A. The spillways, head and tailraces, power caverns, access tracks both temporary and permanent and construction compounds also do not appear to directly impact on any of the scheduled monuments. We would welcome clarification on the physical impacts which are being predicted in the scoping report and we are happy to discuss this matter in more detail at a meeting.	This is contained within Chapter 13 with the above and below ground infrastructure shown on Figure 2.4 and Figure 2.5 respectively. The Applicant can confirm that Option B has been chosen as the Headpond orientation and that this is the basis of the assessment in Chapter 13
05.1.11	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	We would like to take this opportunity to note that any physical interventions within the scheduled areas of any of the scheduled monuments would be likely to require scheduled monument consent from Historic Environment Scotland. At this stage we can confirm that it is unlikely that scheduled monument consent would be granted for any works within the scheduled areas.	Noted
05.1.12	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	There are a number of scheduled monuments both within the development boundary and in the surrounding area which may receive setting impacts from the proposed development. As noted above this list is not exhaustive and a wide ZTV should be used in the first instance to identify assets which require further detailed assessment. • Caisteal an Dunriachaidh, fort 1520m N of Achnabat (SM 11817) • Achanabat, cairn 960m N of (SM 11799) • Achnabat, hut circle 1065m N of (SM 11828) • Achnabat, hut circle 815m NNE of (SM 11827) • West Town, five hut circles 480m WSW of (SM 11813) • West Town, ring cairn 240m SW of (SM 11551) • Urquhart Castle (SM 90309 and Property in Care of Scottish Ministers) Our key interest in this case is likely to be the potential setting impacts on the scheduled fort within the proposed development boundary and our comments below have focused on this asset.	A Zone of Theoretical Visibility is shown on Figure 11.4

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
05.1.13	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Caisteal an Dunriachaidh, fort 1520m N of Achnabat (SM 11817) This scheduled monument represents the remains of a fort of probable Iron Age date, defended by inner and outer stone ramparts which follow the top of the rocky ridge on which the fort is located on a NNE/SSW alignment. The fort commands the lower lying ground of Ashie Moor where extensive remains of prehistoric settlement have been identified. The fort is an obvious landmark on a high point in the surrounding low lying ground between Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ness and commands extensive views outward in all directions over the relatively undeveloped landscape which forms a key characteristic of the setting of this monument. There are clear and uninterrupted views to the NE towards the two smaller lochs of Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha and in the further distance the prehistoric settlement and funerary monuments near West Town (SM 11813 and 11551).	See response to 05.01.06
05.1.14	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A From the information and drawings provided so far, we have significant concerns over the proposed Option A for this pumped storage hydro scheme. The proposals to combine the two smaller lochs of Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha into one larger headpond for the scheme would dramatically alter the topography and setting of the fort. Figure 2.3 indicates that the headpond for this option would be in very close proximity to the scheduled fort, within c. 300m of the asset. The information provided in the scoping report indicates that the embankment surrounding the headpond would be up to a maximum height of 30.2m above the existing ground level. This represents a substantial change to the topography of the landscape in very close proximity to the fort and would have a significant impact on the setting of the fort in this direction, radically changing the views outwards. Given that a key characteristic of the setting of the fort is the low lying/flat nature of the surrounding it, the development proposals comprising such a change in topography in such close proximity have the potential to have an adverse impact on the integrity of the setting of the monument. The size of the new headpond and the height of the embankment would potentially reduce our ability to understand, appreciate and experience the monument in its setting.	We can confirm that Option A is not the chosen Headpond orientation and is not the basis of the assessment contained in Chapter 13
05.1.15	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	We therefore have significant concerns over the proposals for the scheme shown in Option A. We consider that Option A may lead to impacts on the setting of the monument which may impact on the integrity of that setting and therefore raise issues of national importance. It seems unlikely that it would be possible to substantially mitigate the level of impact to the setting of the fort from Option A. Should Option A be chosen to go forward in its current form it is possible that Historic Environment Scotland will object to the development. We would be happy to discuss this further if that would be helpful.	We can confirm that Option A is not the chosen Headpond orientation and is not the basis of the assessment contained in Chapter 13

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
05.1.16	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option B From the information and drawings provided at this stage Option B appears to be less likely to raise such significant impacts on the setting of this scheduled monument. The proposals shown in Option B are considerably further to the NE, over 1km from the monument on an area of ground which begins to rise up above the low lying ground surrounding the fort. The information provided indicates that the embankment required for this option would be higher than Option A, at up to 43m above existing ground level. The location of the new headpond at this greater distance and on ground which does not form part of the low-lying/flat Ashie Moor suggests that the impacts to the setting of the scheduled fort would be lesser than the impacts from Option A. We consider that it is likely that there will still be impacts to the setting from Option B which would need to be assessed in the EIA Report, however we consider that it may be possible to accommodate this option for the scheme without significantly reducing the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the monument in its setting.	Noted, and this is the basis of the assessment contained in Chapter 13
05.1.17	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Visualisations We would strongly recommend that visualisations are provided to demonstrate the impacts of the proposed development on the setting of the scheduled fort. Visualisations, including photomontages, should demonstrate both the views from the fort towards the development and from the surrounding area showing both the fort and the development in the same view to demonstrate the impacts on views towards the fort in its setting. We would be happy to be involved in further discussions regarding visualisations if this would be helpful.	See response to 05.01.06
05.1.18	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Urquhart Castle (SM 90309 and Property in Care) Urquhart Castle lies on the opposite shore of Loch Ness, around 5.5km from the red line boundary of the development. We note that this scheduled monument currently lies ouwith the 3km study area proposed and beyond the 5km ZTVs provided with the scoping report. Urquhart Castle has an expansive setting given its location on the edge of Loch Ness and it is not currently clear whether the proposed development will be visible from the castle. Given the scale of the development proposals and that some elements of the scheme will be located on the edge of Loch Ness, including the potential substation, we recommend that consideration should be given to potential setting impacts on Urquhart Castle. Should significant impacts be identified we would recommend that visualisations are provided to support the assessment.	A ZTV is shown on Figure 11.4 and Viewpoint 9 provides a visualisation from this location. Chapter 13 concludes that there is views from Urquhart Castle would not be significantly affected by the Development.
05.1.19	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Other scheduled monuments There are a number of other scheduled monuments in the area surrounding the proposed development, including those listed above. It is not clear from the information provided at this stage whether or not either of the options for the proposed scheme would be likely to have significant impacts on the setting of these assets. We therefore recommend that they are assessed to determine whether significant setting impacts are likely. Should significant impacts be identified we suggest that any assessment in the EIA Report should also be accompanied by visualisations to demonstrate the level of impacts.	Impacts on other scheduled monuments is outlined in Section 13.4.13-13.4.44 of Chapter 13 and in Table 13.5 which summarises all the residual effects

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
05.1.20	HES	14/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Summary We note that there are currently two options being considered for the proposed pumped storage hydro scheme. Historic Environment Scotland considers it likely that Option A will raise significant concerns for the impacts to the integrity of the setting of Caisteal an Dunriachaidh, fort 1520m N of Achnabat (SM 11817). It seems likely from the information provided so far that Option B will not raise concerns over the integrity of the setting of this monument. We therefore recommend that Option B is the preferred option for our remit. We would be happy to meet with the developer to discuss these matters further.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessment contained within Chapter 13. Further consultation has been undertaken prior to the submission as outlined in the response to 05.01.06
05.2.01	HES	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	We have previously provided comprehensive comments on the draft version of this scoping report in our letter dated 14 September 2017. I have reviewed the scoping report provided and note that there have been no changes made to the project description, the archaeology and cultural heritage chapter or the figures provided. We are therefore content to rely on the comments laid out in our previous response from 14 September which I will forward along with this letter. We have no further detailed comments to add at this time.	Noted - please see responses to 05.1.01
05.2.02	HES	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	I would also note that Historic Environment Scotland met with the applicant's cultural heritage advisor on the 25th September to discuss the comments made in our letter of 14th September. At the meeting we reiterated our comments and discussed the need for visualisations to demonstrate the level of impacts on the setting of the scheduled monuments for both options for the scheme.	Noted - please see responses to 05.1.01
05.3.01	HES	25/09/2018	Gate Check Response	Having reviewed the submitted report, I can confirm that we are broadly content that the details given reflect Historic Environment Scotland's involvement with, and advice regarding, the EIA process for this development. We consider that we have been appropriately consulted at this stage, and that the proposed assessment is appropriate for our requirements. We note that the design and layout has been modified since the original scoping request and we consider that the changes to the layout will not alter our advice as provided previously. We would welcome further consultation should any further changes to the design and layout be proposed.	Noted. Details on the evolution of the Development are contained with Chapter 3: Design Evolution and Alternatives. This includes consideration of the Scoping Response from HES. The Applicant confirms that they welcome further consultation post-submission
05.3.02	HES	25/09/2018	Gate Check Response	If the developer would like us to provide further comment on any visualisations produced prior to submission of the EIA Report and application we would be happy to do so.	Visualisations have been prepared and can be found in Volume 4: Visulisations
06.1.01	AM Geomorphology	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	We note from section 7.3.6 of the Main Report that dependent on the extent of peat present across the site, a range of peat studies may be undertaken as part of the EIA (including a peat stability assessment). It is important therefore that peat probing is undertaken at a sufficient level to inform the need for such studies (or demonstrate that they are not required).	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
07.1.01	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	In the event that the trunk road is to be utilised, we would request that an assessment of the potential effects of traffic and transport relating to the construction of the new proposal on the trunk road receptors be undertaken as part of the ES.	Chapter 15 provides the Traffic and Transportation assessment including an assessment of the roads to be utilised for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Development

