

## Appendix 2.1 Consultation Response Table



## Appendix 2.1 Consultation Response Table

Table 1.1: Loch Liath Wind Farm Scoping Consultation Responses

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU)	30/04/21	Confirmed that Scottish Ministers are satisfied with the scope of the EIA.	Noted.
		Requested the Applicant contacts Scottish Water and make further enquires to confirm whether there are any Scottish Water assets which may be affected by the Proposed Development and include details of any relevant mitigation measures to be provided in the EIA Report.	Consultation has been undertaken with Scottish Water; further details are provided below and required mitigation is discussed in <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> of the EIA Report.
		Requested that the Applicant investigates private water supplies within close proximity to the Proposed Development which may be impacted. The EIA Report should include details of the supplies identified and potential impacts, risks and mitigation required.	Consultation with local properties has identified that there are no Private Water Supplies likely to be affected by the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> of the EIA Report.
		Requested that the Applicant takes account of the advice provided by Marine Scotland Science in relation to fish, including consideration of effects on Atlantic salmon, sea trout and brown trout, and any Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) where fish, as a qualifying feature, could be impacted.	A detailed assessment of the potential effects on fish has not been undertaken as it has been agreed with NatureScot that this can be scoped out of detailed assessment. Further details on this are provided in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA) should be undertaken as part of the EIA process. This 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 is provided as <b>Appendix 7.4 to Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that the list of final assessment viewpoints should be agreed with the Highland Council (THC) and NatureScot as part of the EIA process.	The viewpoints included in the visual amenity assessment in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> have been agreed through further consultation with THC and NatureScot.
		Stated that the noise assessment should be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards, and in accordance with the methodology set out in the Scoping Report.	<b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> presents the assessment of both construction and operational noise effects undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidance set out in the Scoping Report.
		Advised that the Applicant should take into account the advice on aviation lighting available from NatureScot, and that the LVIA should assess the potential effects of lighting from agreed assessment viewpoints.	The effects of night-time aviation lighting have been assessed in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> for the following viewpoints: VP1: Affric-Kintail Way, near Braefield, P10: Creag Dhubh, and VP18: Toll Creagach.
		Requested that 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 providing updates on consultation and timescales, and at the Gatecheck process.
		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 is included in <b>Appendix 4.2: Schedule of Mitigation, Good Practice, Enhancement and Monitoring</b> 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 12 months of the receipt of the Scoping Opinion, however the ECU has been kept up to date of progress with the EIA and has not required that a revised Scoping Opinion be obtained.		
The Highland Council (THC)	24/02/21	Noted that the EIA Report should recognise the existing land uses affected by the development having particular regard for THC's Development Plan inclusive of all statutorily adopted Supplementary Guidance (SG), and that this is in addition to the provision of a planning statement.	The EIA Report includes a chapter on planning policy ( <b>Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework</b> ) and is accompanied by a stand-alone Planning Statement.
		Advised that list of relevant HwLDP polices should be expanded to include HwLDP Policy 29 Design Quality and Place-making and HwLDP Policy 56 Travel in terms of the assessment and mitigation of travel impacts.	Planning policies of relevance are referred to within <b>Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework</b> of the EIA Report and the Planning Statement where appropriate.
		In relation to the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP), noted that the <i>"IMFLDP doesn't contain any locational guidance relevant to wind farm application other than its identification of settlements and development boundaries for the larger settlements. The proposal doesn't look close to any mapped settlement boundary"</i> .	Reference to the IMFLDP, is included in the EIA Report in <b>Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework</b> and the Planning Statement.
		Advised that a Sustainable Design Statement is required and recommend that matters related to the three pillars of sustainable development are fully assessed in the information which supports the application.	A Sustainable Design Statement is incorporated into the Design and Access Statement which accompanies the EIA Report and application for consent.
		Advised that a statement on how the development is likely to contribute to the Scottish Government Energy Efficiency Scotland roadmap and provide the Highlands with secure and clean energy supplies should also be included with the application.	This has been covered within <b>Chapter 5: Statutory and Policy Framework</b> of the EIA Report and the Planning Statement where appropriate.
		Noted that energy storage technology is of interest to the Council and that the inclusion of energy storage infrastructure is broadly supported. Further information is required if this is taken forward.	Energy Storage is not proposed at the Site.
		Confirmed they are content with the assessment methodology for the LVIA.	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
		Noted the requirement for two sets of visualisations, one to THC standards, and one to SNH standards. Visualisations should show ancillary infrastructure including borrow pits and accesses.	Visualisations have been prepared that meet both sets of standards as part of the EIA Report.
		Provided feedback on viewpoint locations.	LUC's landscape team undertook consultation with THC and NatureScot to agree the final list of viewpoints which are assessed in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> .
		Highlighted that THC has reservations that anticipated significant landscape effects will be limited to a focused area extending to approx. 15km given the scale of the proposed turbines.	Extensive work was undertaken on the design to ensure that the likely significant landscape and visual effects have been minimised as far as possible, including from Glen Urquhart. Significant effects on the landscape is considered within <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> .
		Agreed that a residential visual amenity assessment can be scoped out of the LVIA.	Residential visual amenity has not been assessed.
