

2 Approach to the EIA

Introduction

- 2.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is a process which identifies the environmental effects (both positive and negative) of development proposals to assist the consenting authority in considering and determining an application. Early identification of potentially adverse environmental effects also leads to the identification and incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures into the project design to avoid, reduce and, if possible, remedy potentially significant adverse environmental effects.
- 2.2 This chapter sets out the broad methodology that has been used in the EIA for North Lowther Energy Initiative (hereafter referred to as 'the Development'). It provides an overview of the key stages that have been followed, in line with EIA good practice.

The EIA Process

EIA Regulations

- 2.3 The ES has been prepared in accordance with the latest regulations and advice on good practice at the time of preparation, comprising:
- The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000 ('the EIA Regulations')ⁱ;
 - Guidance On The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000ⁱⁱ;
 - The Scottish Government Online Onshore Wind Turbines Information, updated May 2014ⁱⁱⁱ;
 - Planning Advice Note 1/2013 (PAN 1/2013) Environmental Impact Assessment (2013)^{iv}
 - Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2004) Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment^v; and
 - Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) A Handbook on Environmental Impact Assessment: Guidance for Competent Authorities, Consultees and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland (4th Edition)^{vi}.
- 2.4 Whilst updated EIA Regulations will be introduced in May 2017 under the new Directive 2014/52/EU, projects subject to EIA Scoping prior to this will continue to be considered in accordance with the current EIA regime. This has been the case for the Development.
- 2.5 The information that a developer is required to submit as part of the EIA process is specified in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations.

Good Practice Guidance

- 2.6 PAN 1/2013^{iv} provides guidance on good practice, and the key steps to be followed in the EIA process are identified in IEMA^v and SNH^{vi} guidance:

Scoping

- Undertake a Scoping exercise to establish likely significant effects.

Baseline Studies

- Examine, through baseline studies, the environmental character of the area likely to be affected by the development.
- Identify relevant natural and man-made processes which may already be changing the character of the site.

Predicting and Assessing Impacts

- Consider the possible interactions between the proposed development and both existing and future site conditions.
- Predict and assess the possible effects, both negative and positive, of the development on the environment.

Mitigation

- Introduce design and operational modifications or other measures to avoid, reduce or offset adverse effects and enhance positive effects.

Integration

- EIA should be an iterative process which aims to ensure early consideration of environmental issues at all stages of project development, and is founded on appropriate engagement with planning authorities and the Consultation Bodies. In addition to meeting the requirements of the EIA Regulations, EIA should add value to the design process, improving environmental outcomes and creating a framework for community engagement.

Proportionality

- EIAs should be fit for purpose and must be accessible to the planning authority, consultees and the public. As such it should focus on significant environmental effects to avoid being overly long in nature.

Efficiency

- Early identification of assessment and information requirements can ensure a coordinated EIA process and can minimise delays.

EIA and the Design Process

- 2.7 EIA is an iterative process which aims to ensure early consideration of environmental issues at all stages of project development. In this way, the findings from the EIA can be fed into the design process, to avoid, reduce and if possible, remedy environmental effects. This approach has been followed in the design of the Development. Where potentially adverse significant environmental effects were identified through preliminary investigations as part of feasibility work, environmental baseline surveys, or later in the detailed EIA, consideration was given as to how the design should be modified to 'design out' adverse significant environmental effects, or where this was not possible, to determine appropriate mitigation. This process is explained further in **Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy** and in the subsequent assessment chapters (**Chapters 6 to 14**). It is considered that this ES contains appropriate information to enable the Scottish Ministers to form a judgement on the likely significant effects of the Development. Information on any limitations, for example, in relation to baseline data, is provided in each of the assessment chapters.

Scope of the Environmental Statement

- 2.8 The purpose of EIA Scoping is to ensure that the EIA focuses on potentially significant environmental issues.
- 2.9 In accordance with the LECU guidance on the S36 consenting process, NLEI Ltd notified the LECU of their intention to submit a request for a Scoping Opinion for the Development on 26th October 2015. A pre-Scoping meeting was held on 8th December 2015 and was attended by the LECU, 2020 Renewables, SNH, South Lanarkshire Council, Dumfries and Galloway Council, and Forestry Commission Scotland. Prior to the meeting, and as required by the Section 36 consenting process, NLEI Ltd prepared and submitted a Pre-Scoping Briefing Note to the LECU for distribution to the pre-Scoping meeting attendees two weeks in advance of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce and discuss the Development as outlined in the Briefing Note with those in attendance to inform the Scoping Report, for the LECU to outline their Scoping process and to agree timescales for submission of the request for a Scoping Opinion.
- 2.10 A Scoping Request accompanied by a Scoping Report was submitted to the Scottish Government Local Energy Consents Unit (LECU) on 29th January 2016 by LUC on behalf of NLEI Ltd under the provisions of Regulation 7(1) of the EIA Regulations. The Scoping Report sought to focus the EIA on the main effects,

with each of the topic-based chapters within the Report setting out a provisional list of potential effects and a second provisional list of non-significant effects to be 'scoped out' of full assessment. These were drafted on the basis of the findings of the preliminary survey work undertaken, the professional judgement of the EIA team, experience from other projects of a similar nature and policy guidance and standards of relevance to the topic area in question.

- 2.11 NLEI Ltd and the LECU agreed a list of consultees to be contacted as part of the formal Scoping process prior to the Scoping Request being made by LUC. The LECU subsequently contacted these consultees and responded to the submission of the Scoping Request on 17th May 2016 with a Scoping Opinion. The Scoping Opinion included comments received from a number of the agreed consultees. A summary of the issues raised by these consultees at Scoping, and how these have been addressed in the ES, is provided in **Table 2.1** below. The consultees who were agreed with the LECU but who did not respond at formal Scoping were: East Ayrshire Council, Scottish Wildlife Trust, Royal Burgh of Sanquhar & District Community Council, Coal Authority, John Muir Trust and The Association of Salmon Fisheries Board. The LECU assumed that these consultees had no comments to make. Despite the lack of a formal scoping response from these consultees, where relevant the areas for which these organisations may have an interest have been included in the EIA. Consultation with some consultees who responded at Scoping has extended beyond the Scoping process. Details of these consultations are provided in **Chapters 6-14**.
- 2.12 In addition to the consultees contacted during the formal Scoping process, a number of other stakeholders were contacted by both LUC and topic specialists to obtain background information to further inform the EIA and allow them the opportunity to raise any concerns that they might have in relation to the Development. Consultation with some of these stakeholders was recommended by consultees who provided a response to formal Scoping. Details of these consultations are provided in **Chapters 6 to 14**.
- 2.13 Whilst a range of possible positive and negative effects has been investigated as part of the EIA process, only effects identified as being of potential significance prior to the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures have been addressed fully in the ES. Unless otherwise stated, all effects identified are considered to be negative.

Topic Areas Scoped Out

- 2.14 The Guidance on the Electricity Works EIA Regulationsⁱⁱ provides advice on the general requirements relating to the preparation and content of an ES and states:
- "Whilst every ES should provide a full factual description of the development, the emphasis of Schedule 4 is on the 'significant' environmental effects to which a development is likely to give rise. Some effects may be of little value or no significance for the particular development in question. They will therefore need only very brief treatment to indicate that their possible relevance has been considered."*
- 2.15 In line with the above guidance, where no significant effects have been identified for a particular topic these have been 'scoped out' and given only brief treatment in the relevant topic chapters. Topics scoped out of the EIA include those listed below, with further details provided in each of the topic chapters:
- Receptors that are unlikely to be affected by the Development, through having little or no theoretical or actual visibility, or being distant from the Development.
 - Effects on habitats and species that are not listed on Annex I to the Habitats Directive^{vii} or Annex II to the Habitats Directive, or habitats or species not protected by other legislation such as The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 (as amended), or The Protection of Badgers Act 1992.
 - Effects on bird species which are not listed on Annex I to the Birds Directive^{viii}, are not regularly occurring migratory species (or have been scoped out in consultation with SNH), are not on Schedule 1 to the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and are not species that are Red and Amber-listed Birds of Conservation Concern^{ix}.
 - Effects of disturbance from vibration, dewatering or changes in hydrology on cultural heritage assets.
 - Effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets more than 10km from the Development.
 - Impacts on setting of cultural heritage assets during construction.
 - Direct impacts on cultural heritage assets during operation.
 - Effects of the Development on traffic and transport during operation.

- Shadow flicker effects during operation.
- Operational effects on television.
- Operational effects on unlicensed airfields.
- Effects on military Air Surveillance and Control Systems (ASACS) Radar, Military Precision Approach Radar (PAR) and Military Aerodromes during construction and operation.
- Dust effects during operation of the Development.

Identification of Effects

- 2.16 To ensure the identification of key effects arising from the Development, the following principles were applied throughout the EIA process.

Significant Effects

- 2.17 The identification of the significance of effects (whether positive or negative) arising from the Development is a key stage in the EIA process. This judgement is vital in informing the decision-making process.
- 2.18 As the identification of significant effects will differ depending on the context and the receptors affected by the Development, there is no general definition of what constitutes significance. In EIA, the term significance reflects both its literal meaning of 'importance' and its statistical meaning where there is an element of quantification. This combination of judgemental/subjective and quantifiable/objective tests has become the standard approach to understanding and applying the test of 'significance'.
- 2.19 Specific significance criteria have been defined for the majority of topic areas, and these are detailed in the topic chapters. As the specialists undertaking each element of the assessment have defined these criteria based on guidance/professional judgement, there is some variation. However, each of the sets of criteria is based on the following aspects:
- type of effect (adverse/beneficial);
 - extent and magnitude of effect;
 - nature of effect: reversible, irreversible, long term, short term;
 - sensitivity of receptor;
 - comparison with legal requirements, policies and standards; and
 - comparison with environmental thresholds.
- 2.20 Using the criteria in each chapter, the significance of the effects arising from the Development has been categorised, where possible and unless otherwise stated within the chapter, as follows:
- major;
 - moderate;
 - minor; or
 - negligible.
- 2.21 Unless stated otherwise in methodologies set out in the individual assessment chapters, effects of 'major' or 'moderate' significance are considered to be 'significant' in the context of the EIA Regulations.

Interrelationships between Effects

- 2.22 For the purposes of the ES, the potential effects of the Development are considered in terms of effects on each of the discrete environmental topic areas. In reality, topic areas such as ecology and hydrology are interrelated. In accordance with the EIA Regulations, indirect and secondary effects resulting from the interaction of separate direct effects are addressed within the ES.

Cumulative Effects

- 2.23 The EIA Regulations state that types of effect identified "should cover direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative

effects.” It is also important to consider the possible effects that the proposal may have in combination with existing, consented or other proposed developments or activities. Likely cumulative effects have been defined as the likely effects that the Development may have in combination with other developments which are at application stage, consented, under construction or operational (i.e. the incremental effects resulting from the Development if all other developments are assumed to be constructed/operated). Within the assessment chapters, a two stage approach to assessment has been adopted, with the second stage comprising the cumulative assessment:

Stage 1: construction and operational effects of the Development¹.

Stage 2: cumulative construction and operational effects assessment of the Development with other nearby schemes. The schemes included in the cumulative assessment for each topic area are set out in the relevant chapters.

Mitigation and Enhancement

- 2.24 Part I (4) of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations states that the ES should include “a description of the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment.” These measures have been termed ‘mitigation’ measures for the purposes of the ES.
- 2.25 The EIA has identified, and assessed, likely significant effects prior to mitigation, and, where mitigation measures are proposed, their likely effectiveness has been examined and the significance of the ‘residual’ effect assessed.
- 2.26 It is important to note that both 2020 Renewables and Buccleuch Estates have prior experience of implementing accepted good practice during construction and operation of large development projects. In addition, in the context of current regulation, a number of measures are not considered ‘mitigation’ as such but rather an integral part of the design/construction process, and have been taken into account prior to assessing the likely effects of the Development. Where relevant, these good practice measures are described in the relevant topic chapters.