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
07.1.02	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Detailed assessment of potential trunk road related environmental impacts (associated with increased traffic) 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). These specify that road links should be taken forward for assessment if: • Traffic flows will increase by more than 30%, or • The number of HGVs will increase by more than 30%, or • Traffic flows will increase by 10% or more in sensitive areas.	Section 15.3 outlines the methdology which the assessment has been used
07.1.03	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	The methods adopted to assess the likely traffic and transportation impacts on traffic flows and transportation infrastructure should comprise: • Determination of the baseline traffic and transportation conditions, and the sensitivity of the site and existence of any receptors likely to be affected in proximity of the trunk road network; • Review of the development proposals to determine the predicted construction and operational requirements; and • Assessment of the significance of predicted impacts from these transport requirements, taking into account impact magnitude (before and after mitigation) and baseline environmental sensitivity.	Section 15.3 outlines the methdology which the assessment has been used
07.1.04	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Where environmental impacts are fully investigated but found to be of little or no significance, it is sufficient to validate that part of the assessment by stating in the report: • The work that has been undertaken; • What this has shown i.e. what impact if any has been identified; and • Why it is not significant. It is not necessary to include all the information gathered during the assessment of these impacts, although this information should be available, if requested.	Section 15.3 outlines the methdology which the assessment has been used with Table 15.15 providing a summary of the residual effects. A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan is contained in Appendix 15.1
07.1.05	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Noise and Air Quality Assessments We note that an assessment of potential noise impacts associated with the construction phase will be provided within the ES. Given the temporary nature of the construction phase, we can confirm that we do not require any assessment of trunk road receptors in this regard. Similarly, there will be no requirement to provide any assessment of potential air quality or vibration impacts on trunk road receptors.	Noted
07.1.06	Transport Scotland	11/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Operational Assessment The SR indicates that once the PSH facility is operational, the amount of traffic associated with the development will be minimal, therefore, it is proposed that any operational assessment will be scoped out of the EIA Report. This is considered acceptable.	Noted
07.1.07	Transport Scotland	26/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Transport Scotland was consulted on a pre-scoping report and provided comments in a letter dated 11/09/2017. It is noted that the Scoping Report under consideration has not changed significantly since this previous submission, with the most notable amendment being headpond options. The choice of headpond has no bearing on the Trunk Road network and consequently, Transport Scotland has no comment to make on this issue. In conclusion, the comments made in our previous correspondence remain valid.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
08.1.01	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	MSS looked at the Red John Scoping Report of September 2017, Highland Council's Pre-Application Advice Response of 28 September, Scottish Wat er's comments of 20 September and joined you at the meeting hosted by T he Highland Council on 27 September.	Noted
08.1.02	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The report understates the fish issues, which should not be scoped out of ei ther option	Noted
08.1.03	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Loch ness has an important fish community of high conservation and fisheries importance, which includes salmon, brown trout including the long lived ferox form, Arctic charr, eel and pike. Regardless of which Option is pursued, there will be a need to review what information is available of the fish present in Loch Ness and what potential there is for them to be adversely affected by the construction work and operation of the scheme, and consider what mitigation to minimise adverse effects is possible. Although Loch Ness is large, areas important to particular fish species may be localised, for example for spawning in the case of loch spawning fish. The developer should consider whether survey work to establish whether the stretch of loch shore involved has or is likely to have any special value to any of the fish species and consider what action to take if special value is identified.	Please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
08.1.04	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Effective non-injurious screening to prevent fish from being drawn into the system will not be a simple matter and will require careful attention as many of the fish may be very small. There should be consideration of what action will be taken and/ or additional measures will be needed should fish become regularly present or established in the system and header loch.	Please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
08.1.05	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The screening arrangements will also require assed by SEPA under CAR and there will a need to co-ordinate the assessments.	Noted
08.1.06	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	There will be a ned to consider potential impacts on the salmon species interest of the Moriston SAC. The whole SAC salmon population needs to pass through Loch Ness at two life stages - salmon smolts emigrating from the River Moriston to the sea feeding grounds and adult salmon returning to need to pass through Loch Ness. The preliminary Ecological Assessment notes that the exact route of migration through Loch Ness is not known but that this will be investigated to determine the potential for fish connected with the designated site to interact directly with the Development. This is helpful, but regardless of the results the developer commits to screening.	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Section 36 application
08.1.07	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	For option A there will be a need to establish by survey work the fish species and an indication of their abundance in Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha to assess conservation value and risks. MSS notes the Bruce Sandison (2011) Rivers and Lochs of Scotland: The Anglers Complete Guide mentions Lochan na Curra as having a large stock of pike. Draining/ transferring the fish from Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha completely into Loch Duntelchaig would have major considerations and there would be cross catchment considerations and licences to consider both for rescuing and transferring fish to other waters.	Option A was not chosen as the Headpond orientation
08.1.08	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	With both options, there will be similar considerations on smaller scale for the fish populations of the burns which will be lost.	Please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
08.1.09	Marine Scotland Science	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	As already noted, there will be a need to prevent further or wider impacts from identified invasive non-native species, and this should be extended to cover all invasive non-native species, whether they have been identified or not.	An assessment of non-native invasive species is included in Chapter 6: Terrestrial Ecology and Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology, with a risk assessment provided in Appendix 7.2
09.1.01	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	The first consideration for the developer should be whether the underlying purpose of the proposals can reasonably be met without resorting to woodland removal. Design approaches which reduce the scale of felling required to facilitate the development should be considered and integration of the development with the existing woodland structure is a key part of the consenting process.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures
09.1.02	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	FCS acknowledges the consideration of changes to the woodland structure, resulting in possible loss of woodland area. An analysis will need to be done to determine the area of woodland loss and how this fits with The Control of Woodland Removal Policy and compensatory planting that this will likely require. The implications of restructuring on the landscape and stability / integrity of the woodland remaining will also have to be considered. The key to this is in the Forest Design Plan for the area and the restocking proposals for the site.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures
09.1.03	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Any compensatory planting outside the current planning area would be subject to The Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. These can be found here http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/supporting/grants-and-regulations/environmental-impact-assessment	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures. Approximately 12.1 ha of compensatory planting is required
09.1.04	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Contrary to Section 14.2.1 the proposed development is located entirely within privately owned woodland and does not extend to within the boundaries of the National Forest Estate.	Noted
09.1.05	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Section 14.2.5 Although a proportion of the Native Scots Pine Woodland is managed on a ‘commercial basis’ the impact of the proposed development on the integrity or conservation value of the woodland should not be considered insignificant as it will have been managed in accordance with The UK Forestry Standard (The governments’ approach to sustainable forestry). Active management of native pinewoods when undertaken sensitively can benefit biodiversity and increase resilience by allowing greater diversity.	Noted
09.1.06	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	According to the Native Woodland Survey of Scotland (NWSS) four UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) Priority Habitats are present within the proposed development namely Native Pinewood, Upland Mixed Ashwood, Upland Birchwood and Wet Woodland. The proposed development will also impact on Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Long Established Woodland of Plantation Origin (LEPO). NWSS describes a wide range of species and structural diversification within the development area. All age classes from visible regeneration to veteran trees have been recorded as being present. The majority of the woodland likely to be impacted by this development also records a high degree of semi-naturalness.Both the Scoping Report and the NWSS indicate the presence of Juniper within the development area (a UKBAP Priority Species recorded within the Scottish Biodiversity List, considered by the Scottish Ministers to be of principal importance for biodiversity conservation). Juniper is already under threat from Phytophthora austrocedri (P. austrocedri). P. austrocedri is a fungus-like pathogen which poses a threat to juniper trees in Britain. Further information can be found at https://www.forestry.gov.uk/paustrocedrae	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
09.1.07	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	A large proportion of the area earmarked for spoil disposal (approx. 50ha) is naturally regenerated Native Pine and Upland Birchwood established with public funding through the Woodland Grant Scheme (WGS III Ref: 030/001885 Clune Wood). There will be contractual obligations as well as nature conservation implications for this area.	This spoil area was removed from the Development as part of the design evolution. Please see Chapter 3: Alternatives for more information
09.1.08	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Policy relevance: Conservation of ASNW and restoration of the biodiversity of plantations on ancient woodland sites are priorities in the Scottish Forestry Strategy and Scottish Biodiversity Strategy. Scottish Planning Policy recognises the high value of ancient woods and semi-natural woodlands for nature conservation. SG Policy on Control of Woodland Removal guiding principles include a strong presumption in favour of protecting Scotland's woodland resources and that woodland removal should be allowed only where it would achieve significant and clearly defined additional public benefits.	Noted
09.1.09	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	FCS would welcome the inclusion of a forestry assessment and chapter as part of the EIA.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures
09.1.10	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	In the first instance FCS would prefer the developer find an alternative design that would not resort to woodland removal. The proposed development as detailed within the Scoping Report does not comply with the SG Policy on Control of Woodland Removal as it is located within woodlands with a strong presumption against removal.	Noted, however following scoping feedback, Option A was discounted. This is outlined in the design evolution in Chapter 3: Alternatives
09.1.11	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Both Options identified within the Scoping Report lack the recognition of the value of nature and do not sit well with SG Route Map to 2020, in that they oppose Priority Project 2: The restoration of Native Woodland.	Noted
09.1.12	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Compensatory planting is insufficient in terms of mitigating against the loss of priority woodland habitats and species as such FCS would object to any final design that would impact negatively on Scotland's Native Woodland resource.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures. Approximately 12.1 ha of compensatory planting is required
09.1.13	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Further information will be required on how the proposed development is likely to affect the UKBAP Priority Habitats and species and likely mitigation measures.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures
09.1.14	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	Woodland removal is likely to result in a requirement for compensatory planting for an area yet to be determined. FCS would seek that this was a condition of approval and that compensatory planting had to be in place prior to construction commencing.	Please see Chapter 12: Forestry and its associated figures. Approximately 12.1 ha of compensatory planting is required
09.1.15	Forestry Commission Scotland	14/09/2017	Scoping Opinion	FCS would be happy to work with the developers as plans progress. I also enclose a copy of FCS generic scoping opinion for further information; although the document is mainly directed at windfarm developments much of the information is relevant to the Red John Pumped Storage Scheme.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.01	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	**Drinking Water Protected Areas** The proposed site falls partly within the drinking water catchments within which SW abstractions from Loch Duntelchaig, Loch Ashie and Loch Ness are located (see attached drinking water catchment map). SW abstractions are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas (DWPA) under Article 7 of the Water Framework Directive. Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie supply Inverness Water Treatment Works (WTW), Loch Ness supplies Invermoriston WTW. It is essential that water quality and water quantity in the area are protected. Annex 1 details a list of precautions and protection measures to be taken within a DWPA and the wider drinking water catchment.	A Water Framework Directive assessment has been undertaken and is contained within Appendix 10.4 of the EIA Report
10.1.02	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	SW has concerns over the location of the proposed works within Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie and the impact it could have on public drinking water supplies. SW would prefer that the headponds and other associated infrastructure and activities are located out of both Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie drinking water catchments. If it can be demonstrated that this is not practicable, an assessment of impacts on the structural integrity of Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie, their dams, their water quality and quantity and any other associated infrastructure, will require to be undertaken. This should cover the construction, operation and decommissioning stages.	Chapter 10: Water Environment provides an assessment of the potential effects on water quality to the surrounding water environment during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Development
10.1.03	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 6 Ecology There is no mention of the following non-native invasive species Phagocata woodworthi (a flatworm), Elodea nuttallii (a type of pond weed) or Cragonyx pseudogracilis (a non native shrimp) in the ecology section. These are species which SW has experienced concern from SEPA regarding potential cross-catchment spread.	An INNS desk study, survey and risk assessment has been undertaken, and this is contained within Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
10.1.04	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 6 Ecology Section 6.2.13 it says that due to the nature of the proposed development there is significant scope for non-native invasive species (NNIS) in Loch Ness to be pumped up into the headpond and in Option A there is a risk of a NNIS being transferred to Loch Duntelchaig during dewatering, whilst in Section 8.5.3, it is noted that the development has been designed to avoid cross-catchment transfer however, there is no information on how this will be done. SEPA in discussion with SW over a future option to supply Loch Ness water directly to a WTW located in the Loch Ashie catchment, have raised concerns over the potential for catchment transfer of NNIS. We would therefore request further information and details of the mitigation for cross-catchment transfer of NNIS into Loch Ashie catchment.	An INNS desk study, survey and risk assessment has been undertaken, and this is contained within Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology. The Risk Assessment contained within Appendix 7.2 outlines the closed loop system which is integral to the design of the operational Development. A Biosecurity Management Plan will be implemented during construction.
10.1.05	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 7 Geology and Hydrogeology It has not been identified that the options will be located within water catchments for Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie DWPA which are public water supplies. This is a key factor which is not detailed in this section. It is only mentioned that The Middle ORS is known to be used for public water supplies from a borehole in the Turriff Basin. Loch Ness is also a public supply DWPA which has not been identified.	Noted, this is recognised in Chapter 10: Water Environment