		Advised that Broad Steep-Sided Glen (Landscape Character Type (LCT) 225) should be scoped in to the assessment as theoretical visibility extends along the far shore from Whitefield to Dore where the B852 has a series of parking lay-bys popular with tourists and recreational users.	This has been scoped in to final assessment and the findings are included in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised Loch Loch and Oich SLA should be included in the assessment. Noted that Ben Tee lies on northern edge of the SLA and that this may be an appropriate location for a view from the west taking in the mountain top views which is one of the SLA characteristics.	Based on the ZTV coverage and intervening distance between the Proposed Development and the Loch Lochy and Oich SLA, significant effects are considered unlikely and the SLA has not been included in the scope of the LVIA.
		Highlighted that Ben Wyvis SLA would be of concern for the potential scale of turbines to add to the prominence of existing development around the Great Glen and confirmed a wireframe would be sufficient in the first instance to verify if cumulative effects warrant further investigation.	Based on the ZTV coverage and intervening distance between the Proposed Development and the Ben Wyvis SLA, significant effects are considered unlikely and the SLA has not been included in the scope of the LVIA.
		Highlighted that the study area for a cumulative LVIA should extend to 45km as a minimum.	The cumulative assessment considers the pattern of development up to 45km from the outermost turbines of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that peat probing should cover the areas of ground which would be subject to micro-siting limits in addition to the infrastructure locations.	Detailed peat probing of infrastructure and the anticipated micro-siting tolerance (50m) has been undertaken. Full details of the survey and findings is provided in <b>Appendix 7.2: Peat Survey Report</b> in addition to <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> .
		Noted that where borrow pits are proposed the EIAR should include information regarding the location, size and nature of these borrow pits including information on the depth of the borrow pit floor and the borrow pit final reinstated profile.	The locations of borrow pits are shown on <b>Figure 4.1a and 4.1b</b> of the EIA Report. Details on the borrow pits are provided in <b>Chapter 4: Project Description</b> .
		Noted that the EIA Report should identify all water crossings and include a systematic table of watercourse crossings, with detailed justification for any such elements and design to minimise impacts. The table should be accompanied by photography of each watercourse affected and include dimensions of the watercourse.	Information on watercourse crossings is presented in <b>Appendix 7.5: Watercourse Crossing Inventory</b> in addition to <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> .
		Details on any water abstraction should be provided if required.	Water abstraction would be agreed in detail via an abstraction license from SEPA, if required. Alternatively water bowsers will deliver water to the Site.
		Confirmed THC Flood Risk Management Team is content with the scope of the proposed assessment in relation to flood risk and drainage.	Noted.
		Advised that the EIA Report should provide a baseline survey of the birds, animals and habitats present on the site alongside any habitat enhancement programme. This should also address whether or not the Proposed Development could assist or impede delivery of elements of relevant Biodiversity Action Plans.	Full details of the surveys undertaken are provided in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> and <b>Chapter 9: Ornithology</b> of the EIA Report.
		Highlighted that if wild deer are present or will use the site an assessment of the potential impact on deer will be required and should address deer welfare, habitats and other interests.	This is addressed in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.
		Noted the requirement to consider aquatic interests within local watercourses, and highlighted the requirement to consult with the local fishery boards.	It was agreed through consultation with NatureScot that effects on freshwater pearl mussel and fisheries could be scoped out of detailed assessment.  Consultation was undertaken with Fisheries Management Scotland, Ness District Salmon Fisheries Board and Ness & Beaully Fisheries Trust however no responses were received.
		Stated the EIA Report should identify community assets that are currently in operation and outcomes of any consultations with the relevant authorities through the provision of written evidence of concluded discussions /agreements.	Consultation has been undertaken with Ofcom, NATS, BAA, CAA, MOD, and Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd as detailed below.
		Advised if there no predicted effects on communication links as a result of the Proposed Development, the EIA Report should still address this matter by explaining how this conclusion was reached.	No known communications links have been identified as detailed below.
		Agreed that shadow flicker can be scoped out of the EIA.	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
		Highlighted consideration must be given to the potential health and safety risks associated with lighting strikes and ice throw given the proximity of recreational routes throughout the Site.	These concerns were scoped out of detailed assessment but are addressed in the EIA Report within the <b>Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA</b> .
		Requested that an outline CEMP and a draft schedule of mitigation is included within the application.	An outline CEMP and schedule of mitigation is provided in the appendices ( <b>Appendix 4.1: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</b> and <b>Appendix 4.2: Schedule of Mitigation, Good Practice, Enhancement and Monitoring</b> ) to the EIA Report.
THC Transport Planning Team	28/01/21	Advised that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be required to be submitted alongside the application.	Details of the CTMP are provided in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> and <b>Appendix 12.1 Transport Assessment</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that a transport assessment should be submitted with the application and a High National Traffic Forecast to be applied.	Potential impacts on traffic and transport are presented in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
THC Access Officer Inverness, Nairn and Lochaber.	23/02/21	Advised that an Access Management Plan should be submitted with the application and should detail all impacts and mitigation measures.	An Access Management Plan is provided in outline as <b>Appendix 13.1</b> which accompanies the EIA Report and application for consent.
