

Technical Appendix 2.1: Consultation Response Table

This page is intentionally blank.

Technical Appendix 2.1: Consultation Response Table

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU)	June 2022	Confirmed that Scottish Ministers are satisfied with the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).	Noted.
		Requested that the Applicant clearly sets out the generation station(s) that consent is being sought for and for each generating station, the details of the proposal should include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– the scale of the development (dimensions of the turbines, solar panels, battery storage);– components required for each generating station; and– export capacity of megawatts and megawatt hours of electricity for battery storage and/or solar.	The details of the Proposed Development are provided within Chapter 4 of the EIA Report.
		Requested that a robust Night Time Assessment with agreed viewpoints should be undertaken as part of the EIA process to consider the effects of aviation lighting.	Night-Time viewpoints have been discussed with NatureScot and Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC) and a Night-Time Assessment is included within Chapter 5 of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that the Applicant agrees the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) study area in kilometres from the outer most turbines and the final list of viewpoints and visualisations (including those for Night Time Assessment) following discussion between the Applicant, DGC and NatureScot.	The LVIA study area as well as the viewpoints and visualisations have been discussed with DG&C and NatureScot. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 of the EIA Report.
		Requested that the full details of all mitigation of aviation lighting impacts should be provided in the EIA Report.	A detailed assessment of the landscape and visual effects, including of aviation lighting impacts are presented in Chapter 5 of the EIA Report.
		Requested that developments to be included in cumulative landscape impact assessments should be discussed and agreed by the Applicant and DGC. Photography and visualisations should reflect the most up-to-date positions.	DGC has been notified of the other developments to be considered in the cumulative impact assessment. Further details are provided in Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 of the EIA Report. Photography and visualisations reflect the most up-to-date turbine layout and are provided within Volume 3 of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that decisions on bird surveys should be made following discussions between the Applicant and NatureScot.	Consultation with NatureScot has been ongoing regarding surveys and methodology. Further details regarding bird surveys are provided in Chapter 8 of the EIA Report.
		Where borrow pits are proposed as a source of on-site aggregate they should be considered as part of the EIA process and included in the EIA report detailing information regarding their location, size and nature. The impact of such facilities (including dust, blasting and impact on water) should be appraised as part of the overall impact of the working. Information should cover the requirements set out in 'PAN 50: Controlling the Environmental Effects of Surface Mineral Workings'.	Borrow pits are included in the design and have been assessed as part of the EIA Report. The EIA Report includes the requested information regarding their location, size and nature. The locations are shown Figures 4.1 and 4.2a-d . Further details are provided in Chapter 4 and Technical Appendix 4.4 .
		Requested that the Applicant include details of any relevant mitigation measures in the EIA Report where Scottish Water assets are located.	Consultation with Scottish Water has been undertaken and no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources have been identified that may be affected by the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
			6. A Schedule of Mitigation is included in Technical Appendix 4.3 .
		Requested that the Applicant investigates the presence of any private water supplies (PWS) which may be impacted by the Proposed Development. The EIA Report should include details of the supplies identified and potential impacts, risks and mitigation required.	PWS information has been obtained and any further details are provided within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report.
		Requested that the Applicant takes account of the advice provided by Marine Scotland Science in relation to fish, including consideration of freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries, and any Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) where fish, as a qualifying feature, could be impacted.	A fish habitat survey was undertaken to inform the Scoping Report, however further fish surveys have not been undertaken, as agreed with NatureScot. Standard mitigation will be put in place to protect fisheries during construction and operation of the Proposed Development as detailed in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) and the Schedule of Mitigation (see Technical Appendix 4.1 and 4.3 respectively). Further details are provided in Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix 7.4 .
		Recommend that the Applicant discusses and agrees Baseline Fish Surveys with the local District Salmon Fishery Board (DSFB) and Fisheries Trust.	A fish habitat survey was undertaken to inform the Scoping Report. Fish surveys have not been undertaken to inform the EIA as agreed by NatureScot. Standard mitigation will be put in place to protect fisheries during construction and operation of the Proposed Development as detailed in Technical Appendix 4.1 and 4.3 . Further details are provided in Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix 7.4 .
