

Appendix 2.1: Consultation Response Tables

Appendix 2.1 Consultation Response Tables

Table 2.1: An Càrr Dubh Wind Farm Scoping Report Feedback

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU)	27/08/21	Scottish Ministers confirmed satisfied with the scope of the EIA.	Noted.
		Recommended requirement for, and assessment of, aviation lighting be agreed with NatureScot and Argyll and Bute Council (ABC). Full details on all mitigation and aviation lighting impacts should be provided in the EIA and effects should be factored into the Wild Land Assessment.	The requirement for aviation lighting has been considered in the design and has been fully assessed in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity and Chapter 14: Other Issues of the EIA Report.
		Advise that the requirement for baseline fish surveys and pre and post development surveys be agreed with the Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board.	Consultation was undertaken with the Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board – see below. Fish surveys have not been undertaken, as agreed with NatureScot.
		Where borrow pits are proposed as a source of on-site aggregate they should be considered as part of the EIA process and included in the EIA report detailing information regarding their location, size and nature. The impact of such facilities (including dust, blasting and impact on water) should be assessed as part of the overall impact of the working. Information should cover the requirements set out in 'PAN 50: Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings.	Borrow pits are included in the design and have been assessed as part of the EIA. Borrow Pits are discussed in Chapter 4: Project Description . The locations are shown in the accompanying Figure 4.1a and 4.1b .
		The Applicant should agree the developments to be included in the cumulative landscape impact assessment with ABC.	The list of schemes for inclusion in the cumulative assessments have been agreed with ABC, the ECU and NatureScot. The cumulative situation is illustrated on Figure 6.1.8 (60km) and Figure 6.1.9 (other wind farm developments included in the cumulative assessment – 20km). The cut-off date for inclusion within the cumulative assessment was 23rd June 2022, however cognisance has been taken of changes to status of schemes within the study area after this date.
		The EIA report should provide a baseline survey of the animals (mammals, reptiles, amphibians, etc.) and habitat interest on site.	The ecological baseline has been provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and supporting appendices.
		Recommended the outer area in respect of assessing effects on the setting of designated sites within the ZTV and viewpoints to be assessed and visualisations to be produced and submitted be agreed following discussion with Historic Environment Scotland (HES).	The scope of the setting assessment has been agreed with HES and has been detailed further in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage .
		Recommended the Applicant consults with Glasgow Airport with regards to identifying if their Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) will be impacted by the Proposed Development, and if it does, what mitigation will be considered and implemented.	Consultation has been undertaken with Glasgow Airport (see below) and details of the aviation assessment have been included in Chapter 14: Other Issues .
		Recommended all designated landscapes to be assessed for the purposes of the EIA report are agreed with NatureScot and ABC.	Effects on designated landscapes have been assessed and included in the visual amenity assessment in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity . Consultation has been undertaken with NatureScot and ABC to agree the scope of the assessment as detailed further below.
		Recommended the noise assessment receptors should be agreed with ABC and noted that the noise assessment report should be formatted as per Table 6.1 of the IOA "A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise.	ABC Environmental Health Officer has been consulted to confirm the approach to the noise assessment (October 2021 and April 2022) however no response has been received. The assessment has been undertaken in line with ETSU guidance.
		Recommended the Applicant has pre application discussions with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) regarding potential obstruction hazards to military low flying training activities.	Consultation has been undertaken with the DIO as detailed below.
		Advised that a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA) should be undertaken in accordance with The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessments: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (Second Edition).	A PLHRA has been provided in the EIA Report as Appendix 7.4 to Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat .
		Requested that an assessment of effects on private water supplies (PWS) be undertaken. This should include details of the supplies identified and potential impacts, risks and mitigation required.	PWS information was obtained from ABC in June 2021. Chapter 7: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat of the EIA Report assesses the potential effects on PWS.
		Advised that the list of final assessment viewpoints (including night-time assessment) should be agreed with the ABC, HES, NatureScot and Mountaineering Scotland as part of the EIA process.	The assessment viewpoints included in the visual amenity assessment in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity have been discussed in consultation with Mountaineering Scotland, ABC, HES and NatureScot (see below).
Requested that the EIA Report includes a Schedule of Mitigation in tabular form setting out all measures proposed to mitigate significant environmental effects.	A Schedule of Mitigation has been included as Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.		
Recommended that an additional Scoping Opinion be sought should an application for consent not be submitted within 12 months of the Scoping Opinion being issued to ensure that the content of the Scoping Opinion remains relevant.	It has not been possible to submit the application within two months of the Scoping Opinion however the Scottish Government has been kept up to date on the project.		
Requested the ECU is kept up to date with further engagement between parties on the refinement of the wind farm design, surveys, and submission timescales.	The Applicant has engaged with the ECU throughout the EIA, including at the Gatecheck process (See Table 2.2 of this appendix for feedback to the Gatecheck Report).		

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
Argyll and Bute Council (ABC)	20/01/22	ABC consider the content of the Scoping Report to be broadly acceptable.	Noted.
		Noted that the EIAR should include a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the Applicant which are relevant to the proposal and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Information on the reasonable alternatives in relation to the design has been provided in Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy .
		Advised the EIAR should identify the location of all built elements, which should be sited to avoid habitats of importance, wetlands, areas of deep peat and blanket bog, watercourses and abstractions, so that areas of particular vulnerability to damage, or which have higher pollution sensitivity, may be protected from unnecessary impacts. The assessment should address the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	All built elements proposed are shown in Figures 4.1 to 4.17 and extensive design work has been undertaken to avoid sensitive areas. Further details on the design are provided in Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy of the EIA Report.