		Considering the potential for this proposal to have significant negative visual and physical impacts on many forms of outdoor access across all phases of the development a similarly significant range of mitigation measures was recommended. This included the submission of a Specification (Red) survey of the length of the Meal Fuar Mhonaigh path from Grotaig to the summit with an Access Management Plan and the delivery of all the works specified and agreed in that survey on or before the completion of construction; all to the Upland Path Management - Standards for delivering path projects in Scotland's mountains by an experienced upland path contractor or contractors.	A Red specification survey of the length of the Meal Fuar Mhonaigh path has been undertaken of the full route to the summit. Further details are presented in <b>Appendix 13.1 Outline Access Management Plan</b> of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that mitigation should include the accommodation and management of public access across the site to minimise any potential negative impacts and maximise benefits to outdoor access.	The site will not be promoted for public access. The approach to access management across the site is presented in The Outline Access Management Plan which supports the EIA Report as <b>Appendix 13.1</b> .
		Recommended that Visit Inverness Loch Ness, managers of the Affric Kintail Way and the South Loch Ness Trail are consulted on the proposal.	Visit Inverness Loch Ness has been consulted and the full details of the consultation is presented in <b>Chapter 13: Land use, Socio-Economic and Tourism</b> .
THC Historic Environment Team	05/02/21	Confirmed they are satisfied with the information presented in the Scoping Report and confirmed the proposed methodology is acceptable.	Noted.
THC Environmental Health	09/02/21	Advised that the applicant should agree appropriate limits with the THC Environmental Health Officer where existing development has consented limited higher than a simplified standard of 35dB LA90 at wind speeds up to 10m/s or a composite standard of 35dB LA90 (daytime) and 38dB LA90 (night time) or up to 5dB above background noise levels up to 12m/s. Noted that the night time lower limit of 43dB LA90 as suggested in ETSU is not considered acceptable in many areas of the highlands due to very low background levels. These limits would apply to cumulative noise levels from more than one development.	A 'simplified' noise assessment was undertaken in line with ETSU as detailed further in <b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> of the EIA Report.
		Noted that the cumulative assessment should include map showing all wind farm developments which may have a cumulative impact and all noise sensitive locations (NSL) including any for which a financial involvement relaxation is being claimed. The assessment should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The predicted levels from this development based at each NSL at wind speeds up to 12m/s.</li> <li>■ The maximum levels based on consented limits from each existing or consented wind farm development at each NSL. If any reduction is made for controlling property or another reason, this should be made clear.</li> <li>■ The predicted levels from each existing or consented wind farm development at each NSL.</li> <li>■ The cumulative levels based on consented and predicted levels at each NSL.</li> </ul>	The noise predictions undertaken demonstrate that the Proposed Development makes a negligible difference to noise levels at the nearby properties when considered in the context of other schemes. Full details are provided in <b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that noise monitoring locations are agreed with the THC Environmental Health Officer if noise monitoring is to be undertaken, and the applicant's noise consultant liaises with the Environmental Health at an early stage to discuss any issues regarding the proposed methodology.	Noise monitoring has not been undertaken. Full details are provided in <b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that a construction noise assessment will be required in the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Where it is proposed to undertake work which is audible at the curtilage of any noise sensitive receptor, out with the hours Mon-Fri 7am to 7pm; Sat 7am to 1pm</li> <li>■ Where noise levels during the above periods are likely to exceed 75dB(A) for short term works or 55dB(A) for long term works. Both measurements to be taken as a 1hr LAeq at the curtilage of any noise sensitive receptor. (Generally, long term work is taken to be more than 6 months).</li> </ul>	Full details of the construction noise assessment is provided in <b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that PWS assessment will be required and that THC has some information on known supplies, but it is not definitive.	Consultation with local properties has identified that there are no Private Water Supplies likely to be affected by the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> of the EIA Report.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
THC Forestry Team	23/02/21	Advised that if felling is required, details of the location of felling and trees affected are included in the EIA Report, accounted for in calculating the carbon balance of the Proposed Development and consideration is given to any required replanting under the Scottish Government's Policy on Control of Woodland Removal.	Felling is not required for the construction or operation of the proposed wind farm. A carbon balance calculation ( <b>Appendix 14.1: Carbon Balance Assessment</b> ) has been undertaken and the findings are presented in the EIA Report.
		Advised that a specific chapter on forestry is included in the EIA Report where there is likely to be an adverse impact on woodland.	n/a
NatureScot	23/02/21	Advised that there is potential for the Proposed Development to result in significant adverse impacts on the Glen Affric National Scenic Area (NSA) and the Central Highlands Wild Land Area (WLA).	Effects on the NSA and WLA are detailed in <b>Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on the Special Landscape Qualities of the Glen Affric National Scenic Area</b> and <b>Appendix 6.4: Wild Land Impact Assessment</b> (Central Highlands WLA 24).
		Noted that aviation lighting will be required and provided guidance on this assessment including the provision of night-time visualisations.	Night-time visualisations are provided for Affric-Kintail Way, near Braefield, Creag Dhubh and Tom a Choinnich and are detailed further in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that they can provide the latest version of the methodology for assessing effects on Special Qualities and would welcome further discussion in relation to the qualities that should be scoped in and out of the assessment.	LUC obtained the methodology for assessing effects on Special Qualities and the assessment is presented in <b>Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on the Special Landscape Qualities of the Glen Affric National Scenic Area</b> .