Monitoring

- 2.27 The ES sets out details of any post-consent monitoring which is proposed.

Data Gaps and Uncertainty in Assessment

- 2.28 The EIA process is designed to assist informed decision-making, based on sound information about the environmental implications of a proposed development.
- 2.29 It is considered that this ES contains adequate information to enable the Scottish Ministers to review and form a judgement on the likely significant environmental effects of the Development.

Consultation

- 2.30 Consultation has formed an integral part of the EIA process and the EIA team and NLEI Ltd contacted a number of interested parties to determine their views on the Development and to collect baseline information. Replies received from consultees in response to Scoping are detailed in **Table 2.1** and responses from other consultees who were contacted for further information to inform the EIA are detailed in the relevant topic chapters.
- 2.31 The responses received indicated that, generally, the scope of the ES had been defined appropriately. However, a number of consultees did highlight issues where further investigation or clarification was required. This has been highlighted and addressed where appropriate within the ES.

Consultation with Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees

- 2.32 NLEI Ltd also engaged fully with the LECU through the S36 Gatecheck process (both stages 1 and 2). The purpose of Gatecheck 1 was to allow NLEI Ltd to seek feedback from key consultees on the design evolution and to seek agreement on proposed methodologies and issues raised at Scoping. To inform this, NLEI Ltd submitted a draft Scoping response table to the LECU on 27th September 2016 which set

out the way in which NLEI Ltd intended to address the issues raised by consultees at Scoping. The most up-to-date design layout was also provided. The LECU subsequently issued the table and design layout to consultees seeking feedback. NLEI Ltd subsequently submitted a revised Scoping response table to the LECU on 15th February 2017 detailing the way in which the feedback received from consultees at Gatecheck had been or would be addressed in the ES. The most up-to-date layout was also submitted. This was in advance of a formal meeting with the LECU and statutory consultees on 28th February 2017 to discuss feedback to date, the way in which the issues would be addressed in the ES and progress with the Development design. The responses received at Scoping and Gatecheck 1 have been presented in **Table 2.1** and **Table 2.2** respectively along with a response to how these have been addressed in the ES.

- 2.33 Consultation outwith the formal Scoping process, including discussions relating to the landscape and visual effects assessment, cultural heritage, noise, ecology and ornithology assessments, was undertaken by NLEI Ltd and topic specialists with a number of consultees including SNH, RSPB, Forestry Commission Scotland, Historic Environment Scotland, South Lanarkshire Council and Dumfries and Galloway Council. Further details of these consultations are provided in the relevant specialist topic assessment **Chapters 6 to 14**.

Public Consultation and Public Exhibitions

- 2.34 Public consultation has formed a key component of the iterative EIA process. Consultation with the local community began in June 2015 and included a public meeting in Wanlockhead, followed by a meeting with Wanlockhead Village Council on 14th August 2015 and public exhibition on 30th September 2015 at the village hall in Wanlockhead. The exhibition was attended by approximately 35 people and 16 questionnaires were completed by those willing to share their views. A second round of public exhibitions took place on 28th September 2016 in Sanquhar and 29th September 2016 in Wanlockhead. Exhibitions were advertised through the local press, notices in the local area and in writing to Wanlockhead Village Council and Leadhills Community Council Community and Village Councils. In addition, letters were sent to stakeholders advising of the exhibitions and to individuals who had previously indicated a desire to be kept informed of the proposal and had provided contact details. Additional meetings have taken place with The Royal Burgh of Sanquhar & District Community Council and Kirkconnel and Kelloholm Community Council and individuals within the local area throughout the EIA process to provide updates on the Development.
- 2.35 A third round of public exhibitions was held on 11th and 12th April 2017 in Sanquhar, Crawfordjohn and Wanlockhead to ensure that local communities were aware of the final design to be submitted for application. These exhibitions were advertised in the local press, through local notices, letters to stakeholders including local residents and leaflet drops in Wanlockhead.
- 2.36 In addition to face-to-face engagement and written communications outlined above, a project website was set up in March 2016 (www.northlowther.co.uk) to provide progress updates and any relevant news stories relating to the proposal. Feedback and comments on the proposal were invited on the website through a contacts section.
- 2.37 Further consultation regarding the development aims of local communities is currently ongoing in the area and will continue into the application stage. This is not specifically consultation on the Development but focuses more on the aims of local communities. However, it does provide a further forum for local people who engage in this process to provide views relating to the Development.

¹ In stage 1 are there certain topics where existing wind farms will be in the baseline including in landscape and visual amenity

Table 2.1: Scoping Responses

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
Scottish Government Local Energy and Consents Unit (LECU)	17 th May 2016	East Ayrshire Council (EAC) request cumulative visualisations for both viewpoints within their boundary which should take a 360 degree view. The LVIA should consider a viewpoint from Blackcraig Hill.	The two viewpoints in East Ayrshire (New Cumnock and Cairn Table) are represented by Figures 6.30a-c and 6.31a-e , which are compliant with SNH guidance. These also include 360° cumulative wirelines. Blackcraig Hill (NS 648 064) has also been included in the viewpoint selection and illustrated by Figures 6.29a-d .
		South Lanarkshire Council (SLC) request additional viewpoints are considered from Glespin, Elvanfoot and Biggar.	Glespin, Elvanfoot and Biggar were considered for inclusion within the LVIA, however they were not included in the final list of viewpoints on the basis that Glespin has theoretical visibility of only 3-4 tips of the scoping layout, and these are likely to be screened by woodland along the Douglas Water; Elvanfoot has very limited theoretical visibility of the proposal, and screening by vegetation means that actual visibility is unlikely; Biggar has limited theoretical visibility, at over 28km from the proposal. While the proposal may be visible in good conditions from open locations above the settlement, effects are not likely to be significant. Views from Tinto Hill are assessed in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity , and represented by Figures 6.33a-f .
		Advised that SNH may suggest further viewpoints within 5km of the development, including areas to the south and west of the site.	The additional eight viewpoint locations suggested by SNH at a meeting on 24 th March 2016 were considered for inclusion in the LVIA, in a long list of 50 locations considered in total. Chapter 6 assesses the visual effects on a representative selection of viewpoints, and key routes and settlements, but does not assess an exhaustive list of locations. Four of the locations suggested by SNH have been included in the final list for assessment as part of the LVIA. In addition, a series of wirelines are used to represent sequential views from along the Southern Upland Way (see Figures 6.34-6.39).
		Highlighted that Dumfries & Galloway Council request an additional 20 viewpoints be considered and used to inform the LVIA.	The additional viewpoint locations suggested by DGC were considered for inclusion in the LVIA, in a long list of 50 locations considered in total. Five of the locations suggested by D&GC have been included in the final list for assessment as part of the LVIA, and others are represented in a series of wirelines for locations along the Southern Upland Way (see Figures 6.34-6.39).
		Harry Burn Wind Farm proposal should be included in the CLVIA.	The CLVIA has included Harry Burn Windfarm. The assessment is presented in Chapter 6 and other windfarms considered in the assessment are shown in Figure 6.7 .
		Stated that the extent of former underground mine workings and mine wastes should be considered in the EIA, and that the application should include a detailed study of site geology to assess the impact of excavation on underlying geology.	The mining desk study is presented at Appendix 7.3 and referred to in Chapter 7: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils . This considers the extent and location of surface and underground workings, associated waste tips, processing areas and mine water discharges etc. It includes areas likely to be contaminated with lead (and other heavy metals) or contain potentially contaminating metal deposits that could be disturbed. It also includes a detailed review of past mining activities, location and extent of surface and underground mines and associated waste and processing areas, together with a review of the geology and hydrogeology of the area. The information has been used to identify any areas of particular concern to inform the layout design and subsequent assessment (see Chapter 3). The study is supplemented by Appendix 7.4 which presents a summary of the results for the initial monitoring visit (September 2016) and subsequent sampling undertaken in December 2016, and makes recommendations relating to the Development's design.
		Special consideration should be given to any possible impacts on identified private water supplies, groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTEs) and the wider water environment.	The assessment of effects on private water supplies, GWDTEs and the wider water environment is presented in Chapter 7 . Further details are provided in Appendices 7.5 and 7.6 .
		Recommended that the ES should contain a forestry specific chapter.	Information on the existing baseline forestry conditions and proposals for felling and replanting are included in Chapter 4: Scheme Description and Appendix 4.2 . Where relevant, the effect of forestry felling has been considered in the topic specific ES chapters.
		NATS should be consulted at the earliest opportunity.	NATS has been consulted in relation to the assessment of effects on aviation and details of

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
			consultation and findings of the assessment of potential effects on aviation are presented in Chapter 14: Other Issues .
		Glasgow Prestwick Airport should be consulted to establish potential effects on aviation interests.	Glasgow Prestwick Airport has been consulted in relation to the assessment of effects on aviation. Details of consultation and findings of the assessment of potential effects on its aviation operations are included in Chapter 14 .
		Unlicensed airfields and operators in the area of the proposed Development who may have an interest should be consulted.	An unlicensed airfield has been identified approximately 3.4km north of Development Area which is outwith the consultation zone (2km) for unlicensed airfields, as stipulated in CAA guidance. Chapter 14 provides more details.
		Emergency Service Helicopter Support Units should be consulted as they may operate in the area and be affected by the introduction of tall obstacles.	Airwave Solutions (who are responsible for emergency services) has been consulted. No concerns were raised.
		Advised that BT object to turbines 3 and 4 in relation to their proximity to microwave radio links. BT requires a 100m clearance of these links.	The design of the Development has taken into account the 100m buffer requested by BT. Details are provided in Chapter 3 and Chapter 14 .
		The EIA should be undertaken in accordance with the requirements set out in the new 2014 EIA Directive.	As the request for a Scoping Opinion was submitted to the Scottish Ministers before the amended Scottish Regulations of the new EIA Directive (2014/52/EU) come into force on 16 th May 2017, the application will be processed in accordance with the current EIA Regulations.
		Advised that the EIA considers potential effects on air quality.	An assessment of dust effects is included in Chapter 14 .
		An access strategy and effects on core paths should be considered as part of the EIA.	The EIA has considered the effects of the Development on access and recreation and the findings are presented Chapter 13: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation .
		Requested that Leadhills Community Council are notified and invited to attend future public exhibition events in relation to this proposal.	Leadhills Community Council has been notified of public consultation events through the EIA process.
		Recommended that an additional Scoping Opinion be sought should an application for consent not be submitted within 12 months. This would ensure that the content of the Scoping Opinion would be up-to-date.	The Scoping Opinion is dated 17 th May 2016. On this basis, if the application for S36 Consent is not submitted by 17 th May 2017, confirmation will be sought that the Scoping Opinion remains valid.
		Recommended engaging with LECU prior to reaching design freeze.	NLEI Ltd has engaged fully with the LECU throughout the EIA process.
Dumfries and Galloway Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO)	25 th February 2016	The site specific assessment should be carried out following the principles detailed in the assessment & Rating of Noise from Wind Farms ETSU Report ETSU-R-97, 1996.	The noise assessment has been undertaken in accordance with ETSU and the findings are presented within Chapter 11: Noise . Noise monitoring and assessment locations are shown in Figures 11.2 and 11.3 .
		The design of the wind farm should be such that cumulative noise levels at noise receptive properties is limited to 35dB or 5dB above background noise levels.	TNEI has liaised with D&GC EHO to discuss the noise limits for the Development. Cumulative noise levels of 35dB or 5dB above background levels have been adopted (see Chapter 11).
		Requested that a Construction Method Statement be included in EIA.	An outline Construction and Decommissioning Environment Management Plan (CDEMP) is presented at Appendix 4.3 .
Dumfries and Galloway Council Roads Service	15 th March 2016	Advised that approval should be obtained from Dumfries and Galloway Council Bridges and Structure Unit on the use of the B740 and B797 due to potential constraints.	JMP has consulted with Dumfries and Galloway Council to obtain specific views on the use of these routes. Details of this consultation are presented in Chapter 12: Access, Traffic and Transport .
		Recommended consulting with South Lanarkshire Council and Transport Scotland (TS).	JMP has consulted with South Lanarkshire Council and Transport Scotland to establish any specific requirements they may have (see Chapter 12).
		The access routes should be assessed in full and the extent of any necessary works identified and accompanied by swept path analysis.	Access investigations including swept path analysis have been undertaken by JMP and an abnormal loads assessment, including swept path drawings for identified pinch points, is