		Noted ABC expect the access to/from the Site to the junction with the public road to be included within the Site boundary.	The access from the public road is included within the site boundary as shown in Figure 4.1a and 4.1b .
		Acknowledge that the grid connection will be subject to a separate design and consent proposal but noted it is normal for general information on the route of the grid connection to be set out in the EIAR.	At present it is not known where the connection point into the grid will be located therefore it has not been possible to provide this information in the EIA Report.
		With regards to forestry, if any felling is required this should be taken into account in calculating the carbon balance of the Proposed Development, and consideration should be given to any required replanting under the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal.	A limited amount of tree felling (3.77ha) will be required to facilitate the access to the Site and information on woodland management and felling, including mitigation, has been provided in Appendix 4.1: Forestry of the EIA Report. A carbon balance calculation has also been provided as an Appendix 14.1 of the EIA Report.
		ABC confirmed they are satisfied with the proposed approach to the assessment of decommissioning but where relevant the environmental impacts associated with decommissioning should be considered in the EIAR and advice of any other relevant consultees should also be considered.	The EIA Report includes high level information on the likely process that will be undertaken for decommissioning. However, a detailed assessment of decommissioning effects has not been undertaken as the future baseline conditions (environmental and other developments) cannot be predicted accurately at this stage and the proposals for refurbishment/ decommissioning are not currently known.
		Noted that ABC is currently in the process of preparing a new Local Development Plan (LDP2).	Noted. LDP2 has been considered in Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that the Argyll and Bute Landscape Wind Energy Capacity Study 2017 (LWECS) is considered fully in the LVIA.	Commentary on the LWECS has been provided in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that visible aviation lighting, as well as any other potential cumulative landscape and visual effects are fully assessed in accordance with the requirements of NatureScot.	The requirement for aviation lighting has been considered in the design and has been fully assessed in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity and Chapter 14: Other Issues of the EIA Report.
		Advised justification should be provided to demonstrate how any effects on the constraints identified in the LWECS have been mitigated.	Commentary on the LWECS has been provided in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the EIA Report.
		Requested that the landscape character types scoped in and scoped out of the assessment are defined as presented in the LWECS.	Commentary on the LWECS has been provided in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the EIA Report.
		Requested to see wirelines from Knapdale NSA before agreeing that this landscape designation can be scoped out from assessment; suggested locations include Mhoine Mhor/Crinan Canal and, in particular the panoramic viewpoint at Dunadry.	There is very little visibility from this area, with only a few blade tips on the far horizon. Wirelines were issued to ABC in February 2022 and on 9 th March 2022 ABC confirmed they were happy with the reasoning for Knapdale NSA to be scoped out of the LVIA.
		Confirmed the list of viewpoint provided on the 20 th December 2021 is acceptable but advised that this may be subject to change should anything arise/require clarification during the consultation process.	Noted. No further changes are anticipated that would affect the list of viewpoints proposed.
		With regards to the cumulative assessment, ABC have noted that Ladyfield Wind Farm is currently at Scoping at present. Confirmed all other relevant wind farms appear to have been included.	The final list of schemes for inclusion in the cumulative assessments was agreed with ABC, the ECU and NatureScot.
ABC note that it is difficult to confirm that a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) will not be required based on the information provided. If any of the properties in relatively close proximity to the Proposed Development will experience a high magnitude of visual change, then an RVAA may be appropriate. However, if it is confirmed that this is not the case, then ABC are satisfied with the intended approach.	The closest properties, to the east of Loch Awe, have reduced visibility due to landform providing screening. Those most likely to have a high magnitude of change are properties to the west (i.e. Dalavich) but these are more distant and often have vegetation/ development filtering views. Given the distance and filtering of views, it is unlikely the Proposed Development will affect overall living conditions and is unlikely to breach the Residential Visual Amenity threshold. As such, a RVAA has not been undertaken.		
Noted no response has been received from ABC's Regulatory Services Officer and therefore information of Private Water Supplies has not been provided.	A separate request was made to ABC to obtain PWS information which was provided in June 2021. Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat of the EIA Report assesses the potential effects on PWS.		
Noted that all turbines will be set at least 500m (sic)* away from any watercourse where practicable and where this is not possible it will be ensured that the Proposed Development is outside 1 in 200-year fluvial flood extent.	This requirement follows SEPA guidance for new housing developments/roads etc. in developed areas and is not directly applicable to wind farm tracks in rural peatland upland areas. Natural watercourses within peatland tend to be narrow and will often flood naturally out of bank, which dissipates energy and provides flood storage out of bank. Introducing an oversized culvert to contain the full 200 year + CC flow can cause more problems for channels within peat areas (e.g. the need for excavation to construct the		

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		<i>*note that it is assumed that the reference to 500m has been made in error, and that this should state 50m</i>	culvert/crossing and erosion/scouring of channel downstream of culverts due to higher velocities created by passing all the flow in the channel.) as such, it is considered that a more suitable design of crossings for wind farm tracks would be a lower return period (e.g. the 1 in 30 year event), allowing extreme flows above this to pass over the tracks and then overland back into the watercourse. This would reduce the risk of damaging channels by installing oversized crossings in rural, peatland areas. For Argyll, climate change allowances are +56% for future river flow to 2100 (for large rivers >50km ² catchment) or +55% peak rainfall intensity increase (for smaller catchments). Clearly, the 200 year + CC flows will be very high compared to average annual flows in the small watercourses on site. This was discussed further with ABC and details are provided in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat of the EIA Report.
		Noted that any watercourse crossings should be designed in a way so as not to reduce the existing capacity of the channel and ideally should be designed to convey the 1 in 200-year plus climate change flow. ABC recommended that this should be secured through a planning condition should consent be granted.	See above.