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.06	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 7.3.4 There is potential for groundwater contribution to both Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie due to the local geology. This section refers to the assessment of construction and operational effects which may interact with the aquifers and any existing abstractions which are found locally. It is not clear if this is referring solely to private water supplies, but this should include the interaction with groundwater contributing to Lochs Duntelchaig and Ashie.	Noted, this is recognised in Chapter 10: Water Environment
10.1.07	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8 Water Quality and Water Resources Whilst within Figure 8.1, Lochs Ness, Duntelchaig and Ashie are labelled as DWPA, it has not been identified that the options will be located within Loch Ness DWPA and Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie DWPA. It should be stated that the proposals are located in the above mentioned DWPAs.	Noted, this is recognised in Chapter 10: Water Environment
10.1.08	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.2.1 It is mentioned that “indirect effects on Loch Ashie from changes in water abstraction as a consequence of the proposed Development may also need to be considered but may be scoped out depending on the headpond Option chosen”. This differs from section 8.4.4 where it is stated that: “Depending on the headpond Option, during operation there may also be direct hydrological impacts to Loch Duntelchaig, Loch Ashie and the Allt a’ Mhinisteir stream due to a loss of catchment area. Option A could result in a reduction in the availability of potable water supply from Loch Duntelchaig, which could indirectly affect Loch Ashie should SW decide to augment supplies by increasing their abstraction from that loch. In a similar manner, Option B could result in a reduction in the availability of potable water supply from Loch Ashie by affecting flows along the main feeder stream. This could also indirectly affect Loch Duntelchaig, should SW decide to augment supplies by increasing their abstraction from that Loch Duntelchaig. The scope of this assessment will be confirmed upon confirmation of the headpond Option, but it should be noted this aspect could also be scoped out subject to further discussions with SW.” The impacts need to be discussed with SW and taken into account to determine the risks on these public drinking water supplies. Neither option can be scoped out, as they could have a significant impact on water quality, quantity and infrastructure and this has to be assessed.	Noted, this is recognised in Chapter 10: Water Environment
10.1.09	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.2.11 The following is stated: “Scottish Water are understood to also have the ability to transfer water from Loch Ness to Loch Duntelchaig under drought conditions, although do not abstract on a daily basis under normal circumstances.” This statement is incorrect. There is no transfer from Loch Ness in place at present and no infrastructure to do so. A proposed future scheme takes water from Loch Ness to the water treatment works directly.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.10	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.2.16 It is stated that Loch Duntelchaig in conjunction with Loch Ashie is the main potable water supply reservoir for Inverness, but does not state that it is a DWPA. It does highlight that the current arrangement is under pressure to meet future demand. It is not stated that any impact on current yield as a result of this proposal will therefore exacerbate this.	Noted. Chapter 11: Flood Risk and Water Resources contains a detailed assessment of this.
10.1.11	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.2.22 It is recognised little is known about the water quality and hydrology of Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha, and the surrounding moorland. This would need to be determined to understand potential impacts of the options and on dewatering the lochs on Loch Duntelchaig	Chapter 10: Water Environment and Chapter 11: Flood Risk provides an assessment of the potential effects during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Development
10.1.12	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.3.7 This needs to include a study of the impact of dewatering Loch na Curra and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha into Loch Duntelchaig on raising the water levels of Loch Duntelchaig. Please can details be provided of how drainage to Loch Duntelchaig and Loch Ashie from the remaining contributing area downstream of the headponds is to be aligned and managed and any impacts on water quantity and quality be assessed. From Figure 2.3 (Option A), it looks like only a portion of Lochan an Eoin Ruadha is to be included in the headpond.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.13	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.3.10 This states that an assessment of low flows impact will be carried out and if significant, there will be a review of safe yield of the WTW sources. This should be an assessment of the impact on all flows and an assessment of the impacts on yield is required, regardless of how large or small the impacts on the inflow flow sequence appears to be.	Noted
10.1.14	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.4.6 This section states that Option B would avoid impacts on Loch Duntelchaig as there would be no loss of catchment area. From the map provided (Figure 2.3), the headpond would encroach into Loch Duntelchaig catchment over a small area. It also says that the headpond area will be isolated from the local catchments, reducing the catchment areas of Lochs Ashie and Duntelchaig and a detailed assessment of the contributing area will be assessed. SW requires details of these contributing areas and how they will be assessed.	Chapter 11: Flood Risk provides a detailed assessment of water catchments