		Recommend that the Applicant discusses and agrees landscape designated sites to be included in the EIA Report with NatureScot and DGC, and survey work and further in-depth modelling and research to be undertaken.	NatureScot and DGC have been consulted regarding the scope of the LVIA. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 .
		Advised that a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA) should be undertaken as part of the EIA process. This should be undertaken in accordance with The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessments: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (Second Edition).	A PLHRA has been undertaken as part of the EIA process and is provided as Technical Appendix 6.4 of the EIA Report.
		Recommend that the final list of noise receptors should be agreed with the Applicant and DGC.	DGC was consulted regarding the noise assessment, including the proposed list of receptors. Further details are provided in Chapter 10 of the EIA Report.
		Stated that the noise assessment should be carried out in line with relevant legislation and standards as detailed in the scoping report and the noise assessment report should be formatted as per Table 6.1 of the IOA "A Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise."	Chapter 10 presents the assessment of both construction and operational noise effects undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidance set out in the Scoping Report.
		Noted that further engagement is required between parties regarding refinement of the Proposed Development and requested that the ECU is kept informed of relevant discussions.	The Applicant has engaged with the ECU throughout the EIA process, including providing updates on consultation and timescales.
		Requested that the EIA Report details and presents any mitigation measures as a conclusion to each chapter, and includes a Schedule of Mitigation in tabular form setting out all measures proposed to mitigate significant environmental effects	Mitigation measures are provided in each technical chapter, as needed. A Schedule of Mitigation is included as Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.
		Recommended that an additional Scoping Opinion be sought should an application for consent not be submitted within 12 months of the Scoping Opinion being issued to ensure that the content of the Scoping Opinion remains relevant.	It has not been possible to submit the application within 12 months of the receipt of the Scoping Opinion; however, the ECU

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
			has been kept up to date on progress with the EIA and has not requested a revised Scoping Report.
Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC) – Council Access Officer	1 June 2022	Confirmed that the Site is affected by a Core Path (Core path 51) but is not affected by any other recorded Core Paths or Rights of Way.	Core Paths have been considered as a receptor within Chapter 5 . Further details regarding affected Core Paths or Rights of Way are provided as part of the Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) in Technical Appendix 4.5 .
DGC – Flood Risk Management Team	1 June 2022	No objection to the Proposed Development.	Noted.
		Advise that the Applicant needs to manage surface run-off from the Site during and after construction, and run-off should mimic that of existing conditions and not be increased.	Any surface run-off not avoided/minimised by design will be mitigated through implementation of the CEMP and following best practice guidance. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 4.1 and 4.3 .
		Advise that the Applicant should consider the rate of run-off into the watercourses within the Site.	Run-off rates are considered as part of the hydrology assessment where applicable. Further details are provided in Chapter 6 .
DGC – Council Landscape Architect	1 June 2022	Concerns that the Proposed Development stand-alone and cumulatively would give rise to significant landscape and visual effects on the Shinnel Water valley and elevated views for hill walkers, and the size and scale of the turbines would be out of scale with the valley.	A detailed cumulative assessment of landscape and visual effects is provided within Chapter 5 .
		Concerns that the turbines would detract from and overwhelm the setting and visitor experience of the Striding Arch Sculptures.	Recreational viewpoints from the arches have been assessed and are presented in Chapter 5 .
		Anticipate scale effects on specific landscape features such as Croglin Crag and Markreach Hill.	The Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter has assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape character. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over proximity and prominence of the Proposed Development to the Thornhill Uplands Regional Scenic Area (RSA).	A detailed assessment of landscape effects, including Thornhill Uplands RSA has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5 of the EIA Report.