		Recommended that the 1 in 200-year flow plus climate change are calculated so that watercourse crossings can be built to an acceptable capacity.	See above.
		Recommended that drainage of surface water be designed in accordance with CIRIA C753 and SuDS guidance and that sections 2 to 3 of the checklist provided in the Flood Risk/Drainage Impact Assessor's response are addressed regarding the drainage design.	Noted. Further details on drainage are provided in Chapter 4 Project Description .
		Requested the Applicant contact the Argyll Fisheries Trust with regards to additional sources of baseline information that should be used to inform the appraisal of effects on hydrology, hydrogeology and peat.	The Argyll Fisheries Trust was contacted in March 2022 – see below.
		Confirmed the grid to be used for initial peat surveys is acceptable.	Noted.
		Advised the Applicant should liaise with NatureScot as the lead authority on peatlands.	Consultation has been undertaken with NatureScot (see below).
		Agreed the Ardchnonnell Wind Farm EIA ecology survey data is a reliable baseline to base the surveys and scope of the assessment for the Proposed Development.	Noted.
		Agreed with the survey scope and the assessment methodology for the ecology surveys but recommended that cumulative effects are factored in at an early stage.	Noted. Cumulative effects have been considered in Chapter 8: Ecology .
		Advised the Applicant should factor in the contents of the draft Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) to further inform the ecological baseline.	The LBAP has been consulted/examined and used to inform the ecology baseline where relevant as outlined in Chapter 8: Ecology .
		Advised further consultation should be undertaken with The Scottish Wildlife Trust, the Lorn Natural History Society and The Argyll Bird Club.	The Scottish Wildlife Trust was contacted as part of the EIA Scoping progress but no response was received. Further consultation was undertaken with the Lorn Natural History Group who advised that data could be obtained from the Argyll Biological Records Centre via the NBN atlas which was consulted as part of the desk study. The Argyll Bird Club was also contacted but no response was received.
		Agreed the range of desk study and ornithological surveys are sufficient and proportionate to inform the design and assessment of the Proposed Development are acceptable.	Noted.
		Agreed the proposed assessment and methodology and the full range of likely effects to be assessed with regards to ornithology are acceptable.	Noted.
		Advised with the exception Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA, the scoping out of all designated sites with qualifying ornithological features by virtue of considerable spatial segregation should be delayed until all survey work is completed and cumulative effects in association with other wind farms have been considered.	NatureScot confirmed that <i>"all designated sites with qualifying ornithological features can be scoped out apart from impacts on Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA"</i> (see response to NatureScot consultation below regarding these SPAs).
		Requested the employment of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to oversee the Proposed Development in the event consent is granted and the drafting of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP should include hydrology, hydrogeology and peat, ecological and ornithological mitigation along with toolbox talks.	A CEMP detailing all proposed mitigation including toolbox talks is provided as Appendix 4.2 of the EIA Report. An ECoW will be appointed during the construction process.
		Advised that the former non-statutory register of schedulable sites (NSR) should be added to the proposed assessment of setting impacts out to 5km distance from the nearest turbine, otherwise the proposed cultural heritage assessment methodology is acceptable.	NSR is provided as part of the HER data which has been considered in the assessment.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Agreed the list of visualisations proposed for the cultural heritage assessment are acceptable.	Noted.
		Confirmed the methodology and further detail in the Scoping Report would be acceptable to Environmental Health with regards to operational noise.	Noted.
		Advised the Applicant should consider the potential for dust emissions from the Site and access roads/tracks during construction on nearby sensitive properties and that these matters are included in the CEMP along with proposed mitigation measures (to be agreed with ABC).	Dust emissions have been considered in Chapter 14: Other Issues .
		Advised the Applicant should consider the potential for light pollution during construction on any nearby sensitive properties.	Any lighting required during construction (e.g. at compound etc.) will be designed to minimise light pollution to the surrounding area. All lights will face inwards to reduce overall environmental impact.
		Requested confirmation that no traffic associated with the Proposed Development will use the B840 East Lochaweside Road.	The B840 will not be used for wind farm traffic. Access to the site will be from the east off the A819.
		Advised the socio-economics assessment should cross-reference to other technical assessments to consider potential effects on recreational assets and other leisure and tourism attractions in the surrounding area, for example due to visual impact, traffic, and noise.	Chapter 13: Socio-Economic, Tourism and Recreation has considered potential effects on recreational assets in the surrounding area with respect of visual impact, traffic and noise.
		Advised the socio-economics chapter of the EIAR should address the consequences of the Proposed Development for users of the countryside, and tourism and recreation interests. The proposal should not result in the unacceptable loss of amenity to individuals who enjoy recreation pursuits on land or water.	Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity and Chapter 13: Socio-Economic, Tourism and Recreation have considered potential effects on recreational receptors in the surrounding area.
		Confirmed they are satisfied with the proposed approach for aviation, communications and telecommunications, shadow flicker, population and human health, including dust, major accidents and disasters and climate change, including carbon balance.	Noted.
NatureScot	02/07/21	Advised the Proposed Development is located in a highly sensitive location which may give rise to significant impacts, especially in relation to landscape. Noted that the site was the subject of a previous application for development (Ardchonnell Wind Farm).	The sensitivities of the Site are well understood and the development of the scheme has given cognisance to the previous application at the Site where relevant.
		Note that the Applicant should demonstrate how they have addressed the potential effects on the constraints identified in the LWECS sensitivity assessment.	Commentary on the LWECS has been provided in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity . The landscape character types set out within the LWECS have been used to inform the LVIA assessment.