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.15	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.4.9 This notes that in extreme rainfall there could be potential overtopping of the pond embankment and spill arrangements will be provided to Ness catchment. SW requires details of this to ensure that there is no impact on its sources. We would expect flood studies to be completed and reservoir inundation maps prepared to assess the impact of a breach of either option on the downstream environment and to identify if there is potential for a breach scenario to discharge into Loch Duntelchaig/Ashie, artificially raising top water level enough to impact on the dam structures. As the applicant will be aware, a Qualified Civil Engineer (QCE) should be appointed from the DEFRA All Reservoir Panel to sign off the construction of the headpond impoundments.	The Applicant can confirm that a Panel Engineer from AECOM has been involved at all stages in the design of the Development to date.
10.1.16	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Section 8.5.3 Notes that the development has been designed to avoid cross-catchment transfer- can details of this be supplied?	In terms of INNS, this is outlined in the Risk Assessment contained in Appendix 7.2
10.1.17	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A Locating the headpond and other infrastructure, partly within the existing Loch Duntelchaig DWPA catchment, will impact on water yield and water quality in the loch, which could be exacerbated if the yield is reduced. This will be affected during construction and then operation of the proposal.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.18	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A If the two lochs and any significant watercourses flowing in will be diverted to settlement ponds and then into Loch Duntelchaig, this could cause concerns with water quality even if via settlement ponds. Lochan na Curra is not within the existing catchment area of Loch Duntelchaig and would appear to flow naturally towards Loch Ness, so draining water from one catchment to another could affect water quality, which would require to be assessed. SEPA may have concerns, as this would effectively be a cross-catchment transfer of water. Sediment in the bottom of the existing lochs could introduce elements that would not normally be expected to enter Loch Duntelchaig. Sediment is not the only concern which is mentioned in the Scoping Report, organic carbon content and other parameters such as metals will need to be assessed as this could affect the water treatment work and potentially public supply.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.19	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A Part of the headpond, temporary access track and one of the temporary construction compounds would be located within the catchment Loch Duntelchaig. The impact on water quality would require to be assessed and mitigated. It is stated in the Scoping Report that the compounds are anticipated to be unsealed (stone, metalled or gravel surface) in nature.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.20	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A It is proposed that water pumped from Lochan an Eoin Ruadha to Loch Duntelchaig will have the outlet situated away from the shore in Loch Duntelchaig to reduce the sediment disturbance at the shoreline. The outlet location will also have a silt curtain installed to reduce the chance of any sediment dispersal. This is not sufficiently clear to understand the impact of the proposal.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.21	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A Any peaty and silty water will be pumped out into large silt dewatering bags that could be located in the low lying area between Loch Duntelchaig and Lochan an Eoin Ruadha. The bags will be placed onto the existing vegetation and in an area where the filtered water can drain towards Loch Duntelchaig. Locating the sediment bags within the Loch Duntelchaig catchment could affect water quality particularly if there was a burst. They will then be left to dry out and cut open in the catchment. It is not indicated where the material will be disposed to, only that it will be used for reinstatement.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.22	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A It is indicated that following the removal of the water from the lochs, a smaller continuous pumping operation will be carried out over the majority of the construction period as the new headpond is being constructed. It is not stated where this will be drained to, if into Loch Duntelchaig, this introduces a continual risk to water quality.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.23	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A It is not stated how the watercourse from the Lochan an Eoin Ruadha and the surrounding area will be sealed off from Loch Duntelchaig catchment and when.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.24	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option A Plant to be used to drain the lochs introduces the risk of fuel and oil spills into Loch Duntelchaig, in particular plant working within watercourses.	The Applicant can confirm that Option B was chosen for the Headpond and this is the basis of the assessments contained within the EIA Report
10.1.25	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option B Locating the headpond partly within the existing Loch Duntelchaig DWPA (a small area) and Loch Ashie DWPA catchments, will impact on water yield and water quality in both lochs, which could be exacerbated if the yield is reduced. This will be affected during construction and then operation of the proposal.	Chapter 11: Flood Risk provides a detailed assessment of water catchments
10.1.26	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Option B The impact of deforestation would require to be assessed and mitigated.	Chapter 10: Forestry provides detailed assessment of the forestry resource, felling and management. Any site clearance involving the removal of forestry and other features is contained in the relevant chapters