		Noted that Viewpoint (VP) 5 Glen Affric is included as being within the NSA. This is incorrect and consider this to be unrepresentative of the recreational receptors within the designation.	The final list of viewpoints was agreed with SNH and correspondence on this is detailed further in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that as a minimum VP10 Meall Mor, VP11 Creag Dhubh and VP16 Tom a Chronnich are included for night-time visualisation so impacts on the WLA 24 and Glen Affric NSA can be assessed.	The final list of viewpoints was agreed with SNH and correspondence on this is detailed further in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that is the proposed Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension has been submitted prior to the Proposed Development then lighting of both developments should be illustrated on a cumulative photomontages from the NSA/WLA viewpoints.	No visible turbine aviation lighting was proposed for Bhlaraidh Extension. Visualisations therefore only illustrate visible aviation lighting for the Proposed Development.
		Confirmed they agreed with the designated landscapes scoped in and scoped out of the assessment.	Noted.
		Advised that further discussion is sought with NatureScot once a draft list of wild land qualities has been screened in for detailed assessment.	Further consultation with NatureScot was undertaken and the assessment of effects on Wild Land is presented in <b>Appendix 6.4: Wild Land Impact Assessment</b> (Central Highlands WLA 24).
		Noted that the Proposed Development has potential to affect nationally important peatland habitat and if adverse impacts cannot be overcome by siting, design or mitigation then they may object.	The assessment of the effects on peatland habitats is presented in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> .
		Advised that the EIA Report should provide sufficient information and assessment, based on site-specific surveys to determine if the wind farm infrastructure will affect, directly or indirectly areas of nationally important carbon-rich soils, deep peat and priority peatland habitat.	Detailed surveys have been undertaken of peat depth and quality across the site and the findings of the assessment are presented in <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> and <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that an Outline Habitat Management Plan (OHMP) should be prepared in addition to a Peat Management Plan and Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment.	An outline Restoration and Enhancement Plan ( <b>Appendix 8.5</b> , Outline Peat Management Plan ( <b>Appendix 7.3: Outline Peat Management Plan</b> ) and Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment ( <b>Appendix 7.4: Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment</b> ) are appended to the EIA Report.
		Confirmed they agree with the survey scope, assessment methodology and the proposed approach to embedded and additional mitigation for assessing effects from a habitat and peatland perspective.	Noted.
		Agreed that it is possible to scope out impacts in the Glen Affric to Strathconon SPA. However due to the very small population of Slavonian grebes in the UK and the declining proportion in the classified SPAs, they consider any impacts on the wider countryside population will impact SPA populations and therefore the North Inverness lochs SPA and Loch Knockie & nearby Lochs SPA should be scoped back into the EIA.	A detailed technical note was prepared to provide further evidence in relation to scoping out potential effects on Slavonian grebe. In response to this NatureScot confirmed in an email on 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2021 that potential effects on Slavonian grebe did not need to be assessed in detail in the EIA Report.
Advised that the Upland Breeding Bird Survey does not conform to our guidance which states there should be a minimum of two years survey work and a modified version of the Brown & Shepherd methodology using 4 visits should be used. Advised that the first year's ornithology survey work should be reviewed by the applicant and justification provided if no further survey work is proposed.	Upland breeding bird surveys were undertaken in April, May, June and July 2021. It was agreed, in further consultation with NatureScot, that one year of survey would be acceptable provided that there were not nationally important numbers of breeding waders of conservation concern.		
Agreed within potential effects identified and the impact assessment methodology in relation to ornithology.	Noted.		
Advised that there is potential for Ness Woods SAC otters to be connected with the Site and if Otters are recorded during surveys, the SAC's otter features should be scoped into the EIA.	Potential effects on otter, including the potential for effects on Ness Woods SAC, is considered in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.		
Agreed with the protected species surveys proposed and noted that if any protected species are identified then Species Protection Plans should be produced and included within the EIA Report.	Full details of the protected species surveys and findings is provided in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.		

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
		Noted that if wild deer are present on or will use the Site then an assessment of the potential impacts on deer welfare, habitats, neighbouring and other interests should be presented. If significant impacts are identified a draft deer management statement will also be required to address the impacts.	This is addressed in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that the EIA process should consider the impacts of decommissioning and redevelopment of renewable energy developments and the Decommissioning and Restoration Plan should be brief but provide an appropriate level of detail about how the site infrastructure may be removed and how the Site is intended to be restored.	High level information on the likely process that would be undertaken to decommission the Proposed Development at the end of its lifespan, including broad principles for a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan is set out in the EIA Report. However, a detailed assessment of the decommissioning effects associated with the Proposed Development 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.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	22/02/21	Stated they are broadly content with the methodology set out in the Scoping Report and the approach to the assessment and are content with the potential impacts to be scoped in and out of the assessment.	Noted.
		HES would welcome further consultation around potential impacts and the requirement for visualisation as the design progresses and as draft visualisations are produced to allow more detailed advice at appropriate stages to be given.	The final list of viewpoints has been agreed in consultation with HES. Full details are provided in <b>Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage</b> of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that an appropriately detailed ZTV is used to identify potential setting impacts and welcomed that the Scoping Report indicates that a ZTV will be used.	A ZTV and heritage assets with visibility of the Proposed Development is provided as <b>Figure 10.1</b> and <b>Figure 10.2</b> which are associated with <b>Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage</b> of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that a wireframe is produced to illustrate impacts on Comar Wood, Dun 830m south-west of Comar Lodge (SM13578) and stated that important views to the south-west appear likely to be affected by the Proposed Development.	Design change means that the scheduled Dun is not at risk of setting change, as it has no theoretical visibility or potential in-combination views. Consultation has been undertaken with HES to agree to scope this asset out of the assessment.