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
			presented in Appendix 12.1 .
		All necessary works to roads to accommodate abnormal loads should be done to the satisfaction of the planning authority in consultation with Transport Scotland.	It is expected that this will form a condition to any consent issued.
		Works to public roads should be reinstated following completion of construction.	It is expected that this will form a condition to any consent issued. Chapter 11 makes reference to dilapidation surveys and the reinstatement of temporary modifications.
		The ES should detail the volume of aggregate and vehicle movements associated with the use of onsite borrow pits so that any effects on importing aggregate, if necessary, can be assessed.	Chapter 4 provides a breakdown of the expected volume of stone that will be won on site as well as the volume of stone / aggregates that will be brought on to site.
		Consultation should be undertaken with the South of Scotland Timber Transport Officer to coordinate timber haulage operations that may use the proposed access routes and thus reduce cumulative traffic effects.	Consultation with the South of Scotland Timber Transport Officer will take place as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) process subject to planning consent being granted for the Development.
		A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is to be agreed is to be agreed in writing with the police and roads authorities.	An outline CTMP is provided at Appendix 12.2 .
Dumfries and Galloway Council Landscape Architect	16 th March 2016	The LVIA should be undertaken in accordance with GLVIA3 (2013) and with special particular reference to SHN's Siting and Design Guidance (2014) and up to date visualisation guidance.	The LVIA has been undertaken according to current guidance.
		Reference should be made to the Dumfries and Galloway Windfarm Landscape Capacity Study (DGWLCS) in the LVIA in terms of the baseline assessments, the sensitivities (summary and detail assessments), opportunities and constraints, and development guidance it sets out.	The DGWLCS has been used as a key reference document in Chapter 6 .
		The LVIA should fully assess all scenarios of potential cumulative effects in accordance with SNH guidance (2014)	It is noted that the SNH onshore wind cumulative guidance is dated 2012 rather than 2014 as stated in the Dumfries and Galloway Council response. The CLVIA has been undertaken in accordance with the SNH 2012 cumulative guidance.
		The proposal should be assessed against the potential impacts on the objectives of the Thornhill Uplands RSA designation and demonstrate the extent to which these can be addressed. They should also be assessed against LDP policy NE2 with respect to the landscape character and scenic interest for which the area has been designated.	The implications for designated landscapes has been undertaken in Chapter 6 . Designations within the wider area are also shown in Figure 6.4 . The Planning Statement provides an assessment of compliance of the Development against planning policy.
		Dumfries and Galloway Council's Technical Paper on Regional Scenic Areas is a key reference and should be considered in the LVIA.	The Technical Paper has been used as a key reference document for the assessment of the Development on designated landscapes (see Chapter 6).
		The effects on Drumlanrig Inventory Designed Landscape (IDL) and Eliock and Craigdarroch Non Inventory Designed Landscapes (NIDLs) should be assessed in accordance with policy HE6.	These designed landscapes are assessed in the operational assessment within Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage , and visualisations are presented in Figures 10.8, 10.9 and 10.12 . The Planning Statement provides an assessment of compliance of the Development against planning policy.
		The detailed study area should be 15km, taking in Upper Nithsdale and the surrounding uplands.	The LVIA has focussed on a detailed study area of 15km as a means of considering landscape and visual effects.
		The LVIA should address: Landscape: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host landscape character units. • Surrounding LCTs / LCUs within 15km. • Local landscape characteristics and any aspects of local distinctiveness, including any direct impacts and indirect on the setting and experience. • The setting of villages: Wanlockhead, Sanquhar, • The setting, value and experience of designated landscapes; notably Thornhill 	These landscape receptors and aspects have been considered in the LVIA. Visual receptors have been considered in the LVIA, and represented with a selection of 24 viewpoints as agreed through consultation with SNH, Dumfries and Galloway Council and South Lanarkshire Council (see Chapter 6).

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		<p>Uplands RSAs, Drumlanrig IDL, Eliock and Craigdarroch NIDL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forestry and woodland areas, including fell and restock areas and phasing, and planting associated with restoration. <p>Visual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential receptors: Wanlockhead, the Nithsdale settlements of Kirkconnel and Kelloholm, Sanquhar, Mennock, Carronbridge, Thornhill, Closeburn; dispersed settlement and properties around Upper Nithsdale, associated tributary glens, transitional upland slopes, such as around Sanquhar and Auchentaggart Moors. SUW long distance route, key tourist route. Travel: A76 main road and key tourist route, and Dumfries / Glasgow rail from Sanquhar west and partially through Mid Nithsdale. Quiet / minor road to south of valley between Mennock and Kelloholm. Tourist receptors, arts and education projects: Wanlockhead Mining Museum, Sanquhar town, including Museum, retail and accommodation facilities, Crawick Artland. Walking: Upper Nithsdale, the Lowther Hills, and Durisdeer are important areas for walking, including the SUW; a number of other core paths, promoted paths and heritage trails; quiet roads and lanes; and some key summits and high level viewpoints, Lowther, East Lowther Hills, and Cairnkinna Hills. Other recreation: horse riding, Sanquhar Golf Course, Drumlanrig Castle. Places of work: farmland, schools, mining areas, shopping streets and areas in Wanlockhead, Sanquhar, Kirkconnel and Kelloholm, Thornhill. Views from and to designated landscapes: Thornhill Uplands RSA, Drumlanrig Castle IDL, Eliock and Craigdarroch NIDLs. 	
		<p>Provided comment on the viewpoints included within the Scoping Report and included a list of additional requested viewpoints.</p>	<p>The additional viewpoint locations requested by Dumfries and Galloway Council have all been considered for inclusion in the LVIA, as part of a long list of 50 possible viewpoint locations. The 24 viewpoints selected for inclusion as part of the LVIA best represent the wide range of visual receptors and viewing experiences within the study area.</p>
		<p>Visualisations must be provided in accordance with SNH (2014 guidance) and LI (2011) guidance. Cumulative wirelines, with other existing, consented, in-planning windfarms / wind turbines labelled / numbered, and photomontages / cumulative photomontages, with existing and consented windfarms / wind turbines labelled / numbered to be provided in LVIA.</p>	<p>Visualisations (Figures 6.11-6.39) have been produced according to SNH Representation of Wind Farms (December 2014).</p>
		<p>Stated that inclusion of private residential properties is recommended within 2km of schemes as part of a residential visual amenity study.</p>	<p>The LVIA includes consideration of likely close views from locations such as residential properties within 2km of the nearest turbine (see Appendix 6.3).</p>
		<p>Recommended a review of all the identified viewpoints to decide on the most appropriate to do full assessments and visualisations for. All viewpoints should be site checked to help determine the most representative and worst case scenarios. This initial assessment could form an Appendix in the ES, and baseline photographs usefully provided to illustrate the key points.</p>	<p>As stated above, all suggested locations have been considered to select the best representative locations and this has been consulted on. All viewpoints have undergone desk based or site checks to ensure visibility and that they represent the maximum case scenario. The viewpoint selection process is detailed in Appendix 6.1.</p>
		<p>Visual receptors, and views that have been identified as unlikely to experience significant visual effects either at scoping or in establishing the baseline should not be included in the detail reporting but should be noted, with reasons given for their exclusion.</p>	<p>The LVIA has focussed on likely significant visual effects, and includes key locations where significant effects are unlikely, but that are of sufficient importance as to warrant their inclusion. Other locations excluded from the assessment have been included in Appendix 6.1.</p>
		<p>Stated that maintaining a cohesive and acceptable wind farm pattern and avoiding coalescence between clusters of wind farms are key LDP policy principles regarding strategic cumulative impacts, and must be tested in the LVIA cumulative assessment. Reference should be made to the DGC Technical Paper WE Interim Spatial Framework, criteria 4.10 and 4.11.</p>	<p>The CLVIA has considered the combined effects of the Development with other nearby windfarms. The existing cumulative landscape pattern has been a key consideration in the design of the Development (see Chapter 3).</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		<p>The CLVIA should address:</p> <p>Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative landscape effects on the host landscape character units, in combination with the wider pattern of WED, in terms of fit with and capacity of landscape character. Cumulative landscape effects on LCT 9 Nithsdale unit. Successive effects with WED to the south of Upper Nithsdale, and in combination with Sunnyside. The additional landscape effects of North Lowthers on the landscape character of the backdrop uplands, the upper dale. Cumulative landscape effects on the Thornhill Uplands RSA. Cumulative landscape effects on the settings of Sanquhar and Wanlockhead. <p>Visual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative visual effects on the visual receptors of Upper Nithsdale. Successive effects with WED to the south of Upper Nithsdale, and in combination with Sunnyside. The additional landscape and visual effects of North Lowthers surrounding, the upper dale. Cumulative visual effects on key summit viewpoints: Lowther (RSA) and East Lowther Hills (RSA), Cairnkinna (RSA), and Cloud Hill (SUW). Cumulative visual sequential effects for the A76, the B797, the B740, and the SUW. 	<p>The CLVIA considers the relationship of the Development with other windfarms in the surrounding landscape, for landscape and visual effects in accordance with SNH 2012 cumulative guidance (see Chapter 6).</p>
South Lanarkshire Council (SLC) Planning Services	4 th March 2016	SLC provided a list of policies, supplementary guidance and technical studies that should be taken into account in the ES and wind farm design.	The design layout and EIA has taken into account local planning policy and guidance pertaining to SLC where relevant.
		Raised the issue that micro-siting the turbines closest to the South Lanarkshire Council boundary may result in the development being located within both Dumfries and Galloway Council and South Lanarkshire Council administrative boundaries.	No turbines or associated infrastructure, including any micro-siting tolerance are proposed within SLC administrative boundary.
		Agreed to proposed viewpoints in South Lanarkshire subject to the provision of wirelines. Also propose that consideration be given to viewpoints from Glespin, Elvanfoot and Biggar.	<p>Glespin, Elvanfoot and Biggar have been considered for inclusion within the LVIA, however they were not included in the final list of viewpoints on the basis that Glespin has theoretical visibility of 3-4 tips only of the scoping layout, but these are likely to be screened by woodland along the Douglas Water; Elvanfoot has very limited theoretical visibility of the proposal, and screening by vegetation means that actual visibility is unlikely; Biggar has limited theoretical visibility, at over 28km from the proposal. While the proposal may be visible in good conditions from open locations above the settlement, effects are not likely to be significant. Views from Tinto Hill are assessed in the LVIA, albeit at higher elevation.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with SLC to confirm the set of viewpoints assessed in the LVIA.</p>
		The ES should fully assess cumulative landscape and visual effects of the development in accordance with SNH guidance, including any effects on South Lanarkshire. Existing, consented, applications and scoping schemes should be included where appropriate.	The CLVIA has given consideration of the effects that will be experienced in South Lanarkshire. Existing, consented and application schemes have been included and can be seen in Figure 6.7 .
		The ES should assess the effects on the qualifying interests of the Muirkirk and Lowther Uplands Special Protection Area (SPA) and Muirkirk Uplands Site of Special Scientific Interests (SSSI).	The ornithology assessment (Chapter 9: Ornithology) has assessed the potential effects of the Development on the SSSI within an EIA context, and the likely significant effects on the SPA within a Habitats Regulations context.
		Raised concerns regarding the hydrological impacts on peatland environment within South Lanarkshire. Comprehensive surveys should be carried out to determine effects on the peatland resource in South Lanarkshire.	No turbines or associated infrastructure are proposed within the South Lanarkshire Council administrative area. No peat probing has been undertaken outside the Development Area.
		Suggested that cumulative effects on biodiversity should be considered in the ES.	Cumulative assessments, occurring at the relevant geographical scales for ornithological and ecological are included in Chapter 8: Ecology and Chapter 9: Ornithology .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		The ES should include details of any habitat restoration or creation proposals.	Proposals for habitat restoration and/or enhancement are included in an Outline Conservation Management Plan (Appendix 8.6).
		The Council's Structure Section should be consulted with regards to structures along Access Options A, B and C.	JMP has consulted with the South Lanarkshire Council structures team to inform Chapter 12 .
		Effects of construction traffic on National Cycle Route 74 should be assessed in the ES.	Effects on recreation including nearby routes have been considered in Chapter 13 .
		Recommended that the developer carries out a structural assessment of the houses through Leadhills that are close to the road which may be affected by construction vehicle movements.	Access route C, via Leadhills, is no longer being proposed as part of the Development.
		A Traffic Management Plan should be submitted in support of the application.	An outline CTMP is included at Appendix 12.2 .
		Any proposed new junction must be designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and South Lanarkshire Council's Guidelines for Development Roads.	Figures 4.8a and 4.8b show the construction works required at Access A and B. Works to these junctions will be undertaken in accordance with the latest guidance and in consultation with Dumfries and Galloway Council.
		The ES should include details of abnormal load routes to site and anticipated construction traffic volumes.	Chapter 12 provides an overview of the abnormal load routes that are to be used during construction as well as the total volume of construction traffic over the construction programme. Appendix 12.1 provides an abnormal loads assessment.
		Details of forestry felling and implications for construction traffic, including vehicle movements and timescales to be included in ES.	Details of forestry felling (including timescales) are included in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4.2 . Construction traffic movements used in the traffic and transport assessment (Chapter 12) has included traffic associated with forestry felling.
		The developer should submit further details of the intended grid connection cable route in the ES.	The grid connection will be subject to a separate consenting process undertaken by the local grid operator as it does not form part of this S36 application and associated EIA.
		The ES should include an assessment of the tourism impact on the Southern Upland Way.	Effects on tourism, including effects on the Southern Upland Way have been assessed as part of the EIA and the findings presented within Chapter 13 . Chapter 6 also assesses the sequential visual effects on the SUW.
South Lanarkshire Council (SLC)/West of Scotland Archaeology Services (WoSAS)	4 th March 2016	Recommended that the cultural heritage Outer Study Area should be extended to 15km and should take into consideration designated and assets which are potentially candidates for designation (NSRs).	A 10km study radius from the outermost turbines has been used in the assessment of effects on setting as agreed with HES (see Chapter 10). No assets beyond 10km have been identified for assessment given that there is likely to be limited visibility of the Development, however an exception has been made in relation to Drumlanrig Castle and Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (IGDL), which has been included in the assessment at the request of HES and Dumfries and Galloway Council Archaeology Service (DGCAS). CFA has consulted with WoSAS but no response has been received to date.
South Lanarkshire Council (SLC) Environment Services	4 th March 2016	Requested that noise sensitive receptors within South Lanarkshire are included in the assessment.	TNEI consulted further with SLC in relation to noise sensitive receptors for inclusion within the EIA (see Chapter 11).
		Cumulative noise effects should be considered in the ES.	A cumulative noise assessment of all existing, proposed and consented windfarms in the area is included in Chapter 11 .
		The developer should consider the effects on wind shear and amplitude modulation of aerodynamic noise related the operation of the turbines. The turbine specification chosen for noise modelling must be representative of the installed turbines.	Effects of wind shear and amplitude modulation have been taken into account in line with current guidance as outlined in both ETSU-R-97 and the government endorsed IOA Good Practice Guidance. Details of the candidate turbine used in the assessment are set out in Chapter 11 .
East Ayrshire Council	9 th February 2016	Suggested that the cumulative visualisations for both viewpoints within East Ayrshire (New Cumnock and Cairn Table) should take a 360 degree view.	The two viewpoints in East Ayrshire (New Cumnock and Cairn Table) are represented by Figures 6.30a-c and 6.31a-e , which are compliant with SNH guidance. These also 360°