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
10.1.27	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Both Options All proposed works seem to be far enough away to minimise any impact on our existing dam structures (albeit there is no indication of construction access routes at this stage), but we would ask that levelling surveys are completed across the dam structure at both Loch Duntelchaig and Ashie before and after work activities, to see if there has been any impact.	Noted
10.1.28	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Both Options During construction, we would request the on-site presence within the project team for a dedicated Environmental Manager to look after the interests of SW and to ensure that risks to our raw water sources are kept to a minimum.	The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) outlines the roles and responsibilities of the required staff during the construction phase. This includes a dedicated Environmental Manager
10.1.29	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Scottish Water Assets A review of our records indicates that there are Scottish Water assets including a 180mm water distribution main running along the B862 which may be affected by the proposed development. The location of SW assets (including water supply and sewer pipes, water and waste treatment works, reservoirs etc.) should be confirmed by obtaining detailed plans from our Asset Plan Providers. Details of our Asset Plan Providers are included in Annex 1.	Noted
10.1.30	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	Scottish Water Assets All SW assets potentially affected by the development should be identified, with particular consideration being given to access roads and pipe crossings. If necessary, local Scottish Water personnel may be able to visit the site to offer advice. All of Scottish Water's processes, standards and policies in relation to dealing with asset conflicts must be complied with.	Noted
10.1.31	Scottish Water	20/09/2017	Pre-Application Response	It should be noted that the development will be required to comply with Sewers for Scotland and Water for Scotland 3rd Editions 2015, including provision of appropriate clearance distances from Scottish Water assets.	Noted
10.2.01	Scottish Water	18/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	On that basis [the Scoping Report only having minor changes between draft and submission] we don't have any further comments to make in addition to our most recent response issued in September [the Pre-Application Response].	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
11.1.01	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	A number of potential impacts arising from the proposed development are of concern to us. These include, but are not limited to the following: - Entrainment and/or impingement of salmon and sea trout smolts at the Loch Ness inlet, in particular those originating from the River Moriston SAC; - The cumulative effects of the proposed development on smolt escapement in combination with other projects that are under construction or going through planning, but also existing developments such as SSE Hydro Dams at Invergarry and Dundreggan, Foyers Power station and the Caledonian Canal; - Reduction of water levels in Loch Ness resulting from the intake of water for the proposed development (particularly during low flow conditions). This has the potential to effect water levels in the River Ness and the ability of fish to negotiate the fish pass at Ness Weir; and - Disruption of the migratory behaviour of salmon and sea trout resulting from the discharge of water from the outlet of the proposed development. This has the potential to leave them more vulnerable to illegal exploitation and predation.	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken and is included in the Section 36 application, in addition to the impact assessment contained in Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
11.1.02	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposal has the potential to impact on salmon and sea trout populations across the Ness system. As such, the spatial extent of the studies to inform the EIA should cover the entire area of the catchment accessible to salmon, rather than be limited to the proposed development area and 'nearby watercourses' as stated in the scoping document.	Noted, please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
11.1.03	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Information relating to the behaviour of migratory salmonids as they pass through Loch Ness is extremely limited. Given the scale of the proposed development and its potential impacts on migratory salmonid populations in the Ness system; it is imperative that an extensive desk study together with both adult and smolt tracking studies be commissioned to adequately inform the assessment of likely impacts.	Noted, please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
11.1.04	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The impacts of development proposals on fish and fisheries are different to the standard receptors normally considered as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment. We strongly recommend that the developer produces a stand-alone 'Fisheries Impact Assessment'. This will more easily allow the balance of conservation and socioeconomics (i.e. the impacts on angling) to be considered.	Noted, please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology
11.1.05	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Given our statutory duties, this response concentrates on salmon and sea trout populations. The Environmental Impact Assessment should however also include an assessment of the likely effects on other key fish species including brown trout, Arctic char, European eel and lamprey species.	Noted, please see Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology where these species have been assessed
11.2.01	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	Loch Ness forms an important migratory route and refuge for Atlantic salmon and Sea trout (migratory salmonids) as they travel between the marine and freshwater environments. Fish originating in the upper Ness system (including the Rivers Oich, Garry, Tarff and Moriston), middle Ness system (Rivers Enrick, Coiltie, Foyers and Farigaig) and lower Ness system (River Ness and tributaries) all have the potential to be present in the area of the proposed development.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
11.2.02	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	The River Moriston is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) designated for Atlantic salmon and freshwater pearl mussel (which depend on the juvenile salmon for part of their lifecycle). The most recent site condition monitoring for the Moriston SAC considers the condition of the Atlantic salmon interest to be 'Unfavourable, No Change'. The Scottish Government has also recently published its 'Conservation Assessment' for the 2018 salmon fishing season. This estimates that the Moriston SAC has only a 0.5 percent probability of meeting its salmon 'egg requirement'. As such it has been designated as a 'Category 3' system, where exploitation is deemed to be unsustainable and management action is required to reduce exploitation. Further to the above, abundance of salmon in the Upper River Garry has declined over the last fifty years and is showing little sign of recovery. Historical annual returns of up to 900 salmon through the fish counter in the Garry Dam have now reduced to a five-year average of just 50 fish. More widely, there has been a long-term decline in the annual Ness district and Scottish National salmon rod catch.	Noted. The Applicant has undertaken a HRA Screening Assessment and this is contained in the Statement of Inform an Appropriate Assessment
11.2.03	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	A general decline in the numbers of returning adult salmon places a greater emphasis on their protection. We aim to maximise the number of healthy wild salmon and sea trout that go to sea from the Ness system (referred to as 'smolt escapement'). As such it is important that a robust assessment of likely impacts of the proposed Red John scheme is completed and adequate measures put in place to mitigate any potential negative impacts.	Noted
11.2.04	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	A number of potential impacts associated with the proposed Red John scheme were highlighted in our scoping response: > Entrainment and/or impingement of salmon and sea trout smolts at the Loch Ness inlet, in particular those originating from the River Moriston SAC;	Noted
11.2.05	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	> The cumulative effects of the proposed development on smolt escapement in combination with other projects that are under construction or going through planning, but also existing developments such as SSE Hydro Dams at Invergarry and Dundreggan, Foyers Power station and the Caledonian Canal;	Noted
11.2.06	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	> Reduction of water levels in Loch Ness resulting from the intake of water for the proposed development (particularly during low flow conditions). This has the potential to effect water levels in the River Ness and the ability of fish to negotiate the fish pass at Ness Weir; and	Noted
11.2.07	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	> Disruption of the migratory behaviour of salmon and sea trout resulting from the discharge of water from the outlet of the proposed development. This has the potential to leave them more vulnerable to illegal exploitation and predation.	Noted
11.2.08	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	Very little is known about the migrations or behaviour of salmon (smolts, adults or recovering kelts) in large water bodies such as Loch Ness. As such we feel that further surveys are required to fill any gaps in knowledge and allow for a robust impact assessment.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
11.2.09	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	For example, salmon smolts are believed to 'passively' migrate (drift downstream) during the majority of their migration to sea. This makes them very vulnerable to the effects of wind and currents in the Loch, meaning that they may be blown or pushed in the wrong direction. The Ness DSFB has received reports of large shoals 'super shoals' of salmon smolts in the Loch Ness during the spring period (estimated to number in the hundreds of thousands, i.e. a significant proportion of the total smolt run). One of the most common sightings has been at Dores Beach, close to the proposed development site. It is not known whether the fish were pushed to this location by the predominant wind or current direction, or whether they actively choose to gather (or stage) in this location prior to migrating through the River Ness on masse. In either case, the potential for significant numbers of smolts to be present in the proximity of the intake/discharge point significantly increases the risk of a potential impact on smolt survival.	Noted
11.2.10	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	Furthermore, it is generally excepted that a proportion of the salmon smolt run is drawn into the Caledonian Canal at Ness Weir (where the flow out of Loch Ness is split between the River Ness and the Canal). Smolts have a very limited period of physiological readiness in which they must enter the sea. In some cases it is believed that this 'smolt window' may be as short as a week, which means that any fish delayed in the Canal are unlikely to survive. Any change to the existing flow regime at Ness Weir associated with the proposed development (particularly in combination with the effects of other water users) will therefore have the potential to impact on smolt survival. Given the current lack of information available regarding the behaviour of smolts in these locations, we would need to take the 'precautionary approach' and assume the worst case scenario, i.e. the scheme will have a negative impact of smolt survival. A well designed smolt tracking study would however enable a more informed assessment of likely impact and help to inform any mitigation measures that might be required.	Noted
11.2.11	Ness District Salmon Fishery Board	02/10/2018	Gate Check Response	The same is true in regard to adult salmon migrations through Loch Ness. The fish pass (or 'spout') located in Dochfour Weir is believed to create a partial barrier to upstream migration of adult salmon under certain flow conditions, however the specific thresholds are not currently known. Without this information it will be difficult to make an informed assessment of the likely impacts of any changes in flow resulting from the operation of the proposed development on the efficiency of the existing fish pass. Furthermore, adult fish are know to utilise the loch as a refuge. They are drawn into the lower reaches of the Rivers Oich and Moriston during hydro generation (and associated increase in flows) before dropping back into the loch. The same behaviour has been reported at the Glendoe tailrace, which has now become a population poaching location. We will need confidence that any 'distraction' in adult salmon migration resulting from the discharge from the proposed development will not have a significant negative impact. A well designed adult salmon tracking study would enable a more informed assessment of likely impact and help to inform any mitigation measures that might be required.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
12.1.01	Scottish Canoe Association	19/10/2017	Pre-Application Response	As access coordinator for the Scottish Canoe Association your consultation letter and cd regarding the above project have been forwarded to me. Do you have a web site that I could direct my fellow kayakers too? Even a basic location map would be helpful.	The application is available at the ECU website and also at the project website hosting by the Applicant at www.redjohnpsh.co.uk
12.1.02	Scottish Canoe Association	06/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	I have received no adverse comments from my fellow paddlers. The Scottish Canoe association will not therefore be commenting on the Red John scheme.	Noted
13.1.01	VisitScotland	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Importance of scenery to tourism Scenery and the natural environment have become the two most important factors for visitors in recent years when choosing a holiday location. The importance of this element to tourism in Scotland cannot be underestimated. The character and visual amenity value of Scotland's landscapes is a key driver of our tourism product: a large majority of visitors to Scotland come because of the landscape, scenery and the wider environment, which supports important visitor activities such as walking, cycling wildlife watching and visiting historic sites. The VisitScotland Visitor Experience Survey (2015/16) confirms the basis of this argument with its ranking of the key factors influencing visitors when choosing Scotland as a holiday location. In this study, over half of visitors rated scenery and the natural environment as the main reason for visiting Scotland. Full details of the Visitor Experience Survey can be found on the organisation's corporate website, here: http://www.visitscotland.org/research_and_statistics/tourism_topics/wind_farms-1.aspx	Please see Chapter 14: Socio-Economics
13.1.02	VisitScotland	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Taking tourism considerations into account We would suggest that full consideration is also given to the Scottish Government's 2008 research on the impact of wind farms on tourism. In its report, you can find recommendations for planning authorities which could help to minimise any negative effects of renewable energy developments on the tourism industry. The report also highlights a request, as part of the planning process, to provide a tourism impact statement as part of the Environmental Impact Analysis. Planning authorities should also consider the following factors to ensure that any adverse local impacts on tourism are minimised: • The number of tourists travelling past en route elsewhere • The views from accommodation in the area • The relative scale of tourism impact i.e. local and national • The potential positives associated with the development • The views of tourist organisations, i.e. local tourist businesses or VisitScotland The full study can be found at www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/03/07113507/1	Please see Chapter 14: Socio-Economics
13.1.03	VisitScotland	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	Given the aforementioned importance of Scottish tourism to the economy, and of Scotland's landscape in attracting visitors to Scotland, VisitScotland would strongly recommend any potential detrimental impact of the proposed development on tourism - whether visually, environmentally and economically - be identified and considered in full.	Please see Chapter 14: Socio-Economics