		Recommended that a photomontage is produced to illustrate impacts on views from the Jacobite cruise ship that transports many visitors to the castle via Loch Ness as there is potential for important views on approach to Urquhart Castle to be affected.	Effects on the setting of Urquhart Castle are detailed in <b>Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage</b> and supported by two in-combination visualisations, one photomontage and one wireframe. For technical reasons a photomontage from the boat is not possible, but the team has taken photos from the boat capturing the visual experience of the approach which is included in the information supporting the assessment.
		Recommended that in addition to a wireframe being produced for Corrimony Chambered Cairn (SM 90081) that this is also illustrated by a photo montage due to the sensitivity of this asset to visual change.	Design change means that Corrimony chambered cairn has no direct visibility of the site, nor potential for in-combination views. Consultation has been undertaken with HES to scope this asset out of the assessment.
		Noted that the grid coordinates to illustrate views from Urquhart Castle from the east shore of Loch Ness appear to be in a picnic area and careful consideration and site visits will be required to pick the precise viewpoint that includes Urquhart Castle and would experience the greatest visual impact. Recommended that a photomontage in relation to Urquhart Castle is produced.	The final choice of viewpoint has been undertaken to ensure that this has been accurately represented. The views are illustrated in the EIA Report.
Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council	30/01/21	Objected to the proposal for access to the Site from A887 as all abnormal load movements from Corpath travel through the villages of Fort Augustus and Invermoriston.	Access is taken from the A887 from the south to utilise the existing access and infrastructure associated with the Bhlairaidh Wind Farm access track as far as possible thereby minimising the length of new access track that will be required. A CTMP will be implemented to manage deliveries through local settlements and further details are provided in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
		Stated that the cumulative impact of operational and proposed developments within a 25km radius is now excessive and that the Proposed Development is within an area of natural beauty with popular hill walking routes. Consent for another wind farm would cause detrimental effects to the local environment and countryside.	A detailed cumulative assessment of effects is presented within each specialist assessment chapter and an assessment of several key viewpoints on key walking routes is provided in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		The Community Council has serious concerns on the visual impact from locations all round the area including from the opposite side of Loch Ness	A detailed assessment of the visual effects, including from locations around Loch Ness, is presented in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
Glen Urquhart Community Council	30/01/21	Raised concern over the access not being determined and requested that the EIA covers all options being considered.	Access will be taken from the A887 from the south to utilise the existing access and infrastructure associated with the Bhlairaidh Wind Farm access track as far as possible thereby minimising the length of new access track that will be required. Further details are provided in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
		Noted that the connection to the grid should be considered as part of the EIA and noted that this is a fundamental part of any wind farm.	The expected point of connection for the proposed development into the electricity grid system is still to be determined. The grid connection will be subject to a separate application for consent by Scottish and Southern Energy Networks (SSEN).
		Noted that the construction will take over 24 months and at least two tourist season and requested that the impact on traffic takes account of the busy summer period.	The traffic assessment has taken account of the potential effects during peak periods as detailed further in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
		Note that the community would be opposed to any Sunday working.	Working hours will be Mon-Fri 7am to 7pm; Sat 7am to 1pm. There will be no working on Sunday with the exception of turbine delivery and erection, during concrete pours and emergency works.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
		Glen Urquhart Community Council do not agree with decommissioning being scoped out.	High level information on the likely process that will be undertaken to decommission the Proposed Development at the end of its lifespan, including broad principles for a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan is set out in the EIA Report. However, a detailed assessment of the decommissioning effects associated with the Proposed Development 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, albeit that the effects are not expected to be any greater than during the construction period.
		Feel that full community consultation is essential and, where necessary, reports should be delayed until this is possible.	Due to the Covid 19 restrictions and requirements for social distancing, the initial public consultation event which took place in May 2021 was held virtually. Subsequent consultation took place both virtually and in person in August 2022.
		Noted that the Site is in an area of 'Significant Protection (Group 2)' and advised that the scope of the EIA should be wide to reflect this.	A detailed assessment of the elements which constitute designation as 'Group 2' has been undertaken in the relevant assessment chapters.
		Disagree with Glen Strathfarrar National Scenic Area (NSA) being scoped out due to its proximity to the Site.	Given the limited predicted visibility indicated by the ZTV along the boundaries of the Glen Strathfarrar NSA, effects on the special landscape qualities of the NSA have not been considered within the LVIA.
		Disagree with Ben Wyvis Special Landscape Area (SLA) being scoped out as the ZTV suggests significant theoretical visibility and this summit is very accessible.	Given intervening distance of approximately 36km between the SLA and the nearest proposed turbine, the Ben Wyvis SLA has not been considered within the LVIA.
		In relation to viewpoints, Glen Urquhart Community Council feel that in addition to Balbeg, the higher ground at Buntait should also be included as well as in the night time selection. Corrimony Cairn should also be included if it is possible to see the turbines from this location. Beinn a'Bha'ach Ard to the north-west should also be included in the hill viewpoints.	Affric-Kintail Way, near Braefield included in LVIA to represent views experienced by recreational receptors on the Affric-Kintail Way promoted long distance trail and similar views experienced from residential properties at Buntait. Dusk/night-time visualisation has been included in the EIA Report.