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
			cumulative wirelines.
		The LVIA should also consider a viewpoint from Blackcraig Hill.	Blackcraig Hill (NS 648 064) is illustrated in Figures 6.29a-d
		Recommended re-consulting East Ayrshire Council should the proportion of construction traffic routing through East Ayrshire change.	Noted.
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	24 th February 2016	Suggested that additional assessment viewpoints within 5km of the site, particularly to the south and west, would be useful to understand landscape and visual effects.	Eight additional viewpoint locations suggested by SNH at the meeting of 24 th March have been considered for inclusion in the LVIA, with four locations selected for the final list. The selection of viewpoints took account of SNH's request for locations within 5km of the Development Area and for viewpoints from the south and west.
		Requested further pre-application discussions as to how the wind farm design has responded to landscape and visual effects and bird survey findings.	Discussion took place on 24 th March 2015 with regards to the landscape and visual inputs to the design process.
		Stated that during the design of the wind farm, close attention should be paid to the content of SNH's guidance on Siting and Designing Wind farms in the Landscape (SNH 2014).	SNH guidance is a key reference document and has been taken into consideration in the Design Strategy (Chapter 3) and the Design and Access Statement.
		Highlighted that it will be important to provide assessment, and where relevant portrayal through visualisations, of the landscape and visual impacts of new tracks and ancillary infrastructure, such as the crane pads associated with turbine construction.	The LVIA assessment and visualisations represent the full development, including ground level infrastructure where visible (see Chapter 6).
		Advocated that the EIA and application contains clear and detailed plans (at suitably legible scales) of all track and ancillary infrastructure proposals, with clear supporting statements relating to their detailed design, construction process, landscape mitigation and restoration.	Noted.
		Acknowledged that the proposal could affect the bird interests of the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands Special Protection Area (SPA) and the North Lowther Uplands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) sites through collision mortality, disturbance and displacement. Suggested that there is a connection between the SPA, potentially resulting in a significant effect on the qualifying interest of the site. The assessment should demonstrate beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there would be no adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA, and should include consideration of cumulative impacts. There should also be assessment of impacts on the bird interests of North Lowther Uplands SSSI.	Chapter 9 assesses the potential effects of the Development on the SSSI within an EIA context, and the likely significant effects on the SPA within a Habitats Regulations context. In both cases consideration of adverse effects due to the Development and other relevant projects and activities within a suitable reference area are included in the cumulative assessment respectively, following SNH (2012) guidance.
		Agreed that the effects on other nearby designated sites can be scoped out of the EIA.	The rationale for scoping out potential effects on designated sites within the wider area is included within Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 .
		Agreed that proposed bird survey work is appropriate but suggested that some additional limited vantage point surveys in 2016 could be useful to understand hen harrier flight patterns around breeding locations.	Surveys undertaken during 2016 comprised a programme of scarce breeding bird surveys, with targeted vantage points designed to understand foraging distribution of hen harrier and other species. Flight activity surveys were undertaken at VP7, to fill a gap in coverage (this VP was not fully surveyed in the 2014 breeding season due to the possibility of disturbing breeding hen harrier). See Chapter 9 and Appendix 9.1 .
		Highlighted that information on limitations to undertaking vantage point surveys should be included in the EIA.	A section on survey limitations has been included in Chapter 9 .
Welcomed the consideration of habitat management or enhancement proposals.	A range of habitat management and enhancement measures are proposed and set out in Appendix 8.6 .		
Production of a deer assessment should be considered.	There are no hill/red deer herds within the Development Area and only Roe deer resident in the forestry blocks where deer pressure is monitored. The forestry blocks are part of the wider Queensberry Estate Deer Management plan, details of which are included in Chapter		

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
			8.
		Advised against scoping out effects on freshwater pearl mussels until detailed surveys are undertaken.	Freshwater pearl mussel (FWPM) habitat suitability surveys have been incorporated into the survey schedule and potential effects assessed accordingly and the findings presented within Chapter 8 .
		Agreed that great crested newts can be scoped out if there is no suitable habitats nearby.	The scoping out of this species was based on the lack of breeding habitat within the development area plus 500m buffer (e.g. waterbodies).
		Advised that the operational effects on bats should not be scoped out of the assessment given potential collision risk effects. The decision to scope out potential operational effects on other protected species should be taken following surveys in 2016.	The scoping out of operational effects on protected species is based on the assumption that there will be a species protection plan in place (draft version provided at Appendix 8.5). This does not include operational effects on bats which are considered in Chapter 8 .
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	23 rd February 2016	Stated that SEPA's responses to previous pre-application consultation should be taken into account.	Noted
		Raised concerns that large scale deep construction work may release further metal loadings into the catchment of Wanlock Water and Crawick Water, and that this must be fully considered prior to any development in the area.	A mining desk study is presented at Appendix 7.3 and details of the soil and water sampling undertaken to investigate the extent of contaminated land is presented at Appendix 7.4 . Consultation on the findings of the desk study and proposals for sampling was undertaken with SEPA in September 2016.
		The ES or planning submission should include a summary demonstrating how the development has been designed with regards to layout and mitigation to minimise release of CO2 and preventative/mitigation measures to avoid significant drying or oxidation of peat through, for example, the construction of access tracks, drainage channels, cable trenches, or the storage and re-use of excavated peat.	A carbon balance assessment is presented in Appendix 14.1 and is based on the latest Scottish Government carbon calculator. It uses site-specific data to determine carbon generation or losses caused by the development against carbon savings made relative to other forms of electricity generation. The outcome is presented as the pay-back period. A Soil and Peat Management Plan is presented at Appendix 4.4 . This provides details of the excavation volumes for various items of infrastructure and potential volumes for reuse of material across the Development Area.
		Requested that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey must be carried out in order to assess the potential risk to GWDTE and suggested the following survey distances: a) within 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m b) within 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m The survey distance should take into account any proposed micro-siting distance.	A National Vegetation Survey (NVC) has been conducted within the 100m and 250m buffers outlined, where effects could occur. The results of the NVC survey has been used to highlight habitats that fall under the GWDTE classification according to SEPA (2014). An assessment has then been made to determine the likelihood of groundwater dependency of each identified habitat. Results are presented in Chapter 8 and in Figures 8.2 and 8.3 .
		A National Vegetation Classification (NVC) Survey should be completed for any wetland identified.	As above.
		Stated that a detailed site risk assessment will be required in the following higher risk GWDTE situations: a) for proposed infrastructure within 250 m of GWDTE, where the infrastructure will require excavation deeper than 1m. b) for excavations within 100 m of GWDTE but shallower than 1m if the applicant will not accept a detailed long term monitoring planning condition.	Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE) have been mapped on Figure 8.3 and effects upon these are assessed in Chapter 7 , with appropriate mitigation and/or monitoring measures identified. SEPA GWDTE Guidance is noted.
		Stated that the ES should include a detailed peat depth map with infrastructure overlain and a table which contains details of proposed peat quantities and depths to be excavated and reused.	A suite of peat depth surveys has been undertaken, focussing on infrastructure locations (see Chapter 7). Peat depths across the Development Area relevant to the infrastructure are shown in Figures 7.5a-7.5e . The final design has taken account of peat constraints to minimise effects and excavation volumes.
		Production of a Peat Management Plan should be considered.	A Soil and Peat Management Plan is included at Appendix 4.4 .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		The ES should include details of any forestry felling to be undertaken and how this will be managed. Should fell to waste not relate to the improvement in peatland habitats, then the ES should justify the environmental benefit.	Details of forestry felling and replanting are included in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4.2 .
		Requested that all groundwater abstractions within the following distances of development need to be identified, in order to assess potential risk: a) within 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m; b) within 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m.	Public and private water supply data has been obtained, with this data reported in the Environmental Statement (Appendix 7.6). Abstraction data includes details of the source location, source type, location relative to infrastructure, potential linkage between source and the Development and appropriate alternative supply, mitigation and/or monitoring (as applicable).
		Stated that a detailed site risk assessment will be required in the following high risk groundwater abstraction situations: a) for proposed infrastructure within 250 m of groundwater abstractions, where the infrastructure will require excavation deeper than 1m. Typically, this includes borrow pits and turbine foundations but may include access roads and other infrastructure. b) for excavations within 100 m of groundwater abstractions but shallower than 1m if the applicant will not accept a detailed long term monitoring planning condition.	As above.
		Stated that engineering activities such as culverts, bridges, watercourse diversions, bank modifications or dams should be avoided unless there is no practicable alternative.	Site infrastructure will be developed with the intention of minimising construction activities within 50m of watercourses and only planning watercourse crossing structures at locations where there are no practical, alternative options available. Crossing structures and sizing will be designed in order to protect natural features of channels. Where existing structures can be used or upgraded, these will be given all due consideration. Typical bridge, culvert and open arch culvert structures are shown in Figures 4.10a-4.10c . Details of watercourse crossings are provided in Appendix 7.7 .
		A Flood Risk Assessment should be submitted with the application if engineering works are likely to lead to increased flood risk to property or people.	Flood risk is considered in Chapter 7 . Appropriate infrastructure design and good practice drainage measures are considered to attenuate any increases in runoff in local watercourses leading to downstream receptors. Therefore a flood risk assessment is not anticipated to be necessary.
		The ES should include details of all proposed engineering activities in the water environment. Photographs and details of engineering works, including justification for such activities and proposed mitigation should be included.	Where there is no feasible alternative and it is necessary to undertake engineering activities in the water environment, good practice measures shall be employed as part of the design and construction activities. Good practice measures are set out in Appendix 4.3 . The most likely engineering activity in the water environment will involve installation of new or upgraded watercourse crossing structures. Crossing structures are shown indicatively in Figures 4.10.a-c and further details of watercourse crossings are included in Appendix 7.7 .
		The ES should include details of any proposed private or public water abstractions.	Public and private water supply data has been obtained, with this data reported in Chapter 7 and Appendix 7.6 .
		A draft Schedule of Mitigation is recommended to accompany the ES and should detail pollution prevention and mitigation measures identified to avoid or minimise environmental effects. Principles of a CEMP should also be set out in the ES and should outline the way in which the Schedule of Mitigation will be implemented.	An outline CDEMP is included at Appendix 4.3 . Good practice construction methods to minimise effects on hydrology and soils are included therein.
		The ES should justify the use of borrow pits in line with SPP paragraph 243 and should provide a map and site specific plan of all those proposed onsite.	Proposed borrow pit details are included in Chapter 4 and shown in Figure 4.1 . Further details of the proposed borrow pit locations, dimensions and potential stone availability are presented in Appendix 4.1 .
		The ES should include an assessment of cumulative effects on the water environment.	Cumulative effects have been considered in Chapter 7 .
		Recommended consulting with the Environmental Health Officer of Dumfries and Galloway	The Dumfries & Galloway Environmental Health team have been contacted to obtain