		NatureScot advise that a reduction in the number and height of turbines from the 26 turbine scoping layout, as part of the iterative design process together with consideration of further mitigation, is required with the aim of addressing the likely significant natural heritage impacts.	Full details of the iterative design process are provided in Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy of the EIA Report.
		Note that the proposal could result in significant adverse impacts including cumulative and night time impacts in relation to highly sensitive landscapes including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ people's appreciation and enjoyment LLTNP; ■ people's experience of Ben Lui Wild Land Area (WLA06) and its wild land qualities; ■ views and setting of Inveraray and associated design landscapes appreciated from Inner Loch Fyne area including e.g. key routes (A83 and A815, NCRs etc), recreational locations and settlement; ■ views from within the designed landscape and conservation areas of Inveraray; ■ sensitive areas associated with the Inner Loch Fyne area, Inver/ Lachlan area (Loch Fyne), and SW Loch Awe area as highlighted in the LWECS. 	A detailed assessment which considers these aspects has been presented in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the EIA Report. A specific assessment on the special qualities of the LLTNP and Ben Lui WLA are provided in technical appendices to the LVIA. The scope of the special qualities for the LLTNP assessment was agreed by NatureScot on 28 th January 2022. The scope of the wild land qualities to be assessed in the Ben Lui wild land assessment were agreed with NatureScot on 29 th September 2021. Viewpoints representing key routes, recreational locations, settlements and the Inveraray Garden and Designed Landscape are also provided within the LVIA.
		Note the requirement for the design to give consideration to cumulative impacts with other nearby schemes, particularly An Suidhe and Blarghour.	A detailed cumulative assessment has been presented in EIA Report Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity .
		Provided detailed advice in relation to effects on national designations and wild land areas.	Further consultation to agree the scope of the assessment has been undertaken with NatureScot as detailed in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity . Following further consultation, NatureScot confirmed on the 28 th January 2022 that they were happy for Knapdale NSA and Loch Etive Mountains WLA to be scoped out of the LVIA assessment. A detailed assessment on the LLTNP and Ben Lui WLA are included within the LVIA.
		Provided detailed advice in relation to the requirement for night time visualisations and potential lighting effects.	Further consultation to agree the scope of the assessment has been undertaken with NatureScot as detailed in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity . Following further consultation on night time viewpoints, the locations were agreed with NatureScot in June 2022 (Dalavich, Dùn na Cuaich, and Beinn Bhuidhe).

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		In relation to ecology, NatureScot agreed with assessment method proposed, including the features scoped in / out of assessment. Noted that land management practices need to be taken into account.	Noted.
		Agreed with the scope and the proposed methodology and assessment approach for ornithology provided the cumulative aspects for relevant species is considered at the level of NHZ 14.	an assessment of potential cumulative effects on golden eagle and white-tailed eagle in-combination with other wind farm developments at the Regional NHZ 14 scale has been undertaken. Potentially effects on all other ornithological features as a result of the Proposed Development have been scoped out of detailed assessment, with no potential to contribute to potentially significant cumulative effects in-combination with other wind farm developments in NHZ 14
		Agreed all designated sites with qualifying ornithological features can be scoped out apart from impacts on Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA.	The request to assess Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA is contrary to NS guidance which states that NRA is required for sites within 6km. Both are over 6km from the wind farm, however, on recommendation by NatureScot, the applicant has obtained satellite tagging from an individual resident golden eagle. This demonstrates the movements of territorial golden eagles (qualifying feature of the Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA) around the application site, and therefore any potential for effects on SPA population birds has been assessed in Chapter 9: Ornithology of the EIA Report.
		Advised vantage points B and C may be at risk of inhibiting flights in the area.	The vantage point locations were chosen following a pre-commencement reconnaissance visit; no other suitable locations could be identified within the application site which provided adequate visual coverage in accordance with NatureScot guidance. The possibility of inhibiting bird behaviour was considered as part of survey design. Furthermore, all surveys were undertaken by suitably experienced field surveyors who are proficient in the methodology and who take all possible precautions so as not to inhibit bird activity. With regards to the primary target species i.e. golden eagle, there is clear and demonstrable correlation between results from VP surveys and the satellite tagging data obtained (see above), which provides assurances that activity recorded during VP surveys was typical. Subsequently there is no indication that surveyor presence has inhibited target species flights.
		Acknowledged the Golden Eagle Topography (GET) model has become available to developers and advised NatureScot would be pleased if the Applicant could contact them to discuss the use of the GET model in relation to the Proposed Development.	The GET model has been used in the assessment and this has been detailed further in Chapter 9: Ornithology . The applicant discussed the use of the GET model with NatureScot as requested (online meeting 2 nd November 2021).
		Noted that the site covers a Class 2 area of the Carbon and Peatland map and as such there is a requirement for a complete peat probing survey to be undertaken, and an associated NVC survey, to ascertain the quality and distribution of peatland and priority habitats across the site as per NatureScot guidance.	Detailed peat probing and a detailed NVC survey have been undertaken. Further details have been provided in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat , and Chapter 8: Ecology .
		Confirmed the requirement for a peat management plan, as well as a habitat management plan which considers ecology as well as ornithology.	A PMP (Appendix 7.3) and HMP (Appendix 8.5) are provided as appendices to the EIA Report.
		Provided proforma for completion for peat assessment in relation to Peatland National Importance.	An amended version of the proforma has been completed and is provided in Appendix 8.2 of the EIA Report.