		Object to the scoping out of the houses higher up on the north side of Glen Urquhart in relation to the residential visual amenity assessment (RVAA).	Effects upon residential visual amenity become a matter of public rather than private interest when properties or groups of properties become widely regarded as unattractive places to live. Given the nearest residential properties are located over 5km from the nearest turbine, a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) to accompany the LVIA, is not deemed to be necessary and has been scoped out. This has been agreed with the Highland Council.
		Concerned that the scope of the Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat, Ecology and Ornithology assessments have been narrowed down too far.	The scope of the assessments has been informed by professional judgement and experience and has been agreed with consultees to be appropriate to the type and scale of the Proposed Development.
		Acknowledged that details in relation to the construction and operational phases are limited at this stage but noted that the EIA must seek to ensure the Proposed Development does not have an impact on householders in relation to noise.	A detailed noise assessment has been undertaken and the findings are presented in <b>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</b> of the EIA Report.
Requested that cyclists and horse riders are included when considering all road users in relation to traffic and transport.	An assessment of effects on recreational access is provided in <b>Chapter 13: Socio – Economic and Tourism</b> .		
Strathglass Community Council	31/01/21	Advised that there is no reference to the Glen Affric National Nature Reserve in the ZTVs or Scoping Report and a rigorous visual impact assessment regarding Glen Affric is required.	Glen Affric National Nature Reserve (NNR) and Special Protection Area (SPA) is mentioned in the EIA Scoping report ecology and ornithology sections and illustrated on the supporting figures. However, due to the distance between the Proposed Development and the NNR, and as they are not physically linked, potential effects on the NNR has not been assessed in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> . Potential effects on the SPA have also been scoped out. This has been agreed with consultees, including Nature Scot. Potential effects on Glen Affric National Scenic Area (NSA) is, however, assessed in <b>Appendix 6.3</b> associated with <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Requested that a full assessment of the cumulative impacts of this proposal in combination with other proposed and operational wind farms is conducted.	Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CLVIA) has been included in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
Transport Scotland (TS)	01/02/21	Agreed with the proposed assessment methodology but noted that potential trunk road impacts will require to be established.	Noted. An assessment of potential effects on the trunk road network is presented in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that TS would require to be satisfied that the size of turbines proposed can negotiate the selected route and that transportation of components will not have a detrimental effect on structures within the trunk route path. TS noted that any proposed changes to the trunk road network must be discussed and approved by the appropriate Area Managers prior to the movement of any abnormal load.	Noted. An assessment of potential effects on the trunk road network is presented in <b>Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the EIA Report.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	01/02/21	Recommended scoping in potential effects on the North Inverness Lochs SPA and Loch Knockie and nearby Lochs SPA, for which breeding Slavonian grebe are the qualifying feature.	Potential effects on Slavonian grebe have been scoped out of detailed assessment as agreed with NatureScot.
		Stated they would welcome the inclusion of the Golden Eagle Topographical (GET) model to show areas of high landscape use and if necessary use of this tool to inform wind farm layout.	GET modelling has been undertaken and the results are detailed in <b>Chapter 9: Ornithology</b> of the EIA Report.. This has informed the design of the wind farm.



Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
		<p>Raised concerns that upland breeding bird surveys are only scheduled for one year and there does not appear to have been any surveys around proposed roads/infrastructure. RSPB stated that two years survey work is recommended to allow for variation in bird use across year and if only one year is used this approach will need to be justified and information provided in the EIA Report demonstrating the survey data is adequate.</p>	As agreed with NatureScot, one year of upland breeding bird surveys was considered appropriate.
		Recommended that a carbon calculation is undertaken to determine the 'carbon payback period' over the operational life of the Proposed Development and should be used as early as possible in the planning process to inform the design.	A carbon balance calculation has been undertaken and the results are presented in <b>Appendix 14.1: Carbon Balance Assessment</b> of EIA Report.
		Advised that a suitable area of modified blanket bog should be identified and restored as compensation for the estimated loss of any functioning blanket bog that cannot be avoided. The area should be of sufficient size, assessed for suitability and discussed in the EIA Report.	An outline restoration and enhancement plan (OREP) is provided to accompany the EIA Report which includes details of loss of blanket bog ( <b>Appendix 8.5 Outline Restoration and Enhancement Plan</b> ).
		Stated that the EIA Report should include a full survey, impact assessment and proposals for mitigation in relation to important habitats and species on the Site, including a specific plan for Slavonian grebe.	<b>Chapter 9: Ecology</b> and <b>Chapter 9: Ornithology</b> of the EIA Report includes details of the important habitats and species on site. As noted above, Slavonian grebe have been scoped out of detailed assessment as agreed with NatureScot.
		Requested that a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) is submitted alongside the application. Noted that there areas of ancient woodland inventory within the Site boundary and stated that opportunities to enhance this habitats should be identified and included in the HMP in line with SPP.	An OREP is provided to accompany the EIA Report ( <b>Appendix 8.5: Outline Restoration and Enhancement Plan</b> ).
NATS	14/01/21	Confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed Development.	Noted.
		Requested that they be further consulted in should any changes be proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application	Noted.
Mountaineering Scotland	15/01/21	Noted that none of the proposed viewpoints represent the high ground north-west of the Site and strongly urged that the Strathfarrar Corbett, Beinn a'Bha'ach Ard be added to remedy this.	The final list of viewpoints has been agreed with consultees and includes Beinn a'Bha'ach Ard.