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		Council.	information of private water supply sources and contaminated land information.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	24 th February 2016	Recommended that the ES includes consideration of cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets.	A cumulative assessment has been included in Chapter 10 .
		Recommended not scoping out direct impacts on heritage at the scoping stage and before the design of the final scheme.	Noted, the design of the Development has sought to avoid direct effects on cultural heritage features (see Chapter 3).
		Stated that preservation by record rather than preservation in situ is not a suitable mitigation strategy for designated assets of national importance.	All designated assets considered to be of national importance have been avoided through design (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 10).
		Direct impacts on the Wanlockhead lead mining and smelting Scheduled Monument should be avoided. The final design layout should take the effects on setting of this asset into consideration and the assessment should be illustrated by visualisations.	The scheduled area is not within the Development Area. The setting of Wanlockhead has been discussed with HES on site and has informed the design layout. LVIA VP3: Wanlockhead Museum (Figure 6.13) represents Wanlockhead SM, which has been used in the cultural heritage assessment.
		Direct and setting impacts should be avoided for Auchengruith Craig (Earthen Cross) Scheduled Monument.	No direct effects are likely as this asset is outwith the Development Area (Mennoch Pass). A photomontage from the location is provided (LVIA VP7; Figure 6.16) and an assessment of setting effects presented within Chapter 10 .
		The ES should consider effects on setting of Leadhills lead mining and smelting Scheduled Monument and the assessment should be illustrated by visualisations.	The scheduled area is excluded from the Development Area. The setting of Leadhills was discussed further with HES and their comments have informed the design of the Development. A detailed blade tip height ZTV is provided covering the two scheduled monuments: Wanlockhead and Leadhills (Figure 10.3).
		The ES should consider effects on setting of the Scot's Mining Company House garden and designed landscape and visualisations should be provided where necessary.	The final layout of the Development has resulted in no visibility from the Scot's Mining Company House IGDL as shown in Figure 10.3 .
		The ES should consider the effects on setting of Drumlanrig Castle Category A Listed Building, including on approach from the south, and garden and design landscape. Visualisations should accompany the assessment where necessary.	The setting of Drumlanrig Castle and its associated IGDL has influenced the design and is included in the setting assessment in Chapter 10 . Visualisations are provided (Figures 10.8 and 10.9; LVIA VP18 Figure 6.27a-e). A detailed blade tip height ZTV has been provided covering the Drumlanrig Castle IGDL (Figure 10.7).
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	3 rd February 2016	Objected to the location of a number of turbines due to there being potential for interference with two radio links which cross the site.	Detailed coordination assessment has been undertaken and details are presented in Chapter 14 along with proposed mitigation.
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	4 th February 2016	Suggested that consultation be undertaken with NATS, MoD/DIO and Glasgow Prestwick Airport.	Consultation has been undertaken with NATS, MoD/DIO and Glasgow Prestwick Airport and details are provided in Chapter 14 .
		Highlighted potential for unlicensed airfields – recommended contacting local planning authority or use of aeronautical chart.	An unlicensed airfield has been identified approximately 3.4km north of the Development Area which is outwith the consultation zone for unlicensed airfields (2km) as advised by the CAA.
		Recommended consultation with emergency services. Stated that the CAA require all structures above 150m to be fitted with safety lighting.	Airwave Solutions contacted for information to inform EIA. Subsequent assessment undertaken and no effects considered likely (see Chapter 14). Requirement for aviation lighting to be confirmed following consent.
British Telecom (BT)	1 st February 2016	Stated that there are two BT links that cross this site which will be affected by turbines 3 & 4 and therefore object to the proposal.	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		Highlighted that BT require, ideally, a 100m minimum clearance from blade tips to links.	The design of the Development has avoided these links by at least 100m (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 14)
National Air Traffic Services (NATS)	3 rd February 2016	Provided general guidance regarding the potential impact upon NATS infrastructure and operations.	Noted.
		Recommended engagement with NATS should aviation issues be anticipated.	Consultation with NATS is ongoing regarding the potential mitigation solution (details included in Chapter 14).
Visit Scotland	3 rd February 2016	Recommended that any potential detrimental impact of the proposed development on tourism be identified and considered in full in the EIA, and suggested the production of a Tourist Impact Statement.	Effects on tourism is assessed in Chapter 13 .
Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS)	5 th February 2016	Requested that a separate forestry chapter be included in the ES and that early engagement during the drafting of such is undertaken to ensure that all relevant issues are addressed.	Engagement with FCS has been undertaken during the design process in relation to the felling/replanting proposals for the Development. Information on the existing baseline forestry conditions and proposals for felling and replanting are included in Chapter 4, Figures 4.11-4.13 and Appendix 4.2 .
The Crown Estate	12 th February 2016	Confirmed that the assets of The Crown Estate would not be affected by the development.	Noted.
The British Horse Society (BHS)	12 th February 2016	Requested that all tracks, paths and long distance routes are multi-use and remain accessible to non-motorised users as much as possible during construction and operation of the development.	Details of the way in which the Development will affect nearby recreational routes during construction and operation as well as deliver additional benefits are included in Chapter 13 .
		Expects turbine siting to respect all existing equestrian access, and to consider opportunities for development of further access wherever possible.	
The Mountaineering Council of Scotland (MCofS)	16 th February 2016	Stated that the proposed viewpoints should give a reasonable representation of the visual impact of the proposed development upon mountaineering interests, specifically viewpoints 1, 4, 10, 11, 16.	MCofS support for these viewpoints has been taken into account during viewpoint selection. Further details are provided in Appendix 6.1 .
		Disagreed that Viewpoint 11: Cairn Table, at approximately 12km north-west, represents a 'distant view' of a development with the size of turbine proposed.	Views from Cairn Table are illustrated in Figure 6.31a-e . It is considered that this represents distant views seen by walkers from the north-west, and is used to examine cumulative effects.
		Suggested that cumulative landscape and visual effects will be a significant consideration given the location of the site in relation to other wind farm developments.	Cumulative effects are considered in the CLVIA (Chapter 6).
		Recommended the inclusion of a cumulative ZTV in the ES.	Cumulative ZTVs are provided in Figures 6.8-6.10 .
		Recommended that the MCofS report titled, 'Wind Farms and Changing Mountaineering Behaviour in Scotland' (MCofS, March 2014) should be referred to when considering the potential effects on tourism and recreation.	The tourism assessment (Chapter 13) has taken into account the latest guidance and studies on the effects of windfarm development on tourism.
		Recommended that sequential analysis of wind farm visibility over the full length of the Southern Upland Way would be a useful contribution to the assessment of cumulative impact on tourism resources in Southern Scotland.	Sequential effects on the SUW have been considered in the LVIA in agreement with SNH and views are represented in Figures 6.34-6.39 .
Scottish Water	22 nd February	Highlighted that there are no Scottish Water drinking water abstraction sources or wider drinking water catchments in the area.	Noted.
		Highlighted that there is Scottish Water infrastructure located at the periphery of the site boundary near Sanquhar and at Wanlockhead, and in proximity to the roads proposed to be	The design has evolved and no site access is now planned in close proximity to either Sanquhar or Wanlockhead settlements where Scottish Water infrastructure is present.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		used for access to the site. Recommended that the location of Scottish Water assets is confirmed through obtaining detailed plans from Scottish Water Asset Plan Providers.	
		Should asset conflicts be identified, further consultation with the Scottish Water Asset Impact Team (AIT) will be necessary.	Noted.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	24 th February 2016	Raised concerns in relation to the potential impact of the development on the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands Special Protection Area (SPA) and North Lowther Uplands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which feature breeding hen harrier, short-eared owl, merlin, peregrine, golden plover and non-breeding hen-harrier.	Chapter 9 assesses the potential effects of the Development on the SSSI within an EIA context, and the likely significant effects on the SPA within a Habitats Regulations context. There are no historic records of breeding raptors within 2km of the SPA boundary and so it is unlikely that any territories of SPA birds will be affected.
		The ES should include consideration of alternative sites and justify the location of the proposed site.	Details and justification of why the Development Area was selected is included in Chapter 3 .
		Recommended increasing the distance of the wind farm to the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA.	As a result of consideration of ornithological effects during the design process, the closest turbine is now over 1km from the SPA boundary. This is considered to remove disturbance-displacement effects on any SPA nest sites.
		Stated that where targeted felling of forestry is required that this should take into account breeding birds and should be scheduled outwith the breeding season.	It is assumed that a Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP) will be agreed in consultation with SNH in advance of construction under the terms of an appropriate planning condition. This plan will ensure that all necessary measures are taken to avoid disturbance to breeding birds and to avoid damage to, or destruction of, nest sites.
		Suggested that the cumulative assessment on the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA should extend to all other relevant development types, not just wind farms.	Cumulative effects on SPA bird populations are assessed in Chapter 9 .
		Stated that deep peat (>0.5m) should be avoided and that opportunities for peatland restoration should be considered.	Peat probing surveys have been conducted and areas of deeper peat avoided where practically possible (see Chapter 7).
		Advised that the latest SNH guidance on collision risk should be followed.	Noted.
		Stated that golden plover has been known to breed within the proposed development site in recent years, e.g. on Middle Moor and Snarhead Hill (personal observation).	Details of breeding bird surveys and results are provided in Chapter 8 .
		Highlighted that peregrine, a qualifying species of the SPA, has also bred at several places within the site in the past.	Data has been provided by the Dumfries & Galloway Raptor Study Group, which show locations of breeding sites for peregrine and other key raptor species over the last 12 years, both within the Development Area and nearby. This information is considered in Chapter 9 .
		Highlighted that a minimum buffer distance of 500m between black grouse leks and turbines will be required.	Avoidance of central location of black grouse leks by at least 500m and deletion of turbines from the more important areas of the Development Area for black grouse has been taken into consideration in the design.
		Vantage Point surveys should allow adequate coverage of potential flights between the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA and the site and individual vantage point flights should be numbered on maps.	VPs were distributed widely across the Development Area, including some that are in close proximity of the SPA to the north (see Figures 9.3 and 9.4).
		Stated that the locations of proposed turbines 41 and 42 appear to have been overlooked during one breeding season.	Further surveys were undertaken during the 2016 breeding season to close this gap. These turbine locations were subsequently removed from the Development as part of the design layout process.
		All breeding bird surveys should be undertaken in accordance with the methods specified in Bird Monitoring Methods (Gilbert et al, 1998), and according to the latest SNH guidance (with special reference to SPAs).	The latest survey and assessment guidance has been used (see Chapter 9).