		Confirmed that peat probing should be undertaken across the whole site on 100m grid, and noted that peat below 50cm must be recorded and mapped appropriately.	The 100m grid has been completed across the site, in addition to the detailed probing at infrastructure locations. This is detailed further in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat . It should be noted that, further to the initial detailed peat probing being completed at a number of infrastructure locations at 10m intervals, a decision was made by the project team to increase the spacing of the detailed peat probes along infrastructure from 10m to 20m to allow for a greater degree of flexibility in finalising the infrastructure due to the high degree of the variation in peat depth across small distances. This approach was confirmed by SEPA as appropriate (see Table 2.2 below).
		Agreed that the proposed mitigation for peat is appropriate.	Noted.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	11/06/21	Confirmed HES broadly content with the scope of the EIA and have not identified any assets beyond 10km that are likely to be significantly affected as result of the Proposed Development. Advised further consultation will be required and the scope of assessment reconsidered if sensitive assets such as scheduled monuments in Kilmartin Glen and around Kilmichael Glassary, the fort at Dunadd and Kilchum Castle have visibility of the proposed Development.	Noted. Visibility of the Proposed Development from the aforementioned assets is not predicted.
		Advised that designated assets which fall outside the ZTV should not be automatically excluded from the assessment and the assessment should consider this and all scheduled monuments within the outer study area should be appraised for potential impacts on their setting.	Full details of the assets considered in the assessment and the reason for their selection has been set out in Appendix 10.1: Historic Environment Assessment of the EIA Report. All designed assets within the 10km study area have been reviewed both for direct visibility (indicated by the ZTV) and potential for in-combination views to be affected.
		Advised the rationale for the exclusion of designated assets should be set out clearly within the EIA Report.	Full details of the assets considered in the assessment and the reason for their selection has been set out in Appendix 10.1: Historic Environment Assessment of the EIA Report.
		Noted the requirement for an assessment of cumulative impacts.	A detailed assessment of cumulative impacts is presented in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		<p>Agreed that the assets identified in the Scoping Report appear to have the greatest potential for significant impacts on their settings but noted these should be further assessed and will likely require visits to the assets and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Site visits to potentially affected assets have been undertaken and have been detailed further in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage. The final list of assets considered for effects on their setting have also be detailed in the assessment.</p>
		<p>As there is potential for the Proposed Development to have significant adverse impacts on the settings of scheduled monuments around and in Loch Awe, and the designated landscape at Inveraray, the assessment and visualisations should be used to determine the scale of the impacts and to design mitigation.</p>	<p>The design has sought to minimise setting impacts where possible, whilst also seeking to balance the complex environmental conditions of the site and surrounding area.</p>
		<p>Provided commentary on specific assets for consideration in the assessment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ardchnonnel Castle & Island Of Innis Chonnel, Loch Awe (SM 291): Requested a viewpoint from a boat in the centre of Loch Awe where the ZTV suggests there would be visibility of the proposed Development. Agreed a viewpoint on the west shore of Loch Awe would be a suitable location. ■ Ardchnonnel, Long Cairn 1200m ENE of (SM 4173): Note that If a site visit confirms that there would be visibility of the proposed turbines from the cairn, recommend a photomontage is produced to illustrate these impacts. If possible, the photomontage should show the monument in the foreground with the proposed development behind, to best illustrate potential impacts. ■ Inveraray Castle Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL 00223): note that the assessment of impacts on setting should assess views towards as well as views from an asset and that in the case of the GDL there are important views from across Loch Fyne. Other views may include from the Category A-listed Array Bridge, and views from Dun na Cuaiche. Request that, if the wind farm appears in the view from the Category A-listed Garron Bridge, it would be helpful to see a wireframe or photomontage illustrating the predicted view. ■ Watch Tower, Dun Na Cuaiche (LB11543): note that the EIA should assess effects on this asset. 	<p>Full details of the assets included in the assessment of effects on setting are included in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage. The final list has been agreed with HES.</p> <p>A viewpoint from a boat on Loch Awe has not been prepared as this is not considered to be any more relevant to the asset's cultural significance than shore-based viewpoints. In subsequent consultation with HES, it was suggested that the wallhead of the castle could be a suitable place for a visualisation, however the level of intervisibility from the wallhead is low and the in-combination effect is considered to be the more significant effect, in addition to being more readily experienced by visitors.</p> <p>Visibility of turbines from the wallhead, while changing the experience of visiting the castle somewhat, does not affect its cultural significance in the same way as the in-combination effect and the perception of the castle as a feature in the landscape / symbol of local power.</p> <p>A wireframe from Ardchnonnel Long Cairn has been provided.</p> <p>Photomontages have been provided from Dun Na Cuaiche within the LVIA and from the Aray Bridge.</p>
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	28/06/21	<p>Currently unable to provide specific responses on land use planning consultations as result of the cyber attack on Christmas Eve 2020. Advised to consult their standing advice and planning guidance.</p>	<p>The design and relevant assessments have taken account of SEPA guidance as detailed in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat.</p>
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	09/06/21	<p>Noted that the following Annex 1 bird species and other Birds of Conservation Concern should be adequately covered with the EIA Report: Golden eagle; White-tailed eagle; Hen Harrier; Red-throated diver; and Black grouse.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Ornithology includes the assessment of effects on these species.</p>
		<p>Advised the EIA Report should include an assessment of any access routes, construction and maintenance tracked to enable consideration of the entire development. Advised that options for the grid connection should also be considered by the EIA Report.</p>	<p>The assessment considers all ancillary infrastructure.</p> <p>At present it is not known where the connection point into the grid will be located therefore it has not been possible to provide this information in the EIA Report.</p>