		Stated that it is not clear from the Scoping Report why it is considered preferable to site turbines north of Carn Loch a'Mhuillin rather than in the south-east of the 'developable area', which in their judgement would provide a better and alignment with Bhlaraidh and Bhlaraidh Extension.	The scoping layout was an early iteration of the layout design which has undergone subsequent refinement following consultation and a full suite of environmental surveys, requiring balancing several competing constraints, including consideration of the nearby Bhlaraidh and Bhlaraidh Extension. Full details of the design process are presented in <b>Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that Viewpoint 18 Carn Dearg at 30km distance and visualisations are 'fairly useless' at that distance and a wireline alone would be more adequate.	The final list of viewpoints has been agreed with consultees – Viewpoint 18 Carn Dearg is shown as a photomontage.
Scottish Water	19/01/21	Confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed Development.	Noted.
		Indicated that the proposed Development falls within a drinking water catchment where a Scottish Water abstraction is located but it is a sufficient distance from the intake that is likely to be low risk.	Noted; potential effects on public and private drinking water are considered in <b>Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that no surface water connections will be accepted into their combined sewer system.	Noted.
Aberdeen Airport	19/01/21	Stated that the proposed Development is outwith their consultation zone and therefore do not wish to be consulted further.	Noted.
Highlands and Islands Airports Limited (HIAL)	29/01/21	Stated that the Proposed Development impacts the safeguarding criteria at Inverness Airport. The turbines could possibly affect the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) and the performance of the Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR) installation for the airport.	Further consultation with HIAL has been undertaken and radar modelling indicates that the turbines are screened by terrain. Further details are provided in <b>Chapter 14: Other Issues</b> of the EIA Report.
		Advised that HIAL would require an IFP impact assessment to demonstrate that the IFPs will not be impacted by the Proposed Development.	As above.
		Advised that HIAL would require a radar impact assessment to demonstrate that the Proposed Development would not be in the line of sight of the PSR.	As above.
		Asked the Applicant to consider the required lighting requirements documented in The Air Navigation Order 2016.	As above.
		Noted that HIAL would work with the Applicant towards a resolution but would object to any proposal which impacts the PSR and/or IFPs	As above.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response / Action taken in the EIA Report
British Telecommunications (BT)	21/01/21	Confirmed that the turbine locations, detailed in Figure 3.1 of the Scoping Report, should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	Noted.
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	22/01/21	Stated they do 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 Horse Society	25/01/21	No objection, noted the excellent opportunity the Proposed Development has to improve connections in the community.	Noted. Potential effects on access in the community are considered in <b>Chapter 13: Socio – Economic and Tourism</b> of the EIA Report.
Crown Estate Scotland	01/02/21	Confirmed that no assets of Crown Estate Scotland are affected by the Proposed Development.	Noted.
MoD DIO	14/01/21	Requested information on capacity, turbine locations and rotor diameter.	Requested information provided, noting that subject to change. Further consultation will be undertaken with the MoD when the application is submitted.
ScotWays	16/02/21	Advised that the recreational baseline should be updated to also include rights of way and other routes within the wider study area. HI52 and HI53 are 'other routes' and HI67 is a recorded right of way and are affected by the Proposed Development.	The rights of way and other routes are considered in <b>Chapter 13: Socio – Economic and Tourism</b> . Where relevant, effects on visual amenity of routes are also assessed in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> of the EIA Report.
		Asked for all proposed and consented developments to be taken into consideration in the cumulative impact assessment.	A cumulative assessment has been undertaken and effects are detailed in <b>Chapter 13: Socio – Economic and Tourism</b> . Where relevant, cumulative effects on visual amenity of routes is also assessed in <b>Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity</b> .
		Advised that an Access Management Plan may need to be implemented in consultation with THC access team to ensure public access can be maintained to the recreational routes that cross the Site during the construction and operational periods of the Proposed Development.	An Access Management Plan is incorporated into the Design and Access Statement which accompanies the EIA Report and application for consent.

Table 1.2: Loch Liath Gatecheck Consultation Feedback

Consultee	Date of Response	Gate check feedback received	Response / Action taken
HES	05/12/22	HES is broadly content that the details given reflect HES's involvement with, and advice regarding, the EIA process. HES responded to a consultation from the development team on 17 <sup>th</sup> November 2022 regarding proposed visualisations for the EIA Report and confirmed that they are content with the proposed locations for the visualisations.  From the information provided in the Gatecheck report HES is content that the Applicant's approach for the EIA appears appropriate. HES consider they have been appropriately consulted so far and that the issues raised at scoping have been appropriately addressed at this stage.	No action required.
NatureScot	06/12/22	NatureScot is content that the developer has carefully considered the advice provided in response to both the scoping request and further consultation. NatureScot met with LUC's landscape team in July 2022 to discuss the scope of the wild land assessment. NatureScot also met with the Applicant and LUC's ecology team in October 2022 to discuss the revised layout and progress of the survey work.  NatureScot has no additional comments to make in response to the Gatecheck consultation.	No action required.