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
		All potential effects on the SPA qualifying species should be considered.	Effects of the development on the qualifying species of the SPA have been considered within a Habitats Regulations context.
Ministry of Defence (MoD)/ Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)	24 th February 2016	Stated that the DIO has no objection to the wind farm.	Noted.
		Requested that the perimeter turbines should be fitted with 25 candela omni-directional red lighting or infrared lighting and that the cardinal turbines should be fitted with 25 candela and infrared lighting	Turbines will be fitted with lighting as required, and it is possible that this will be specified through a condition to consent.
		Recommended that the DIO is consulted again following any changes to the design layout.	The MoD/DIO will be consulted again at the application stage.
Transport Scotland	23 rd February 2016	The traffic and transport assessment in the ES should take into account a worst case scenario whereby construction material cannot be sourced from onsite borrow pits.	The traffic and transport assessment (Chapter 12) considers a worst case construction traffic scenario.
		The ES should also include an assessment of effects on road users should junctions be affected.	The effects of construction traffic on driver delay have been assessed.
		The traffic and transport assessment should consider cumulative effects.	Cumulative effects have been assessed for other developments which may utilise any sections of the road network required for the Proposed Development.
		Suggested that the provision of traffic volume estimates on a month by month basis in the ES highlighting any overlapping construction periods associated with other cumulative developments.	A full programme of vehicle movements for the Development is provided in Chapter 12 . The suggested approach of overlapping with cumulative developments at planning application stage is onerous at pre-application stage. One of the measures in the TMP (Appendix 12.2) is to ensure that major traffic generating activities associated with other development do not coincide. This will be investigated further at the construction stage.
		The ES should detail any foreseen decommissioning processes that could lead to traffic and transport effects.	An assessment of the decommissioning of the Development has not been undertaken as part of the EIA as: i) the future baseline conditions (environmental and other developments) cannot be predicted accurately at this stage and ii) the proposals for refurbishment / decommissioning are not known at this stage. However, details on proposed decommissioning activities and how these will be managed are included in Appendix 4.3 .
		The ES should provide full details of proposed accesses where they relate to the public road network.	Chapter 4 includes details of the proposed access points A and B.
		The noise assessment should consider trunk road receptors during construction where necessary.	The noise assessment (Chapter 11) takes into account the affect of increased traffic movements on noise levels on receptors along the proposed traffic route.
		The noise assessment should take into account worst case scenario traffic movements should borrow pits not be available onsite.	The noise assessment has taken into account the worst case construction traffic scenario as presented in Chapter 12 .
		The ES should include an assessment of noise effects of operational traffic unless it can be demonstrated that this is not necessary.	An assessment of noise effects from operational traffic has not been undertaken given that the most intensive level of noise generated by traffic will be during construction.
		The ES should include an assessment of cumulative noise effects.	Cumulative noise effects are considered in Chapter 11 .
The ES should consider the effects on air quality with reference to DMRB and in the Environmental Protection UK "Development Control: Planning for Air Quality" publication.	The effects of dust generated from construction activities is included in Chapter 14 .		
Dirt and dust effects should be scoped into the EIA.			
Marine Scotland	23 rd February	The ES should include details of all water quality, macroinvertebrate and fish population surveys and proposed monitoring programmes.	Survey methods and results of the fisheries, invertebrates and freshwater pearl mussel surveys are outlined within Appendix 8.4 .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
	2016	Effects on water quality as a result of felling should be considered.	Consideration of effects on water quality as a result of construction activities is included in Chapter 7 . Good practice measures to minimise effects on hydrology and surface water are included in Appendix 4.3 .
		The ES should consider cumulative effects on water quality, taking into consideration nearby lead mining and hydro schemes and other wind farm developments.	Cumulative effects on water quality are assessed in Chapter 7 .
		Recommended consulting with The Nith District Salmon Fishery Board.	Nith District Salmon Fishery Board conducted fish and freshwater pearl mussel surveys on watercourses within and draining the Development Area during summer 2016. Survey methods and results are outlined in Appendix 8.4 .
		Effects on fish populations should be avoided through site specific mitigation and monitoring programmes throughout the development.	The results of the fish surveys have been incorporated into the design layout by avoidance of watercourses where possible.
Leadhills Community Council	23 rd February 2016	The ES should include details of alternative sites considered.	Details and justification of why the Development Area was selected is included in Chapter 3 .
		Consideration should be given to community ownership.	Consultation on the geographical extent and distribution of the community benefit is ongoing although the existence of the Trust established by Sanquhar and Kirkconnel and Kelloholm Community Councils is noted as a potential vehicle for administration of funds (see Chapter 13).
		Cumulative landscape and visual effects to be considered in the ES.	Chapter 6 considers cumulative landscape and visual effects.
		The residential visual amenity study should take into account effects from properties in Leadhills.	The LVIA includes consideration of likely close views from locations such as residential properties within 2km of the nearest turbine (see Appendix 6.3).
		The ES should consider the effects of the proposal on the local economy of Leadhills.	The effects of the Development on the local economy is considered in Chapter 13 .
		The ES should consider the effects of lead pollution should lead deposits be disturbed.	A mining desk study is presented at Appendix 7.3 and details of the soil and water sampling undertaken to investigate the extent of contaminated land is presented at Appendix 7.4 . Consultation on the findings of the desk study and proposals for sampling were undertaken with SEPA in September 2016.
		The effects of forestry felling should be included in the ES.	Details of forestry felling and replanting are included in Chapter 4, Figures 4.11-4.12 and Appendix 4.2 . Where relevant, the effects of forestry felling is included in the assessments.
		The ES should include details of how siting infrastructure on peat has been avoided.	Peat surveys have been undertaken within the Development Area, to identify peat depth and characteristics to inform the design and assessment. Details are included in Chapter 7 and Appendix 4.4 .
		Otter, red squirrel, newt and water vole surveys should be undertaken to inform the EIA.	These species are considered in the ecology assessment (Chapter 8).
		Raised concerns in relation to Access Option C in relation to safety, noise and disturbance caused by construction traffic.	Access Point C is no longer being considered.
		Further surveys are recommended to establish where bats hibernate.	Chapter 8 considers the effects of the Development on bats, and survey details are provided in Appendix 8.3 and Figures 8.6-8.9 .
		Raised concerns in relation to focussing on existing ecological baseline conditions rather than changing ecological conditions.	The ecology assessment has considered the existing baseline conditions based on the most up to date field surveys being conducted specifically for this EIA.
		Requested that an assessment of the significance of the noise impact of the Development in accordance with the Environmental Impact Regulations (as well as an ETSU assessment) and an assessment of the risk of amplitude modulation be undertaken.	Noise effects and amplitude modulation have been taken into account in Chapter 11 in line with current guidance as outlined in both ETSU-R-97 and the government endorsed IOA Good Practice Guidance.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
Wanlockhead Village Council	24 th February 2016	Harry Burn Windfarm should be considered when assessing cumulative effects.	Harry Burn Windfarm has been included in the CLVIA.
		Suggest the inclusion of a number of additional assessment viewpoints.	Additional viewpoint locations suggested have been considered alongside the locations already identified for inclusion in the LVIA. The LVIA assesses the visual effects on a representative selection of viewpoints, and key routes and settlements, and have been agreed with SNH and the relevant local planning authorities.
		The design of the wind farm should take into account old mine workings and effects in relation to mine disturbance should be considered.	A mining desk study is presented at Appendix 7.3 and details of the soil and water sampling undertaken to investigate the extent of contaminated land is presented at Appendix 7.4 . Consultation on the findings of the desk study and proposals for sampling were undertaken with SEPA in September 2016.
		The effects of forestry felling should be included in the ES.	Forestry effects are considered in the relevant topic chapters.
		Effects of peat disturbance should be assessed.	Peat surveys have been undertaken within the Development Area to identify peat depth and characteristics to inform the design and assessment. Details are included in Chapter 7 and Appendix 4.4 . Carbon-rich soil mapping published by SNH has been used to inform the assessment process. This is a national dataset that includes both South Lanarkshire Council and Dumfries & Galloway Council areas. Defined classes of carbon-rich soils have been identified in relation to the Development Area. Site peat data has been used in the peat stability risk assessment (see Appendix 7.2) (following Scottish Government Peatslide Risk Assessment guidance), preparation of a peat management plan (Appendix 4.4
		Further surveys are recommended to establish where bats hibernate. Surveys of the moors should also be undertaken to establish bat presence.	The hibernation roost detailed in the scoping response is located approximately 1km away from the closest turbine/infrastructure. Structures within the turbine envelope, plus a minimum of 200m, have been assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats. Potential roost features are considered in Chapter 8 . Details of bat activity surveys are provided in Appendix 8.3 and shown in Figures 8.6-8.9 .
		Raised concerns in relation to focussing on existing ecological baseline conditions rather than changing ecological conditions.	The ecology assessment has considered the existing baseline conditions based on the most up to date field surveys being conducted specifically for this EIA.
		Effects on palmate newt, brown hare and other protected species to be considered in ES.	The methods and results of the protected species survey results are outlined within Appendix 8.2 . Palmate newts and brown hare are only given limited protection under the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 (as amended). For palmate newts this applies to protection against sale, barter, exchange, transporting for sale and advertising to sell or to buy. The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011 introduced closed seasons for the killing or taking of wild hares. Therefore no targeted surveys were undertaken for these species.
		Effects on badgers, otters, hedgehogs and red squirrel should be assessed.	Protected species recorded during baseline surveys are assessed in Chapter 8 .
		Requested that an assessment of the significance of the noise impact of the Development in accordance with the Environmental Impact Regulations (as well as an ETSU assessment) and an assessment of the risk of amplitude modulation be undertaken.	Noise effects and amplitude modulation has been taken into account in line with current guidance as outlined in both ETSU-R-97 and the government endorsed IOA Good Practice Guidance.
Raised concerns in relation to Access Option C in relation to safety, noise and disturbance caused by construction traffic.	Access Point C is no longer being considered.		
Suggested that The National Association of Mining History Organisations (NAMHO) be consulted.	NAMHO promotes mining history. Information requested from Coal Authority and The Museum of Lead Mining, Wanlockhead are referenced in Appendix 7.3 .		
Raised concerns in relation to shadow flicker.	Shadow flicker has been scoped out of the EIA, the reasons for which are provided in		