		<p>A cumulative assessment on the ability of the range to support golden eagle should be undertaken as the Site lies within an area of open ground which forms part of the GLAE1B golden eagle pair's home range. Research and modelling are required to assess the consequences for golden eagles resulting from cumulative home range habitat loss.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Ornithology includes the assessment of effects on golden eagle, including cumulative assessment. This also includes assessment of the potential for effects on territory reference GLAE1B.</p>
		<p>Golden eagle range reports produced by NatureScot for NHZ 14 'Argyll West and Island' should be accessed to inform the EIA Report off the impacts this proposal will have on the active territories within this area.</p>	<p>Detailed information on golden eagle has been obtained through consultation and survey.</p>
		<p>GET modelling should be used to assess the implications of the proposed Development on the golden eagle territories in this area, as mentioned in the Scoping Report.</p>	<p>GET modelling has been undertaken, and this has been agreed in discussion with NatureScot. The findings are presented in the EIA Report.</p>
		<p>Noted there is satellite tag information for a number of golden eagles within this natural heritage zone and the Applicant should consult with NatureScot to see if this information is available.</p>	<p>Detailed information on golden eagle has been obtained through consultation and survey. Satellite tag data has been obtained and has been used to inform the assessment.</p>
		<p>Advise that since there is a possibility that white-tailed eagles may occupy this area within the proposed Development's lifetime, ongoing assessment and mitigation are required and survey work should occur throughout the planning and installation periods (as well as post-construction).</p>	<p>Detailed information on white tailed eagle has been obtained through consultation and survey. Monitoring is proposed during construction and operation. The overall survey programme was extended to include an additional breeding season in response to recent establishment of a new white-tailed eagle nest site (outside the application site boundary).</p>
		<p>Argyll Raptor Study Group should be contacted in relation to all raptor species.</p>	<p>Argyll Raptor Study Group has been contacted for information to inform the assessment.</p>
		<p>The EIA should fully assess impacts on black grouse, including nosie impacts, and should avoid siting turbines close to any lek sites and consideration should be given to mitigation works for the species within the site and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Surveys for black grouse have been undertaken and the findings are presented in Chapter 9: Ornithology.</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		The Proposed Development should be designed to avoid impacts to red-throated divers, turbines should be setback distance of 1km from lochans used by this species.	No evidence of breeding red throated divers has been found within 1km of the application site. Subsequently the species has not been considered a design constraint. Full details of the survey findings are provided in Chapter 9: Ornithology .
		The EIA Report should include a full survey, impact assessment and proposals for mitigation in relation to important habitats on the Site.	Full details of the survey, assessment and mitigation measures for habitats is provided in Chapter 8: Ecology of the EIA Report.
		Noted all proposed turbines are situated on Class 2 Peatland, therefore a full assessment of the carbon implications of the proposed Development should be undertaken by using the latest version of the Scottish Government's Carbon Calculator.	Detailed peatland surveys have been undertaken as detailed above. The findings are set out in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat . A carbon balance calculation has been provided as Appendix 14.1 of the EIA Report.
		Advised the EIA Report should consider what mitigation measures are required to minimise the impact on important species and contain detailed ecological justification for an such proposals. This should include relevant timeframes for mitigation in relation to the Site development.	Full details of mitigation measures are set out in the EIA Report.
		Advised an assessment of the potential for the Proposed Development to impact Glen Etive and Glen Fyne golden eagle SPA should be carried out.	See comments under NatureScot above. The request to assess Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA is contrary to NS guidance which states that NRA is required for sites within 6km. Both are over 6km from the wind farm Regardless, on recommendation by NatureScot, the applicant has obtained satellite tagging from an individual resident golden eagle. This demonstrates the movements of territorial golden eagles (qualifying feature of the Glen Etive and Glen Fyne SPA) around the application site, and therefore any potential for effects on SPA population birds can be assessed.
		An assessment of cumulative bird impacts in relation other existing, consented and proposed projects (forestry and wind farms) within this Natural Heritage Zone (NHZ) should be undertaken.	Chapter 9: Ornithology has included an assessment of effects on these species.
Transport Scotland (TS)	21/05/21	Confirmed that no further assessment will be required if the thresholds within the IEMA Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic are not exceeded.	Noted.
		Confirmed that the proposed methodology detailed in the Scoping Report is acceptable.	Noted.
		Advised that TS would require to be satisfied that the size of turbines proposed can negotiate the selected route and that transportation will not have any detrimental effect on structure within the trunk road route path. TS noted that any proposed changes to the trunk road network must be approved by the appropriate Area Manager. Specific attention was drawn to the following pinch points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A83(T) at the Crinan Canal/Ardrihaig Basin (swing bridge); ■ mini roundabout junction of the A83(t) with the A816. 	Noted. An assessment of potential effects on the trunk road network has been presented in Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport .
		Advised that a full Abnormal Loads Assessment report should be provided with the EIA Report that identifies the key pinch points on the trunk network.	Noted. An Abnormal Loads Assessment has been provided within an appendix to the EIA Report.
		Advised that 1:500 scale plans of any new or modified access from the trunk road should be submitted along with the visibility splay plans	The required plans have been included in the EIA Report as part of Chapter 4: Project Description .
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	17/05/21	JRC does not foresee any potential issues with proposal on known interference scenarios and advised that if any details of the wind farm change, particularly the disposition or scale of any turbines, this would need to be re-evaluated.	Noted.
British Telecommunications (BT)	19/05/21	Confirmed that the turbine locations should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	Noted.
Glasgow Airport	02/06/21	Confirmed the Site is located outwith the obstacle limitation surfaces and radar safeguarding area for Glasgow Airport but within the instrument flight procedure (IFP) safeguarding area and this should be considered as part of the EIA. Noted they will carry out a full safeguarding impact assessment once the turbines are finalised and they have been consulted on the full planning application.	Noted.