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
13.1.04	VisitScotland	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	VisitScotland strongly agrees with the advice of the Scottish Government –the importance of tourism impact statements should not be diminished, and that, for each site considered, an independent tourism impact assessment should be carried out. This assessment should be geographically sensitive and should consider the potential impact on any tourism offerings in the vicinity.	Please see Chapter 14: Socio-Economics
13.1.05	VisitScotland	31/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	VisitScotland 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.	Please see Chapter 14: Socio-Economics
14.1.01	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We note that the site contains some areas of peatland, including deep peat. As required by Policy 55 of the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, the proposal should demonstrate how it avoids unnecessary disturbance, degradation or erosion of peat and soils. If any peat would be disturbed, an assessment of the likely effects of the development on carbon dioxide emissions should be undertaken, as required by Scottish Planning Policy.	Chapter 5 and Appendix 5.1 provides details of the Phase 1 peat survey.
14.1.02	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Several bird species listed for their importance in a European context, and others which are of conservation concern in the UK, are present or potentially present on the site. These include black-throated and red-throated diver, Slavonian grebe, goshawk, hen harrier, osprey and peregrine. All of these species are in Annex 1 of EU Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds, which requires the Government to take special conservation measures to protect their habitats, including due regard to their conservation in the taking of development management decisions. All of these species are also on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Other important bird species likely to occur on the site include black grouse which is on the Red list of Birds of Conservation Concern. The potential impacts on all of these species should be adequately covered within the EIA report.	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken, in addition to stand alone ornithological assessment in Chapter 8: Ornithology
14.1.03	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The assessment 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.	Through the application of the mitigation hierarchy, this has been taken into account in the assessment
14.1.04	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Both black-throated divers and red-throated divers are known to breed in or frequent all the lochs surrounding Loch Duntelchaig. Red-throated divers have been recently recorded breeding on Loch na Curra and are present on Loch an Eoin Ruadha. We would be opposed to Option A as shown on Figure 2.3, as this layout would result in the loss of these lochs as a breeding habitat. As paragraph 5.3.5 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states, replacement of these lochs with a head pond subject to water level fluctuations of high amplitude and frequency would render the water body unsuitable for much of the notable vegetation and fauna. The head pond proposed for Option A would be unsuitable for breeding and also result in potential loss of primary feeding habitat due to higher water levels (shallow waters are required by young birds to access invertebrate prey species). Fluctuating water levels could prove detrimental to nest sites, which could flood or be left surrounded by dry land allowing access to predators. These impacts would also need to be considered in relation to Slavonian grebe.	Option A was not chosen as the Headpond orientation

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
14.1.05	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Additionally, the construction of any scheme is likely to be a major source of disturbance to the birds present on water bodies. In addition to their main breeding loch, adult RTDs and BTDs frequent other nearby lochs to forage and this requires consideration. We would recommend no disturbance during the breeding season from April 1st – July 31st and that the minimum exclusion zone distance adopted is 750m from a nest.	Option A was not chosen as the Headpond orientation
14.1.06	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Artificial nesting rafts are used readily by black-throated and red-throated divers, and the extra provision of these may help to mitigate impacts and create suitable nesting habitat. It must be noted that rafts require annual maintenance and long-term commitment. Careful consideration must be given to the siting of rafts, as black-throated divers will displace red-throated divers and grebes.	Option A was not chosen as the Headpond orientation. In addition it is not proposed to add these rafts into the operational headpond of the Development due to the fluctuating water levels
14.1.07	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposed development lies in an area which forms part of the core range in Scotland (and UK) of the Slavonian grebe, one of our rarest water birds. The breeding range in Britain has always been restricted to a few freshwater lochs in a relatively small part of Scotland. Loch Ashie and Loch Ruthven Special Protection Areas are both large open lochs and are two of the most important sites designated in Britain for Slavonian grebe. Loch Ashie is used as an important pre- and post-breeding site and sometimes supports breeding birds. It is likely that Slavonian grebe also regularly use other lochs in the area, which along with Loch Ashie therefore should be included in the scope of survey work and assessment.	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken, in addition to stand alone ornithological assessment in Chapter 8: Ornithology
14.1.08	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Due to the potential impacts of the development on Slavonian grebe associated with Loch Ashie SPA, particularly in relation to disturbance (from noise and visual effects), the Scottish Government (Energy Consents Unit) will need to undertake an appropriate assessment of the potential impacts on the SPA, taking into account advice from Scottish Natural Heritage. The applicant should submit information to inform that appropriate assessment, including on the impacts of fluctuating and low water levels as discussed above.	A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken, in addition to stand alone ornithological assessment in Chapter 8: Ornithology
14.1.09	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Should breeding or pre/post-breeding behaviour be in evidence we recommend an exclusion zone of at least 300m radius, within which no construction or other activities can take place from 15th April – 31st July, in order to avoid disturbance of the birds.	Noted
14.1.10	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Our records show that goshawk, hen harrier, long-eared owl, osprey and peregrine, are recorded as breeding or probably breeding on or around the development site. Due to the sensitivity of nest locations they are not detailed here but can be provided on request by the Highland Raptor Study Group (HRSG). Advice should be obtained from the HRSG before any survey work is undertaken to avoid any extra disturbance to already established nest locations which can be identified by HRSG.	Chapter 8: Ornithology provides an assessment on birds, and included a desk study, records search and survey data.
14.1.11	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Additionally, it is important to consider the home hunting ranges of certain species and potential effects of the development on these, as hunting adult raptors will regularly frequent the same area and could be affected by disturbance. For example, male ospreys can show preferences to certain lochs for hunting.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
14.1.12	RSPB Scotland	03/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Black Grouse are identified as being present within the development area, and the potential impact on this species could be significant. A minimum buffer around the development site of 1.5km should be applied for survey work. Black grouse are known to suffer from disturbance and displacement while lekking and we recommend that in order to avoid this, there should be construction and other activity within a buffer of 750m around any lek site (this distance can vary according to line of sight and time of day) between 1 hour before and 2 hours after local sunrise from the 15th March – 15th May.	The Black Grouse survey is included in Appendix 8.1
14.2.01	RSPB Scotland	04/10/2018	Gate Check Response	I write on behalf of RSPB Scotland with regard to the gatecheck report for the above proposal. We are content with the submitted gatecheck report, and havethe following advice and recommendations at this stage.	Noted
14.2.02	RSPB Scotland	04/10/2018	Gate Check Response	As noted in our response regarding the EIA scoping request, Slavonian grebe, black-throated and red-throated divers are known to breed in or frequent all the lochs surrounding Loch Duntelchaig. We are pleased to note that the previously considered Option A for the headpond location is not being proposed. These species are listed under Annex 1 of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and Schedules 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence to disturb any whilst it is building a nest or whilst it is in, on or near a nest containing eggs or young. It is also an offence to intentionally or recklessly harass these birds and to disturb dependent young. Without robust mitigation, the construction of this scheme would be likely to lead to disturbance of nearby breeding pairs and foraging adults, potentially affecting their breeding success. It is therefore essential that robust mitigation measures are implemented to prevent such disturbance if the scheme is consented and goes ahead.	Noted. The Applicant can confirm that an assessment on these species has been undertaken.
14.2.03	RSPB Scotland	04/10/2018	Gate Check Response	We are pleased to see in Table 3.2 that operations will be programmed to avoid disturbance to these sensitive species. They should occur outside of the breeding period of 1st April – 31st July, especially highly disruptive work such as blasting and the use of rock hammers. We recommend an exclusion zone of at least 750m from Loch Ashie, Loch an Eoin Rhuadha, Loch na curra and Loch Duntelchaig, unless it is confirmed by an ECoW that breeding or pre-post breeding behaviour of these species is not in evidence and that operations within this distance will not cause disturbance.	Noted. The Applicant can confirm that such activities are proposed to be undertaken outside this sensitive season. However the buffer zone is not possible as the Headpond is located within 200m of the banks of Loch Ashie. We can confirm that an ECoW is secured through the CEMP
14.2.04	RSPB Scotland	04/10/2018	Gate Check Response	We welcome the proposed provision of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) and request an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed mitigation measures when the outline CEMP becomes available.	An outline CEMP is provided in the EIA Report as Appendix 3.1.
15.1.01	JRC	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	This proposal cleared with respect to radio link infrastructure operated by: The Local Electricity Utility and Scotia Gas Networks	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
15.1.02	JRC	11/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	JRC analyses proposals for wind farms on behalf of the UK Fuel & Power Industry. This is to assess their potential to interfere with radio systems operated by utility companies in support of their regulatory operational requirements. In the case of this proposed wind energy development, 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. In making this judgement, JRC has used its best endeavours with the available data, although we recognise that there may be effects which are as yet unknown or inadequately predicted. JRC cannot therefore be held liable if subsequently problems arise that we have not predicted. It should be noted that this clearance pertains only to the date of its issue. As the use of the spectrum is dynamic, the use of the band is changing on an ongoing basis and consequently,developers are advised to seek re-coordination prior to considering any design changes.	Noted
16.1.01	NATS	16/10/2017	Scoping Opinion	The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal. However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted. If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.	Noted
17.1.01	ScotWays	07/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	The National Catalogue of Rights of Way does not show any rights of way affected by the area outlined in red on Figure 1.2 The Proposed Development Site. As there is no definitive record of rights of way in Scotland, there may be other routes that meet the criteria to be rights of way but have not been recorded as they have not yet come to our notice.	A desk based survey has identified the routes shown on Figure 14.1 showing all known recreational routes in the Development Site boundary
17.1.02	ScotWays	07/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	Baseline Information 12.3.3 states that information sources for tourism and recreation may include ScotWays: Aecom is welcome to contact the Society directly if a more detailed consultation response is required.	Noted
17.1.03	ScotWays	07/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	You will no doubt be aware there may now be general access rights over any property under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. We understand that the applicant has consulted the Core Paths Plan, prepared by Highland Council's access team as part of their duties under this Act. We strongly recommend that the applicant consult with the access team at Highland Council with regard to any proposals for closure/diversions of recreational routes across the site.	Noted