Strathglass Community Council (SCC)	07/12/22	SCC does not agree with the scope of the landscape and visual amenity assessment of Glen Affric NSA and NNR. This is because SCC had responded during scoping and asked for a rigorous assessment for Glen Affric NSA and NNR due to the high volume of visitor numbers per year and the single access route into the NSA. SCC therefore ask for a full assessment on the NSA and NNR.	The EIA Report includes a detailed LVIA which thoroughly assesses the potential for effects on Glen Affric NSA. This includes an assessment of visual impact for visitors to the wider area, including from a number of viewpoints located outside the NSA but within Glen Affric NNR which partly overlaps with the NSA. By extending the assessment to cover effects on visual amenity outwith the NSA but within the NNR, it is acknowledged that the NNR as a location to which visitors are drawn.  In terms of the ecological effects on the NNR, unlike sites such as SSSIs and SACs, the NNR designation is not itself designated for specific ecological features but is applied to areas of land of acknowledged significance and which are being managed with nature as a priority. As such, Glen Affric NNR does overlap with the Glen Affric SSSI and Strathglass Complex SAC (as well as the Glen Affric to Strathconon SPA). The SSSI is designated for its breeding bird assemblage, dragonfly assemblage, lichen assemblage and native pinewoods, and the SAC for a range of upland habitat types, as well as otter. These sites are over 7km from the Proposed Development, and as such there is a no ecological or hydrological connectivity with these designated sites. Due to the lack of connectivity, no potential impact

Consultee	Date of Response	Gate check feedback received	Response / Action taken
			pathway has been identified that would require an ecological assessment of these designated sites, nor of the overlapping NNR.
		SCC asked for additional settlements to be included within the assessment. Noted that the settlements to the west of the Proposed Development, including Cannich and Tomich (which are within a Conservation Area), which are located within the SCC area, have been omitted even though they are both approx. the same distance from the site as Balnain.	There is no visibility of the Proposed Development from the settlements of Cannich or Tomich, with the closest visibility of turbines to the east of Cannich from a short section of the Affric Kintail Way after it climbs up the steep minor road east of the settlement. As such, visual effects from these settlements has been scoped out of assessment based on the theoretical visibility, however, receptors (including residents) travelling to these settlements is assessed in respect to the route assessment for the A831.
		Noted that the Affric – Kintail Way (AKW) traverses the SCC area and that the SCC support the development of this long distance route. SCC noted that the Highland Council Access Officer has recommended that Visit Inverness Loch Ness (VILN) are consulted with regard to the AKW. Advised that the lead of the Strathglass Marketing Group should be contacted and provided contact details.	The Applicant has consulted with Strathglass Marketing Group and, in relation to specific consultation on the Affric Kintail Way, the Applicant consulted Visit Inverness Loch Ness.
		SCC also noted that any referral by the SCC of the developer to Soirbheas was in the context of community benefit only and that all other aspects of community engagement and consultation should take place with the SCC.	The Applicant has endeavoured to engage with all community councils directly, in addition to that with Soirbheas and since the onset of the project the Applicant has engaged directly with SCC at various times. The Applicant will continue to engage directly with SCC and other community councils in the area as the project progresses.
RSPB Scotland	08/12/22 20/01/23 26/01/23	RSPB note that RSPB did not receive the technical note provided to NatureScot regarding Slavonian Grebe. This was subsequently provided to RSPB for review who confirmed that they were in agreement that Slavonian Grebe could be scoped out of detailed assessment.	Slovian Grebe is scoped out of the EIA.
SEPA	19/12/22	In relation to peat, SEPA note that the development has generally been designed to avoid the deepest areas of peat but that there will nonetheless still be impacts on some areas of > 1m.  Queried if further amendments may be beneficial for peat by moving T5 further south or east and moving the access track immediately leading up to T13 further north.	Due to a combination of constraints associated with watercourse buffers and turbine spacing, T5 has not been moved. Furthermore, the turbine has been oriented such that the temporary areas of hardstanding are on the deeper peat, and this will be restored following construction.  In relation to the track to T13, this cannot be moved due to the presence of steep slopes to the north. Floating track will be used in this area to minimise the requirement for excavation of peat at this location. The turbine itself is sited on relatively shallow peat.
		SEPA noted that impacts on watercourses does not seem to be an issue; infrastructure is generally located out with the buffer and crossings are perpendicular.  Queried if the water feature at T1 is a natural watercourse, man-made channel or eroded peatland feature. Aerial photography seems to suggest the latter which if it is the case then it can be restored post construction.	The water feature is a minor drain and there may be some scope for restoration of small areas upstream.
		Noted that NVC survey information has yet to be provided and would welcome the opportunity to provide further pre-app advice on any GWDTE assessment if helpful. SEPA note and welcome the commentary which suggests that bog pools have been avoided and hope a similar approach has been taken to any other near natural wetland habitats.  SEPA also welcome the reference made to habitat management prescriptions and habitat management area and would expect the application to be supported by an outline habitat management plan which identifies areas for peatland restoration (which should be significantly larger in scale than the area of direct and indirect impacts from the development) and an outline of the types of works proposed.	NVC data is provided in <b>Chapter 8: Ecology</b> and <b>Appendix 8.2: Habitats and Vegetation Survey Report</b> . No Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs) will be affected by the Proposed Development therefore a specific assessment for effects on GWDTEs is not provided.  Habitat management measures are detailed in <b>Appendix 8.5: Outline Restoration and Enhancement Plan</b> .
THC	22/12/22	THC stated that they had received a briefing from the Applicant regarding the Proposed Development and THC provided verbal feedback which was in line with the pre-application advice previously given. As such, THC did not provide any further written comments at this stage.	Noted, no action required.
No Gate Check Feedback Provided:			
Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council;			
Glen Urquhart Community Council			
Mountaineering Scotland			
ScotWays			