Glasgow Prestwick Airport (GPA)	02/06/21	Confirmed the proposed scope of the EIA seemed appropriate and requested to be consulted with once the application is submitted. Confirmed the proposed Development has no impacts on their published IFP's and the Preliminary Line of Sight (LoS) indicates all turbines will be significantly terrain shielded from GPA's primary radars therefore would be unlikely to object to the planning application. Noted their interest on how the Applicant proposed to address the issue of aviation warning obstruction lighting scheme	Noted. GPA will be consulted once the application is submitted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
NATS	17/05/21	Confirmed they have no objection to the Proposed Development and request to be further consulted should any changes be proposed.	Noted.
Scottish Forestry (SF)	17/05/21	Advised that design approaches that reduce the scale of felling required to facilitate the Proposed Development must be considered, integration of the Proposed Development with the existing woodland structure is a key part of the consenting process.	Noted, care has been taken to avoid unnecessary felling which will be limited to 3.77ha located along the access as shown in Appendix 4.1 .
		Stated the EIA Report should include a stand-alone chapter on 'Woodland management and tree felling' (a forest plan) prepared by a suitably qualified professional, supported by existing records, site surveys and aerial photographs.	Information on woodland management and tree felling is provided as Appendix 4.1 to the EIA Report. A stand alone chapter has not been prepared.
		Details of the proposed mitigation measures must be included in the EIA Report, not left to post-consent HMPs (or others) to decide and implement.	As above.
		Advised a long term forest plan should be provided as part of the EIA Report (as a technical appendix for context) to give a strategic vision to deliver environmental and social benefits through sustainable forest management and describes the major forest operations over a 20 years period	As above.
		The Applicant should consider the potential cumulative impact of existing and the Proposed Development on the forest resource in respect to the local and regional context.	As above.
Mountaineering Scotland	13/05/21	Suggested that a viewpoint at the Munro Beinn Bhuidhe would be preferable to Viewpoint 15 Ben Lui as Beinn Bhuide is a summit destination for hillwalkers and is much closer to the Proposed Development (c.17km rather than 26km).	Whilst closer to the site and in the same viewing direction as Ben Lui, and also within the North Argyll APQ, it is not within LLTNP, and is not as popular a summit as Ben Lui. As NatureScot specified hills within the National Park should be considered in the assessment, it was not considered appropriate to substitute the Ben Lui VP for Beinn Bhuidhe in the LVIA. Further consultation with Mountaineering Scotland was undertaken in October 2021, setting out the reasoning for including Ben Lui instead of Beinn Bhuidhe. Response received back on 25 th October 2021 setting out that they understand our reasoning. A wireline has been provided from Beinn Bhuidhe
British Horse Society	07/06/21	Noted their thanks at being consulted and provided links relating to recent studies and guidance relating to off-road horse riding, safety advice for horse riders, the Outdoor Access Code, active travel and equestrian access.	Noted. Potential effects on access and recreation have been considered in Chapter 13: Socio-Economic, Tourism and Recreation .
Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board	23/05/21	Recommended that pre and post development surveys are undertaken to ensure that no damage to habitats and fish populations have occurred and demonstrate that stream crossings have not prevented the movement of fish between habitats downstream.	Fish surveys have not been undertaken to inform the EIA and these were not requested by NatureScot. Standard mitigation will be put in place to protect fisheries during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology .
Crown Estate Scotland	14/06/21	Recommended that the Applicant contacts Crown Estate regarding Option agreements.	Further discussions have established that there are no option agreements in place with the Crown Estate Scotland which would preclude development of the site.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	25/5/21	Noted that the site occupies Low Flying Area 14 (LFA 14) and that the proposed turbines will impact upon military low flying training activities conducted in this area. Request to be further consulted.	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on aviation, including military low flying, has been considered in Chapter 14: Other Issues .
Scottish Water	20/5/21	Noted that the turbines are located in the upper reaches of a drinking water catchment, and that any works likely to be low risk, however care should be taken and water quality protection measures implemented.	Noted.
		Request further details of any peatland restoration plans to ensure protection of drinking water in the area.	Details of peat restoration plans are set out in the habitat management plan which has been provided as Appendix 8.5 to the EIA Report. It is not anticipated that there will be any effect on drinking water as a result of the proposed development.
		Note the presence of Scottish Water infrastructure within the site to the east and recommend obtaining detailed plans for the location of this infrastructure from Asset Plan Providers.	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
Argyll Fisheries Board	29/03/22	<p>Advised stream spawning and juvenile nurse habitats associated with the lochs should be identified to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Stream crossings do not affect the movement of both adult and juvenile fish between refuge habitat and spawning and nursery habitat; and ■ The spoil created by infrastructure works should be managed to avoid any impact on the condition of the habitat siltation or water quality. <p>Whilst some of the lochs have been stocked, AFT recommend that the trout populations be considered as wild brown trout in the absence of information concerning the origin or date of the fish stocking. This is because any effect of stocking may not be long lasting or have relevance to the conservation of existing stocks which are important in their own right, in addition to playing a key role in supporting local biodiversity.</p>	<p>Fish surveys have not been undertaken to inform the EIA as agreed by NatureScot. Standard mitigation will be put in place to protect fisheries during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology.</p>

Table 2.2: An Càrr Dubh Wind Farm Gatecheck Consultation Feedback

Consultee	Date of Response	Feedback Received	Response/Action
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	07/11/22	Overall, HES were happy with the content of Gatecheck Report and have noted that consultation with the applicant has taken place.	Consultation with HES is outlined in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage .