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
17.1.04	ScotWays	07/11/2017	Scoping Opinion	We note that Figure 10.2 is titled Public Rights of Way. As, noted above, there are no recorded rights of way across the development site this sheet appears to use the recreational baseline rather than show the right of way network over the site and should perhaps be re-titled.	Noted, this has been amended for the EIA Report
20.1.01	Member of the public	17/07/2018	Public Exhibition	Issues due to increased traffic on B862 as there are no roadside fences on the hill ground and stock can range freely all year round. Incresaed dangers in spring/ summer-time (mid-March onwards). Road marked orange on map. I also am concerned at the signle track road between Croachy on the B851 to Achnabat (B862) that this is not used as a short cut. I farm at Ballachar and Dalcrombie also and there are no roadside fences and stock roams freely also. Road marked red on map.	A Framework Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals. In addition the Construction Environmental Management Plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the construction staff and the method of raising concerns or making a complaint.
20.1.02	Member of the public	10/07/2018	Public Exhibition	Very impressed with the thought and planning that has gone into this scheme. This and other schemes like it will help to make Scotland self-sufficient in renewable energy and keep us on track to become world leaders in the field. My main concern, in common with other people in the area, is the use (or abuse) or our local road network during the construction phase by contractros from outside of the area who do not know how to use single track roads. I appreciate that this scheem will probably result in fewer heavy vehicle movements than the windfarm developments we are accustomed to, but I still feel that the developers have an obligatio to put some of their projected profits into local road improvements e.g. widening part of the Daviot- Inverarnie stretch or the Dores Brae (B862 south of Dores). This would ease congestion, reduce damage to vehicles from damaged road surfaces, and possible even get some renewable energy skeptics on side! P.s. "Lochan an Eoin Ruadha" translates as "Little loch of the red grouse" (Eon Ruadh = Red Grouse) Not Red John!	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals. In addition the Construction Environmental Management Plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the construction staff and the method of raising concerns or making a complaint. Comments on the name error is noted, and the Applicant will rename the project prior to the determination of the planning consent by Scottish Ministers

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
20.1.03	Member of the public	06/07/2018	Public Exhibition	1. In support, overall excellent idea and planning, however… 2. Name needs corrected and changed. Incorrect Gaelic translation. 3. Please protect the mature trees and blackberry ground cover near to the Drumashie crossroads. This is potential capercaillie territory and they have been seen and heard in Strath Nairn and Stratherrick in similar habitat. Locals also collect blackberries here. 4. Ensure local businesses are properly compensated for loss of business, not indirectly through the community fund. Even if this is afterwards, it could be done by comparing income before and during work. But prefarbly compensated during construction. 5. Please ensure and enfore the rule that no extra traffic uses the Abersky Road or the Loch Ruthven road. 6. Do something to prevent accidents and speeding at the Achnabat corner. This is bad enough already without more traffic. The road surface abd visibility are awful. Slow down. 7. If there is more traffic on the road through Strath Nairn, please do something about the dreadful road surface between Farr Hall end and the A9 past Dell ? farm. 8. Please let everyone know well in advance of any local delays or diversions. We need plenty of notice particularly about any road closures as this affects people going to work, and potential business traffic. 9. Make sure the Communit Liaison Offiver is connected properly to all those affecred. Not everyone has access to the internet, particularly the elderly and those who can't get a proper conneciton. 10. We already have problems with people speeding, on our single track roads, and this is made worse by extra-slow drivers. We need some signs to enforce and inform on the use of passing places and speed traps if necessary. Problems with the roads will be made worse by increased traffic. We have seen this already in StrathNairn with increased accidents and a recent fatality - Good luck with all your endevours, hope it all goes well.	Comments are made using the same notation for ease of reference: 1. Noted 2. Comments on the name error is noted, and the Applicant will rename the project prior to the determination of the planning consent by Scottish Ministers 3. Our surveys have confirmed the presence of Black Grouse but not capercaillie. None the less, there are no plans to alter the crossroads at this location or impact the mature trees 4. Details of the community benefit are outlined in the Planning Statement. In addition, the Construction Environmental Management Plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the construction staff and the method of raising concerns or making a complaint. 5. A Framework Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals. 6. Any damage caused to the roads to be used by construction traffic will be rectified, and in some cases, improvements will be made to those specific roads prior to construction starting 7. Please see response to point 5 8. The CEMP outlines that there will be a community liaison group and a dedicated officer who will be responsible for communicating with the surrounding communities about the construction phase of the Development. This will include a website, and a newsletter as well as regular meetings. 9. Alternative means of communication will be made such as meetings, newsletters and leaflet drops 10. Please see response to point 5 regarding traffic
20.1.04	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	Positive about project. What benefits will the Project gain to the local community?	Details of the community benefit are outlined in the Planning Statement. In addition, any highway improvements and improvements to local paths and recreational routes will remain. The Access Management Plan also outlines the improved signage and educational boards which will be installed. It is also proposed to leave the permanent elements of the jetty to aid any aquatic recreational craft.
20.1.05	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	The Project will have enormous impact on the B851 if 300 people are employed and they don't live on site. I appreciate the importance of the Project. I am concerned at the impact it will have on the local community during the construction phase.	It is proposed that there is a sufficient workforce in Inverness and surrounding residential areas given the presence of other hydro power schemes in the vicinity. Therefore it is intended that a lcoal workforce will avoid the need for local accommodation to be used by a substantial external workforce. In addition a small worker accommodation facility is proposed during critical path activities onsite. With regards to traffic, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals.
20.1.06	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	Good clear presentation of the proposal and thank you to the staff for answering questions. Generally, support the propsal, but concerned over the destruction of General Wade's Road section.	A cultural heritage assessment of General Wade's road has been undertaken in Chapter 13