		Concerns over “poor fit” with The Dumfries and Galloway Wind Farm Landscape Capacity Study (DGLWCS) in terms of landscape character and potential for direct and / or indirect effects on the Ken unit (Landscape Character Type (LCT) 19a), the Keir unit (LCT 18), and Shinnel Water unit (LCT 10).	The Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter has assessed impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape character, including cumulative effects. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over indirect effects of the Proposed Development, such as LCT 10 and LCT 19.	A detailed assessment of landscape effects, including LCTs has been undertaken. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over addition to cumulative impacts and noted that the Ken unit (LCT 19a) was noted as reaching capacity for development in the DGLWCS.	A detailed cumulative assessment of effects has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over aviation lighting given the prominence of schemes across several sensitive receptors, including the Galloway Forest Dark Sky Park.	A detailed assessment of landscape effects, including aviation lighting, has been undertaken and further details are provided Chapter 5 .
DGC	1 June 2022	The key relevant policies for the scheme are likely to be policies OP1: Development Considerations, OP2: Design Quality and Placemaking, IN1: Renewable Energy IN2: Wind Energy, NE2: Regional Scenic Areas, and ED11: Dark Skies.	A Planning Statement has been submitted as a Supporting Document to the EIA Report as part of the Section 36 application.
		Noted that the EIA study area is 45 km from the outermost turbines. Advise that the detailed LVIA study area should be 25 km.	A detailed assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken within an appropriate study area and further details are provided Chapter 5 .
		Noted that LCTs beyond 6 km are scoped out which is very tight, but against the DGLWCS then wider landscape context and visual issues are covered.	A detailed assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5 .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		<p>Advise that the following landscape receptors should be referred to in the LVIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LCT 19a/178, LCT 18/175, LCT 10/166. – Local landscape characteristics and aspects of local distinctiveness, including Croglin Crag, the crags of Markreach Hill, Lamgarroch, Blackcraig Hill, Colt Hill (including the Striding Arches), and the Appin and Shinnelhead farm steadings. – Forestry and woodland areas. – Surrounding LCTs/LCUs within 25km as covered by the DGWLCS (2017) and with indicated intervisibility on the ZTV. – Setting, value and experience of designated landscapes, and any other aspects of recognised landscape value. 	<p>A detailed assessment of landscape effects, including LCTs has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Provided a detailed list of the proposals against key LCTs and the potential impacts to be considered.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Provided a list of visual receptors where the Proposed Development has the potential to cause impacts which need to be assessed in the EIA.</p>	<p>Visual receptors have been included and assessed and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Provided a list of alterations to the proposed viewpoints, as well as a list of proposed new viewpoints and as well as suggested night-time viewpoints for photomontage.</p>	<p>Discussions have been undertaken with DGC regarding the final list of proposed viewpoints to be assessed. Further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Request for sequential assessments along routes.</p>	<p>Sequential assessment of routes has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Request for visualisations of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Visualisations have been produced and are provided within Volume 3 of the EIA Report.</p>
		<p>Provided a list of potential receptors where cumulative impacts could occur.</p>	<p>A detailed cumulative assessment of effects has been undertaken and is presented within each specialist assessment chapter (Chapters 5-11).</p>
		<p>Request a design statement given the sensitivity of landscape and visual receptors.</p>	<p>The design of the development has been described in Chapter 3 of the EIA Report. It should be noted that a standalone Design and Access Statement has not been prepared, as agreed with the ECU.</p>
		<p>Concerns over wind farm layout and the potential to give rise to stacking and overlapping of rotors, also noting that there are a number of sensitive landscape and visual receptors in close proximity including the Striding Arch Sculptures.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of landscape effects has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p>
		<p>Concerns over the 230 m proposed turbines with potential for least good fit/greatest impacts directly on LCT 10, LCT 18, LCT 19a, LCT 19, LCT 18, LCT 10. Potential scale effects are envisaged from individual turbines.</p> <p>Request that alternative turbine heights are tested in local and wider views, specifically below 150 m.</p>	<p>The proposed turbine height has been reduced to 200 m from 230 m. A detailed assessment of landscape effects, including on LCTs has been undertaken and further details are provided in Chapter 5.</p> <p>Turbines below 150 m are not commercially viable; further details are provided in Chapter 3.</p>
		<p>Concerns over aviation lighting. Request that any lighting is visualised and assessed. Residential properties within 2 km of a lit turbine should be assessed and mitigation should be explored.</p>	<p>The requirement for aviation lighting has been considered in the design and has been fully assessed in Chapter 5. An Aviation Lighting Assessment is provided as Technical Appendix 5.2 and a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is provided as Technical Appendix 5.3.</p>

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Request access impacts to be assessed with photomontages to be provided.	An OAMP has been provided as Technical Appendix 4.5 to the EIA Report. Relevant photomontages are cross-referenced and are provided in Volume 3 .