Argyll District Salmon Fishery Board (ADSFB)	09/11/22	<p>The report refers to ADSFB concerns over maintaining fish habitat and fish passage at stream crossings to comments made by NatureScot. ADSFB provided feedback that these comments do not appear to be detailed in the report, so they are unable to cross-check any comments made by NatureScot. ADSFB ask that the comments made by NatureScot are clearly shown in the report to allow ADSFB to identify specific comments made.</p> <p>ADSFB believe that 'standard mitigation' do not identify any specific characteristics of fish habitats (such as spawning sites and suitability or sensitivity of proposed stream crossing points) within the site that may be critical to the conservation of fish populations. This approach does not provide ADSFB with any assurances that the developer will have demonstrated that they have not damaged or prevented access to fish habitats. While the developer may have the best intentions of protecting the water environment, delivery of projects by contractors may not always go to plan and ADSFB therefore need some mechanism to ensure that the development does not impact on the fish populations or their habitat. ADSFB do not believe that 'standard mitigation' provides them with this assurance.</p> <p>ADSFB recommend that pre and post development surveys are undertaken to ensure that no damage to habitats and fish populations have occurred as a result of the works and demonstrate that stream crossings have not prevented the movement of fish between habitats downstream and downstream of the crossings.</p>	<p>The requirements set out in the feedback from ADSFB has been achieved through the applicant committing to the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Embedded mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Use of bottomless arch or single span crossings wherever possible in the first instance; – Retention/recreation of natural stream beds where possible; – Closed pipes used as a last resort; and – Commitment to set any pipe culverts below the existing watercourse bed wherever possible and use of natural bed material. ■ Pre-construction fish habitat surveys (to micro-site the crossings away from potentially sensitive habitats wherever possible, and to confirm the habitat baseline within an appropriate distance either side). ■ ECoW involvement (to ensure things are built correctly and in the correct location). ■ Post-construction fish habitat survey to confirm that everything has been implemented as planned (i.e. crossings have not resulted in obstructions or loss of potentially sensitive habitats) and to identify remedial works required as necessary.
Mountaineering Scotland	11/11/22	Mountaineering Scotland confirmed no further comments.	Noted, no action required.
Argyll and Bute Council (ABC)	17/11/22	ABC confirm that no further comments to make at this time.	Noted, no action required.
SEPA	17/11/22	<p>SEPA welcomes the inclusion of good peat probing information within the Gatecheck report and approved the sampling strategy used which was adapted due to the variability of peat depths across the site. SEPA considers that good baseline information has been gathered to inform the layout. SEPA requested that the final peat probing plans showed the infrastructure just as an to enable the colour of the probes in the exact location of the infrastructure to be seen.</p> <p>As well as avoiding deep peat the layout should also be shown to avoid any good quality peat-forming habitat, and a layout plan showing such areas should be included, if relevant.</p> <p>Advised that it has been beneficial to see that GWDTE point features have been avoided in many cases. SEPA has requested that the schedule of mitigation should include specific measures to protect the habitats where this has not been possible.</p> <p>SEPA note that the report indicates that a 50m buffer has been applied around water features and have requested that a detailed layout plan in relation to watercourse buffers be provided in the EIA Report to see fully in which location it may not have been applied. It's noted that there are a number of small lochans or large bog pools on the site and they should be protected in a similar manner. Note that working within the 50m buffer can be acceptable if it's shown to avoid impacts on other aspects that SEPA have an interest in – such as deep peat – as long as there are no known downstream sensitive receptors and additional mitigation is outlined where necessary. SEPA have requested that such areas should be clearly identified and justified.</p>	<p>All of the points raised by SEPA have been covered within the following places of the EIA Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Figure 7.2: Watercourse Crossings and Buffers shows all watercourse buffer breaches (labelled). Technical Appendix 7.1 Watercourse Crossings provides more detail on locations where the 50m buffer was not achieved, along with justification and additional mitigation, if required. ■ Figure 7.3: Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) and Appendix 7.5: Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE). ■ Figure 7.8: Peat Survey Results shows the infrastructure outline with peat depths on top and at a large enough scale to see probed depths. <p>Details of mitigation for GWDTEs are provided in Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat, and information on peat habitat and potential for peat formation are provided in Appendix 8.2.</p>
NatureScot	13/12/22	<p>NatureScot are content that the Applicant has taken on board advice provided to date. NatureScot note Section 2.26 Hydrology and Peat states "areas of deeper peat (>1m)" have been avoided regarding siting turbines and infrastructure. For clarification, peat depth of 0.5m or more qualifies as deep peat. Within Appendix D figures 2.6.A – C peat depth values are not currently visible under the 'permanent hardstanding' yellow shading in addition to missing peat depth information under the 'permanent compound including substation and BESS' blue shading.</p> <p>NatureScot note the stated separation distances (20m) between sample points for infrastructure locations. Detailed survey at 10 to 50m intervals along proposed track/ road locations using 10m right angled offsets is acceptable, with a 10m by 10m grid around the centre of each proposed turbine base or other infrastructure including borrow pits and proposed temporary storage sites.</p>	<p>The points raised by NatureScot have been covered within the following places of the EIA Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Figure 7.8: Peat Survey Results shows the infrastructure outline with peat depths on top and at a large enough scale to see probed depths. ■ Within Annex B of Appendix 8.2: Habitats & Vegetation of the EIA report a table is included, adapted from the provided NatureScot Peatland Importance Table outlining the peatland condition at each location of the Infrastructure within the Site.

Consultee	Date of Response	Feedback Received	Response/Action
		<p>NatureScot requested that the Peatland Importance Table which was attached to the response could be completed and included within the EIA Report.</p> <p>NatureScot draw the Applicant's attention to the 'general pre-application / scoping advice to developers of onshore wind farms' guidance,</p>	