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
20.1.07	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	Good presentation - info and people Good that input being requested before planning had been completed We are particularly intered/ concerned about visual impact from Abriachan and light pollution Could we please receive visual impact photos once these show the Project (email).	Visualisations have been prepared and can be found in Volume 4: Visulisations. The viewpoint from Abriachan is number 2
20.1.08	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	Very positive Project. Fully support proposal.	Noted
20.1.09	Member of the public	27/06/2018	Public Exhibition	In principle in favour of any scheme that promotes renewable energy, so support this scheme. The only concern would be about traffic management during the construction phase.	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals.
21.1.01	Stratherrick and Foyers Community Council	10/07/2018	Public Exhibition	The SFCC had hugse concerns over the proposed traffic route for the Project, as it will come through an SFCC area between Dunmaglass and Torness. Our area has had to endure wind farm and hydro scheme traffic for more than 4/5 years already. Our roads are not built for this kind of traffic and are being ruined. Although a TMP will be agreed and in place, our previous experiences show that TMP's are not easily experiences show that TMP's are not easily enforceable and end up just being ignored. Speeding work vehicles through our villages is top of the SFCC agenda every month. Yes we get some road upgraders, but again these come with more upheavle and inconvenience to locals. The SFCC will object to the proposed traffic route and request an alternative be considered.	A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals. In addition the Construction Environmental Management Plan outlines the roles and responsibilities of the construction staff and the method of raising concerns or making a complaint.
22.1.1	Local Business	Business Questionnaire		I would not want it to be too noisy e.g. continuous hum as we are the 2nd closest house to project	The EIA Report contains a noise assessment with Figure 16.2 providing the noise monitoring locations which have been used for the impact assessment
22.1.2	Local Business	Business Questionnaire		The road running from loch duntelchaig, through the crossroads at the intersection of No 14 and downwards past Clune Wood leading down the hair pin bend road to the B852 is used frequently by guests going to the Dores Inn. It doesn't appear to be mentioned, but as it is very narrow and has no signed passing places (as pointed out by one freaked guest who didn't know to use the coreners instead!) so it having 3 junctions of possible traffic will need extra passing places. My neighbour uses it frequently. Will the residents of the Duntelchaig area be linked into the mains if they want to? To give the option would be nice. Note: call me if any workmen want to bring a campevan/ caravan as I may be able to rent an area depending on dates of required stay (not sure when project starts).	Thank you for your comments. The B852 will not be used for construction traffic for entry into Dores. The access route for all construction traffic is via the A9 and B851, with the exception of potential sensitive times of the year to avoid impact to ornithological features on Loch Eion Rhuda, where traffic will enter the site via Compound 3. A Framework Traffic Management Plan is included in the EIA Report as Appendix 15.1 and outlines how construction traffic will be managed on all public roads. There is no proposals to amend any existing utility arrangements near Loch Duntelchaig with the exception of the diversions required on the C1064 and some localised distribution overhead lines in the vicinity of the Headpond.
22.1.3	Local Business	Business Questionnaire		Anticipating some disruption during construction - noise, traffic etc. Would consider long-term lets to construction personel if required.	Noted
22.1.4	Local Business	Business Questionnaire		The project will severely curtailed our riding operations so adequate provision will need to be made to make sure the impact is as little as possinle - alternative tracks provided and plenty of communication about works in progress so we can work together.	The Access Management Plan is provided in Appendix 14.3 and outlines the alternative routes, diversions and closures which will be required during the construction phase. It also details other measures such as signage and communication regarding the construction phase.

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
22.1.5	Local Business		Business Questionnaire	Concern about increase traffic Concern about noise pollution	The EIA Report contains a Framework Traffic Management Plan and a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which outlines the measures to control these aspects of the construction phase.
22.1.6	Local Business	29/06/2018	Public Exhibition	Not enough information supplied to date to provide detailed comments. Concerns and topics I would expect to be addressed: - Flood Risk Assessment - Assocaited impacts on our property and isurance; - Transport: winter safety; Route for construction to be confirmed; Access from A9 S of Daviot through Inverarnie how will this be controlled. - Ecological Impacts: GWD Ecosystems; Ornithology - Osprey v. close by - spotted on way home from consultation. Wood peckers, kyte, grebe, barn owl, kestrel, perrigine falcon all in area; Bats definitely in construction area; red squirrel; scots pine some interesting examples; -Archaeology: wades road, mill stone, stone circle; - LVIA: Particularly from Loch Ashie and Loch Duntelchaig north side - Effects on hydrology, water table and knock on flood implications. Also on Loch Duntelchaig levels as we have a private water supply. Sceptic tanks and soakaways are used on most properties here increase in water table will impact these needs considered; - Non-native species introduction to Loch Ashie or Loch Duntelchaig spread by birds etc. from headpond. - carbon calc for the Development - actual savings; - Social-economic benefits? Local content of construction how will this be insured. - Construction programme minimise disturbance but realistic re winter shutdowns. - Noise impacts of construction - construction site hours? - Recreation use of Loch Ashie near Development for dog walking, stand up paddle boarding, paddling, fishing and wild camping.	Responses are made in the same order for ease of reference: - A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and is contained within Chapter 9, with the breach analysis in Appendix 9.1. The Applicant is unable to provide any information on insurance. - A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented and enforced through the Section 36 planning consent. This CTMP will outline the mandatory routes for all forms of construction traffic including timings, speeds, and approvals. - A full ecological impact assessment has been undertaken and contained in Chapter 6: Terrestrial Ecology, Chapter 7: Aquatic Ecology and Chapter 8: Ornithology, including all the associated appendices for species specific surveys. A Statement to Inform an Appropriate Assessment is also included within the submission for potential effects on Natura 2000 sites - An archaeological assessment has been undertaken and is contained with Chapter 15 - Chapter 11 contains the Landscape and Visual Assessment and should be read in conjunction with its associated Appendices. The Visualisations (to both THC and SNH standards) are available in Volume 4 Visualisations - Chapter 9 provides information on flood risk whilst Chapter 10 provides an assessment on water quality and private water supplies - An assessment of non-native invasive species has been undertaken, specifically on aquatic species as well as terrestrial and this is contained within Chapters 6 and 7. A INNS Risk Assessment for the construction and operational phases has been completed and is contained within Appendix 7.2. This has been approved by SEPA and SNH (see comments G135 and G70) - No carbon calculation has been undertaken - A socio-economic assessment is contained within Chapter 14 with the community benefit outlined in the Planning Statement - A noise assessment is contained within Chapter 16 with the working hours outlined in Chapter 2: Project and Site Description - The Applicant can confirm that no works are proposed in Loch Ashie and
23.1.01	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	Firstly, please address all correspondance from now on to our chairman, George Hawco, Dalluarach, Abriachan, Inverness, IV3 8LB, to whom a paper application should be sent. Mr Hawco is currently on holiday.	Noted with thanks
23.1.02	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	Secondly please note there is a highly successful community forest in Abriachan, owned and managed by residents, founded 20 years ago, which welcomes more than 40,000 visitors each year and provides educational facilities and an extensive network of forest paths and high hill walks, including Carn na Leitir and Meall a Bhathaich. From the latter there would be extensive views into your development site. It might be appropriate for ECU to consult with the Abriachan Forest Trust on the development. They can be contacted via their chairman, Marco Baglioni, Easter Tomachoin, Abriachan, IV3 8LB.	Noted
23.1.03	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	We agree with THC that there should be a set of visualisations to THC guidelines.	We can confirm that the visualisations prepared conform to both THC and SNH requirements and are contained Volume 4 Visualisations
23.1.04	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	We agree with various agencies that felling should be kept to a minimum.	Noted, this is outlined in Chapter 10: Forestry

ID	Organisation	Date	Consultation Method	Comments	Response from Applicant
23.1.05	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	We consider that all above ground infrastructure should be rendered/finished in a material and of a colour which will blend into the background.	Noted, we seek to gain agreement on the finishes with the relevant bodies post-planning consent
23.1.06	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	We agree with THC that a landscape and visual effects appraisal should be jargon-free and include a sensitive assessment of how the landscapes are viewed, used and valued by residents and visitors alike.	We can confirm that the visualisations prepared conform to both THC and SNH requirements and are contained Volume 4 Visualisations. Commentary can also be found in Chapter 11: Landscape & Visual and the associated appendices
23.1.07	Inverness West CC	13/10/2018	s36 Copies	It is a small point, but I notice Abriachan is mis-spelt in your scoping document. This is not to be pedantic, but spelling errors make a digital search/use of manual index more difficult than it should be.	Noted

aecom.com