		Request other infrastructure impacts to be assessed with photomontages to be provided.	Other infrastructure forming part of the wind farm has been assessed in the EIA Report with photomontages to be provided, as needed.
		Considers that the structure of the Scoping Report is clear and sets out a prudent approach to topics that may give rise to significant effects. Request that the topics listed in the EIA Report should be fully assessed and are acceptable to the Council.	Noted.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	28 April 2022	Objected to the methodology used for the assessment of the Scheduled Monuments theoretical visibility. Requested that these assets are assessed using the long-term forest plans for the areas concerned as this is the baseline. Advised that vegetation, generally, should not be considered a permanent or suitable mitigating factor.	Full details of the methodology used in the final assessment are provided in Chapter 9 . The position regarding vegetation and mitigation is noted.
		Rejected the list of assets as inadequate and the associated proposed visualisations. Advised best practice for theoretical visibility within 10km of the Proposed Development would be for the Applicant to provide bare earth wireframes to provide more certainty in the assessment of potential impacts.	The list of assets has been reviewed in light of the comments from HES and the final layout of the Proposed Development. Bare earth wireframes are provided to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 10 .
		Recommend that HES are given sight of wireframes/visualisations in advance of the EIA Report at an early stage in the design process.	It has not been possible to provide HES with the wireframes/visualisations in advance of submission of the EIA Report due to the lack of time between completing the visualisations and submission, however the Applicant would welcome further discussion with HES post-submission if required.
		Requested that an assessment of cumulative impacts of the development on the setting of assets should be undertaken, supported by visualisations where significant effects are identified.	A detailed cumulative assessment of cultural heritage effects as well as visualisations has been undertaken. Further details are presented within Chapter 9 .
NatureScot	21 April 2022	Advise that Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands Special Protection Area (SPA) is included within the EIA Report due to connectivity range of the peregrine falcon (18 km). Also advise that reference to the 10 km buffer is removed and that all SPAs within 20 km are included in the EIA Report and Habitat Regulations Appraisal (HRA).	Potential effects on the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA have been considered in the EIA. SPAs within 20 km from the Site have been considered where qualifying species have documented (core) foraging ranges that exceed 10 km. Otherwise SPAs within 10 km have been considered (as is standard methodology), with the exception of Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA as stated (which will be considered in the assessment). Further details are provided within Chapter 8 .
		Requested that a standalone HRA should be included as an appendix to the EIA Report and should include Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands SPA and Loch Ken and River Dee Marshes SPA.	This is provided as Technical Appendix 8.4: Information to Inform a Habitats Regulations Appraisal.
		Requested that barn owl, pink-footed goose and greylag goose is scoped into the assessment.	Potential effects on these species have been considered in the ornithology assessment, and where effects are scoped-out of detailed assessment, this has been fully and robustly justified in Chapter 8 .
		Advise that development should avoid areas of peat exceeding 50 cm.	Areas of peat exceeding 50 cm have been avoided where possible during the design process. Detailed peat probing has been undertaken. Further details are provided in Chapter 6 .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Advise that development which involves forestry activities in close proximity to watercourses adheres to the UK Forestry Standard Forests and Water guidelines .	Any forestry activities in close proximity to watercourses will adhere to standard mitigation procedures. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 .
		Advise a Pollution Prevention Plan is put in place.	A Pollution Prevention Plan is provided as part of the CEMP. An OCEMP is included as Technical Appendix 4.1 .