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response/Action taken in the ES
			Chapter 14.
		Raised concerns in relation to maintaining tourism and recreational opportunities.	An assessment of the effects of the Development on tourism and recreational resources is included in Chapter 13.
		Suggested that Wanlockhead Community Centre Committee, The Ramblers Association, the National Trust and the British Gold Panning Association be consulted.	Details of consultation undertaken to inform the socio-economic assessment is set out in Chapter 13.
ScotWays	4 th March 2016	Provided details of Rights of Way and other routes within the site boundary.	Noted, these have been mapped to inform the layout design and considered in the assessment of recreational effects in Chapter 13.
		Advised that a minimum distance equivalent to the tip height of turbines is maintained in relation to public paths and a larger separation distance between turbines and the Southern Upland Way than would normally be required for other paths.	A minimum distance of 150m from turbines to the SUW has been maintained as part of the design process.
		Stated that there should be sufficient coverage of viewpoints important to recreational access when assessing landscape and visual amenity effects.	The LVIA has assessed the visual effects on a representative selection of viewpoints, and key routes and settlements. Reasons for the selection of viewpoints are included in Appendix 6.1. Visual representation of sequential views along the SUW are provided in Figures 6.34-6.39.
		The cumulative landscape and visual amenity effects on the Southern Upland Way should be included in the ES.	The CLVIA assesses the sequential visual effects of the Development in combination with other windfarms on the SUW (see Chapter 6.)
Lowther Hills Ski Club Community Interest Company	25 th February 2016	Requested that the Ski Club be contacted for information to inform the EIA.	Consultation with the Ski Club is set out in Chapter 13.
		Raised concerns in relation to the effects that the proposal will have on the visual experience of skiers from Lowther Hill.	Lowther Hill is included as a viewpoint (VP06) for assessment in Chapter 6.
		Suggested that a viewpoint from the B797 should be chosen to assess visual effects.	The B797 is represented by a viewpoint in Wanlockhead (VP04: Upper Wanlockhead – Figure 6.14) and a viewpoint on the Mennock Pass (VP07: Mennock Pass – Figure 6.16) near the Earthen Cross, further south. A sequential assessment of the Mennock Pass is undertaken as part of the LVIA.
		Cumulative effects of the development should be assessed.	Cumulative landscape and visual effects of the Development are assessed in Chapter 6.
		The effects of the proposal on local tourism should be assessed in the EIA.	Effects on tourism are assessed in Chapter 13.
Leadhills Parent Teacher Council (PTC)	22 nd February 2016	Raised concerns with access route C due to it being near Leadhills Primary School.	Access C is no longer being proposed as part of the Development.
		Raised concerns regarding the potential noise and vibration effects in Leadhills town centre as a result of construction traffic.	
Southern Uplands Partnership (SUP)	11 th March 2016	No specific comments offered but advised that the SUP have no direct responsibility for the SUW. Recommended that local councils, who maintain the route in the vicinity of the wind farm, be consulted.	Noted. A meeting was held with Dumfries and Galloway Council access officer on 25/08/2016 in relation to access across the Development Area, including use of the SUW and potential enhancement opportunities.

Table 2.2: Gatecheck Responses

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
<p>South Lanarkshire Council (SLC) Planning Services</p>	<p>24th October 2016</p>	<p>The approach to the CLVIA is welcomed and for clarity the proposed Harryburn Wind Farm requires to be included in the assessment and in visualisations. Acknowledged that RWE (Innogy) are at a similar stage to 2020 Renewables and are working towards design freeze. Contact should be made to discuss the appropriate time to exchange information.</p> <p>The Gatecheck report does not refer to the issue raised relating to the proposed development located adjacent to the Leadhills and Lowther Hills Special Landscape Area (SLA). The ES requires to fully assess the effects on Leadhills and Lowther Hills SLA. South Lanarkshire Validating Local Landscape Designations 2010 identifies those areas of South Lanarkshire covered by local landscape designations. It should be recognised at the design stage that the area is more sensitive to wind energy development and the qualities for which the SLA is designated require to be taken into account in the ES.</p>	<p>Harryburn Windfarm is included in the CLVIA and visualisations where relevant.</p> <p>The implications for designated landscapes has been assessed in the LVIA (Chapter 6). Landscape sensitivities have been taken into account in the design process.</p>
		<p>A peat survey undertaken prior to submission of the application to inform design and proposed mitigation measures is welcomed. It is understood that no turbines or associated infrastructure are within SLC and this is due to landowner boundaries. However turbines (T32- T35) and their associated infrastructure are located approximately 100m from the administrative and landownership boundary.</p> <p>It is noted that in the response 'deep peat' appears to be the main concern. However the original issue raised is in relation to all peatland depths and not just areas of deep peat. For clarification the Council requires the ES to fully assess the impact of the proposal on all peatlands.</p> <p>To accord with Scottish Planning Policy (Group 2 Areas of Significant Protection) the effects of carbon rich soils/peatland must be assessed and clearly demonstrated that all significant effects on the qualities of these areas can be substantially overcome through siting, design or other mitigation. This includes areas outwith the site boundary where potential effects are likely on carbon rich soils/peatland.</p> <p>The South Lanarkshire Spatial Framework Map 1 identifies carbon rich soils/peatland class 1 (taken from SNH carbon-rich soil, deep peat and priority peatland habitats map) at the eastern boundary of the proposed site within South Lanarkshire area between Slough Hill and Sown Hill. It is likely that these peatlands cross into the application site.</p> <p>In addition to assessing carbon rich soils/peatlands, the ES also requires to assess areas of peat which are not covered by any designations and require to be subject to good on-site peat management practices to ensure minimum carbon loss. A draft Peat Management Plan should be included in the assessment.</p> <p>A Peat Slide Risk Assessment should also be provided to assess the potential effects of peat slide and the implications of this if it were to impact outwith the landownership boundary.</p> <p>It is also acknowledged that the Applicant's response to SEPA's comments state that a Carbon Balance Report will be undertaken and that a Soil and Peat Management Plan shall be prepared. This is welcomed. SEPA's scoping response also states the survey distances for GWDTE. Potential impacts may be outwith application boundary and require to be fully assessed.</p>	<p>Peat surveys have been undertaken within the development area, to identify peat depth and characteristics to inform the design and assessment. Details are included in Chapter 7 and Appendix 4.4.</p> <p>Carbon-rich soil mapping published by SNH has been used to inform the assessment process. This is a national dataset that includes both South Lanarkshire Council and Dumfries & Galloway Council areas.</p> <p>Site peat data has been used in the peat stability risk assessment (see Appendix 7.2) (following Scottish Government Peatslide Risk Assessment guidance), preparation of a peat management plan (Appendix 4.4) and for carbon balance reporting for the Development (see Appendix 14.1).</p> <p>Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTE) have been identified by project ecologists and applicable locations assessed in relation to potential groundwater influence from the Development, which could extend beyond the Development Area. An assessment on GWDTEs is included in Chapter 7 and further details are provided in Appendix 7.5.</p>
		<p>Early consultation with SLC Bridges and Structures Section is recommended to ensure that any potential issues with structures can be mitigated and that the</p>	<p>JMP met with the structures team from SLC to discuss the mitigation measures required to support abnormal loads (see Chapter 12).</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
		<p>ES clearly demonstrates the proposed solution. It has been highlighted that there is a structure on the B740 that has been previously assessed for another wind farm development as being unable to accommodate abnormal loads (Birkcleugh Bridge).</p>	
		<p>Welcomed the inclusion of an overview of abnormal load routes to be used within the ES. However the original issue raised required that details of all construction traffic volumes are provided in the ES. Not just traffic related to abnormal loads. It is noted that Access route C via Leadhills is no longer being proposed as part of the Development. For clarification no construction traffic or abnormal loads should use the route via Leadhills due to the issues previously discussed in terms of health and safety, structural effects on houses and conflict with pedestrians.</p> <p>The SLC Scoping response under Roads and Transportation sets out further detail than is reflected in the Gatecheck report. The ES requires to take cognisance of these details.</p> <p>It is also noted that further discussions are to take place with SLC Roads and Transportation as the proposed access is through South Lanarkshire from M74. From the initial discussions it noted that major works are required to facilitate the transportation of abnormal loads through Crawfordjohn village. All works required as part of the proposed wind farm development including the proposed bypass require to be assessed in the ES to allow for full consideration. In addition to the technical information required on the proposed bypass, the effects on landscape and visual, ecology, archaeology, ground conditions (this list is not exhaustive) require to be fully assessed in the ES. We would welcome visualisations of the proposed bypass to be included in the ES.</p> <p>To ensure the access is deliverable, evidence is required to demonstrate that the applicant has control of the required areas of land.</p>	<p>The effects of traffic volumes associated with the construction stage have been assessed in Chapter 12. The maximum-case month in terms of traffic volumes has been used as a worst case scenario.</p> <p>Since the scoping stage, JMP has met with the Roads / Transportation teams from both South Lanarkshire Council and Dumfries and Galloway Council to discuss the abnormal load routes and the access locations. JMP also met with the structures team from South Lanarkshire Council to discuss the mitigation measures required to support abnormal loads.</p> <p>No construction related traffic will access the Development Area using the previously considered access point C which would have required construction traffic to exit the A74(M)(T) at Junction 13 before utilising the A702 Edinburgh Road and the B797.</p> <p>Chapter 12 has considered South Lanarkshire's comments as set out in their scoping response, and provides outline details of the new section of road required to support the movement of construction traffic to site through Crawfordjohn. More details are provided in Appendix 12.1.</p> <p>However, the additional short section of access track required through a single field in Crawfordjohn is not part of the Section 36 application and will be subject to a stand-alone planning application to South Lanarkshire Council if this is the route that is progressed. There is no requirement for a commercial agreement to be in place between an applicant and landowner to allow an application to be determined.</p>
		<p>Traffic volumes related to forestry felling should also be provided in the ES and require to be taken into account in the Transportation Assessment. Required details set out in SLC Scoping Response 4 March 2016.</p>	<p>The assessment of traffic related effects during construction has taken into consideration traffic volumes associated with forestry felling (see Chapter 12).</p>
		<p>Further discussion with SLC Archaeology Advisors (WOSAS) is required. A 10km study radius is proposed however clarification on the agreement of the study area is required from WOSAS as the Scoping Response refers to potential of outer study area extending up to 15km.</p> <p>It is recommended that further discussion is required with WOSAS to agree the parameter of the assessment. In particular assessing 'other features'.</p> <p>It is important to highlight that there are two aspects to assessing the heritage significance and the contribution of setting. It is recognised that the setting of the assets make to their heritage significance is an essential part of the assessment of potential impact on the historic environment. In addition to this assessment, a separate assessment is to assess the potential impacts on the landscape setting of these assets themselves, rather than on the impact changes to the setting might make to the heritage significance of the asset. It maybe that the heritage assessment concludes there may be changes to the setting of an asset. Once the changes are applied to the heritage asset, does that change the significance of the asset? What is the effect on the heritage asset as a result of the change in the landscape which is founded in its heritage?</p> <p>It is considered that the effects on setting of the Scot's Mining Company House</p>	<p>CFA consulted with WoSAS via letter on 03/08/2016 but have to date received no response. This was followed up with a reminder on 19/09/2016, but no response has been received. A further reminder was sent on 31/10/2016.</p> <p>Consultation with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has confirmed that 10km is an acceptable study area for considering effects on setting.</p> <p>The proposed approach to assessing effects on setting has been to consider the impact on the landscape setting of the assets before any judgement is made regarding the effect on the heritage significance of affected assets.</p> <p>Scots Mining House: there is no predicted visibility from this asset as can be seen in Figure 10.3.</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
		garden and designed landscape should be assessed and visualisations should be provided. It is recognised that visibility may be limited however the ES requires to fully assess and demonstrate the potential effects.	
		The ES should set out the JRC detailed assessment and any mitigation measures proposed.	Information on the Detailed Coordination Assessment undertaken by JRC is included in Chapter 14 .
		The ES requires to set out the aviation lighting required. If visible lighting is required, the likely effects of the proposed lighting require to be fully assessed and visualisations provided.	It is not anticipated that visible aviation lighting will be required due to the reduced tip height of 149m. Infrared aviation lighting requirements will be agreed post consent and may be required as a condition.
		The ES requires to address the issue of T3 and T4 which impact on BT links.	The design of the Development has taken into account the 100m buffer requested by BT in relation to T3 and T4 (see Chapter 14).
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	21 st October 2016	Acknowledged DIO's advice on visible turbine lighting. Advised that there could be significant environmental effects arising from requirements for visible lighting of turbines and that clear information on the specific visible lighting requirements and assessment of the potential impacts should be presented as part of the EIA.	It is not anticipated that visible turbine lighting will be required as the tip height is below 150m.
		Recommended that the latest SNH guidance is used to inform surveys/assessments and that the SNH ES pre-submission checklist should be used to inform the gatecheck process.	Noted.
		Advised that it is possible that SNH will object to the Development on landscape and visual grounds.	Noted.
		Confirmed that SNH is content without a formal round table gatecheck meeting taking place, but would be amenable to attend if it would be considered beneficial.	Noted.
		Stated that they are broadly content with the proposed scope of the EIA for natural heritage interests within our remit.	Noted.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	11 th October 2016	Stated that SEPA are satisfied that the issues raised at scoping have been acknowledged. Recommended that sufficient detail is provided in the ES to address these issues.	Noted.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	13 th October 2016	Stated that HES are content that the advice provided at scoping has been taken into consideration. Advised that the proposed assessment meets HES' requirements.	Noted.
Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS)	15 th October 2016	Stated that FCS is content that the issues raised at Scoping have been recognised.	Noted.
Marine Scotland	6 th October 2016	Welcomed the proposed inclusion of macroinvertebrate and fish survey details in the ES but requested that site characterisation surveys of water quality of watercourses within and downstream of the site should be undertaken to inform a water quality monitoring programme. Responded again and acknowledged the use of macroinvertebrates to assess water quality but advised that water sampling at high and low flows should be undertaken and the results presented in the ES. Emphasised the need to provide details of water sampling strategy in the ES.	Fisheries surveys undertaken have included invertebrate surveys (see Appendix 8.4), which can be used to provide an indication of water quality and assist in the long-term monitoring of the health of the watercourse. Water quality will be monitored pre-construction and during construction, with locations and parameters to be agreed with statutory stakeholders in due course.
Wanlockhead Village	23 rd November 2016	Extensive studies should be undertaken to ensure that any area of ground that	A mining desk study is presented at Appendix 7.3 and details of the soil and water sampling

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
Council		will be disturbed by the creation of infrastructure, borrow pits, compounds and sub stations does not re-mobilise existing lead.	undertaken to investigate the extent of contaminated land is presented at Appendix 7.4 . Consultation on the findings of the desk study and proposals for sampling were undertaken with SEPA in September 2016.
		From the proposed Spango Bridge Access there is a Cairn (AAI) and the planned compound would firstly intrude on the access of visitors to this cairn and the possibility of damage or destruction of this AAI. The proposed road then passes through two areas – one area the road will border the AAI and it is envisaged that during the building of this infrastructure that there is potential or destruction of the AAI.	The route of the access and the site of the compound have been designed to avoid the identified archaeology, as far as practicable. Where infrastructure passes close to identified assets, these will be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. Where effects are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation, through archaeological investigation, will be agreed with the Council.
		Turbines 27/28/29/30/31 - in the centre of this group there is a planned substation and two borrow pits. These are exceedingly close to an AAI and it is envisaged that the development of these five turbines will destroy this archaeology. Water flow is also of concern, with the Glenbuie Burn directly in the path of the development and any additional run off caused by this construction will flow directly into the Mennock Water exacerbating the problem.	As a result of design iterations, the planned development in this area is reduced to a single borrow pit as well as the substation and turbines outlined which have been designed to avoid cultural heritage features. Runoff from this area of the development will flow via local watercourses, including the Glenbuie Burn and Clackleith Burn, to the Crawick Burn, rather than the Mennock Water. Turbines and associated infrastructure locations have been designed to minimise any increases in runoff to local watercourses, and detailed design of the scheme at the pre-construction stage using appropriate mitigation and drainage design measures will protect against this further. Details of mitigation measures are included in Chapter 7 and Good Practice Measures are included in Appendix 4.3 . Turbine bases and substations shall be concrete and hence impermeable features but tracks and hardstandings will not be impermeable and in combination with good drainage design features, will encourage infiltration, settlement of suspended solids and attenuation of runoff. Borrow pit drainage will be designed to pass via settlement ponds prior to discharge. The access track to T31/30/ passes close to an identified heritage site but utilises an existing track where it does so. The route of the access and the site of the compound have been designed to avoid the identified archaeology, as far as practicable. Where infrastructure passes close to identified assets, these will be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. Where effects are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation, through archaeological investigation, will be agreed with the Council.
		Turbines 22/23/24 - There is a planned borrow pit close to turbine 22 and it is envisaged that whilst working this pit we will see additional waters run off into the Wanlock Water.	As a result of design iterations, this borrow pit has been removed.
		Turbines 19/20/21 - Turbine 19 is directly on the SUW and there is also a spring in this vicinity. Turbines 20 and 21 straddle the SUW which is a renowned visitor attraction to Scotland. Any damage to the waterways will feed into the Crawick Water and Glensalloch Burns.	As part of the design process, a distance of at least 150m has been maintained between turbines and site infrastructure and the SUW to address potential health and safety concerns. Identification of local watercourses and groundwater features form part of the assessment process, with the iterative design leading to minimised infrastructure within 50m of watercourses shown on OS 1:10,000 mapping and limiting locations where any crossing structures shall be required.
		Turbine 18 is directly on the SUW. There is also a borrow pit planned for this area. Run off of water from Glensalloch Burn to Crawick Water in terms of contamination is also a concern.	As part of the design process, a distance of at least 150m has been maintained between turbines and site infrastructure and the SUW to address potential health and safety concerns. Identification of local watercourses and groundwater features form part of the assessment process, with the iterative design leading to minimised infrastructure within 50m of watercourses shown on OS 1:10,000 mapping. This also is used to evaluate borrow pit locations. Drainage from borrow pits, tracks and turbines will be appropriately mitigated to encourage flow attenuation and settlement of suspended solids and not discharged directly into local watercourses.
	Turbines 16/17 Straddle the SUW	As part of the design process, a distance of at least 150m has been maintained between turbines	

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
			and site infrastructure and the SUW to address potential health and safety concerns.
		Turbine 15 - it is envisaged that by developing this there will be additional run off of water from Glensilloch burn which feeds into Crawick Water which will place these waterways in danger of further contamination.	<p>Turbines and associated infrastructure locations have been planned to minimise any increases in runoff to local watercourses, such as the Glensalloch Burn, and detailed design of the scheme at the pre-construction stage using appropriate mitigation and drainage design measures will protect against this further. Turbine bases shall be concrete and hence impermeable features but tracks and hardstandings will not be impermeable and in combination with good drainage design features, will encourage infiltration, settlement of suspended solids and attenuation of runoff.</p> <p>Pollution prevention Good Practice Measures shall be incorporated as site environmental management at the construction stage and the activities underway shall be regularly assessed for performance. Good Practice Measures are included in Appendix 4.3.</p>
		Turbine 10/11/12/13/14 - to build these five turbines there is a need for a long stretch of road. There are also plans for a compound. This compound sits in the area between 2 hush dams (Again an AAI site) and directly on the Glencleuch Burn, and Glendyne Burn which runs into the Mennock water. In addition to this there are also mine workings. As per the information in the Coal Authority Report 2014, there is no doubt that this will increase the contamination of the Mennock Water due to increased water pressure on old mine working waters which contain high levels of Lead, Cadmium and Arsenic. It is also understood that damage to the substructure may redirect any standing, contaminated water through the village.	<p>The compound has been located on suitable ground alongside the planned access track, slightly relocated to a better position to the west, on Stood Hill, following review of local constraints.</p> <p>There are no borrow pits planned in this area of the Development Area.</p> <p>Historic mineworking information has been gained from British Geological Survey and other sources plus discussions held with the Museum of Lead Mining in Wanlockhead to help establish locations of former mine activity and associated waste material. Areas of known historic mine working have been avoided as part of the design process.</p> <p>We would request that due consideration is given to the content of the ES and the responses of statutory consultees before any weight is attached to definitive statements such as there being 'no doubt' of particular effects occurring.</p> <p>The access track route planned for T10-T14 has taken account of the above historic mineworking constraints and also local concerns regarding access from the B797 south of Wanlockhead.</p> <p>The route of the access and the siting of the turbines have been designed to avoid the identified archaeology, as far as practicable.</p> <p>Where infrastructure lies near or passes close to identified assets, these will be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. Where effects are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation, through archaeological investigation, will be agreed with the Council).</p>
		Turbine 32 - there is a planned borrow pit, which is close to Earthworks and a Cairn (AAI). There is also a tributary feeding Wanlock Water.	As a result of design iterations, this borrow pit has been moved further north to east of Access A.
		<p>Turbines 33, 34 and 35 – there is a perceived probability of further water contamination to the Wanlock Water.</p> <p>At turbine 35 there is a Hush Dam up from Glendorch Rig and this is again an AAI.</p>	<p>Identification of local watercourses and groundwater features form part of the assessment process, with the iterative design leading to minimised infrastructure within 50m of watercourses shown on OS 1:10,000 mapping. Drainage from tracks, turbines and associated infrastructure will be appropriately mitigated to encourage settlement of suspended solids and not discharged directly into local watercourses.</p> <p>The turbine is not sited near to the hush dam, which lies outwith the Development Area.</p> <p>Where infrastructure lies near or passes close to identified assets, these will be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase.</p> <p>Where effects are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation, through archaeological investigation, will be agreed with the Council.</p>
		Turbines 1 and 2 - we feel that it is impossible to carry out such works without damage to the archaeology on the ground. There also appears to be a planned Borrow Pit less than ½km from the AAI and given the nature of the borrow pits we feel that it would be impossible for them to do so without firstly destroying the AAI.	<p>The proposed access route passes through an area of identified archaeology (an extensive field system) and the proposed compound is located within that area. The proposed borrow pit lies to the west of a block of forestry and there are no identified remains that will be affected.</p> <p>The route of the access and the site of the compound have been designed to avoid the identified archaeology, as far as practicable. In particular the design has sought to avoid the most sensitive elements of the historic farmstead – the remains of the farm buildings.</p> <p>Where infrastructure passes close to identified assets, these will be marked out for avoidance during</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Gatecheck Response	Response/Action taken in the ES
		<p>There is the potential for run off of water going into the Glendyne and Sheil Burns, which run into the Mennock Water causing further contamination on an already contaminated river source.</p>	<p>the construction phase.</p> <p>Where effects are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation, through archaeological investigation, will be agreed with the Council.</p> <p>Identification of local watercourses and groundwater features form part of the assessment process, with the iterative design leading to minimised infrastructure within 50m of watercourses shown on OS 1:10,000 mapping mapped and limiting locations where borrow pit features shall be planned.</p> <p>Drainage from borrow pits, tracks and turbines will be appropriately mitigated to encourage flow attenuation and settlement of suspended solids and not discharged directly into local watercourses.</p>

ⁱ The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000 (The EIA Regulations)

ⁱⁱ Guidance On The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000

ⁱⁱⁱ Scottish Government, 2014, 'Onshore Wind Turbines', Scottish Government Renewable Energy Policy Subject, Available [online] at: <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0045/00451413.pdf>, Last accessed on: 06/09/2016

^{iv} Scottish Government, 2013, Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment

^v Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2004) Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment

^{vi} SNH (2013) A Handbook on Environmental Impact Assessment: Guidance for Competent Authorities, Consultees and others involved in the Environmental Impact Assessment Process in Scotland (4th Edition)

^{vii} Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (EC Habitats Directive).

^{viii} Council Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds (the Birds Directive)

^{ix} Eaton MA, Aebischer NJ, Brown AF, Hearn RD, Lock L, Musgrove AJ, Noble DG, Stroud DA and Gregory RD (2015) Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. *British Birds* 108, 708–746.