		With regards to the Striding Arches, particularly on Colt Hill, impacts to the diminution of the scale or prominence of the sculpture, or the potential detracting from the hilltop location should be assessed, as well as the access and visual/physical connection to the four sculptures.	However, recreational viewpoints from the arches have been assessed. Further details are presented in Chapter 5 .
		Request the following viewpoints: – Moniaive, perhaps on the A702 or on the minor road along the Dalwhart Water. – Thornhill	Moniaive has been added as a viewpoint. Discussions have been undertaken with NatureScot regarding the viewpoints to be included, including Thornhill. Further details are provided in Chapter 5 .
		Request that consideration is given to increasing the potential suitable habitat to breeding birds within any felled areas.	An outline Nature Enhancement Management Plan (NEMP) is provided as Technical Appendix 7.6 of the EIA Report.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	14 April 2022	Request a map and assessment of all engineering works within and near the water environment including buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications.	All engineering works have been assessed and maps with all infrastructure have been included with the EIA Report (see Volume 2, Figure 4.2a-d and Figures 6.1 to 6.3). A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is not required as detailed further in Chapter 6 .
		Request a map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs) and buffers.	An assessment of GWDTEs has been undertaken and further details are presented in Chapters 6 and 7 of the EIA Report. Locations of GWDTEs are shown in Figure 6.3 .
		Request a map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.	Impacts to groundwater are assessed and further details are provided in Chapter 6 of the EIA Report. Figures of these locations have been provided (Volume 2, Figure 6.1).
		Request a peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals.	A peat depth survey has been undertaken and the results are provided within Technical Appendix 6.2 . Peat depth has also been illustrated and presented on Figure 6.7 .
		Request a map and table detailing forest removal.	Information on forestry removal is provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 , of the EIA Report, and is illustrated on Figure 4.12 .
		Request a map and site layout of borrow pits.	The locations of the three proposed borrow pits are shown on Figure 4.2a-d .
		Request a schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures.	A Schedule of Mitigation measures is provided as Technical Appendix 4.3 .
		Request a Borrow Pit Site Management Plan of pollution prevention measures.	A Borrow Pit Report is provided as Technical Appendix 4.4 and pollution prevention measures are detailed in the CEMP which is provided as Technical Appendix 4.1 .
		Request a map of proposed wastewater drainage layout and a map of proposed surface water drainage layout.	A map of the proposed wastewater drainage and surface water drainage at the substation is shown on Figure 4.8 .
		Request a map of proposed water abstractions including details of the proposed operating regime.	No water abstraction is proposed at the current time, should this be needed e.g. for concrete batching, this will be subject to a separate licence from SEPA if required. Further details are provided in Chapter 4 .
		Request a decommissioning statement.	A decommissioning statement will be provided post-consent.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Request to avoid areas of deep peat (over 1 m) and areas of Class 1 and 2 peat areas to have no infrastructure on them.	Areas of deep peat have been avoided and areas of Class 1 and Class 2 have been avoided where possible. Further details are provided in Chapter 6 .
		Request that where felling for infrastructure is undertaken, these areas should be surveyed for GWDTE's, specifically flushes and springs, and demarked and avoided.	Surveys for GWDTEs have been undertaken and buffered where applicable. Further details are provided in Chapters 6 and 7 .
BT	05 April 2022	Confirmed that the Proposed Development should not cause interference to BT's current and planned radio network.	Noted.
Closeburn Community Council	17 April 2022	Raised concerns with the number and height of turbines, and that they would be inconsistent with the local and surrounding landscape.	The number and height of turbines have been reduced and further detail regarding design evolution is presented in Chapter 3 .
		Raised concerns that they would have a larger visual impact and would merge with other wind farms to be one large block.	A detailed cumulative assessment of effects on visual impacts has been undertaken and further detail is presented within Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over the potential adverse impact to the Thornhill Uplands RSA.	A detailed assessment of the landscape and visual effects, including upon Thornhill Uplands RSA has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 5 .
		Concerns over the adverse effects to the Dark Skies region if aviation lighting is required.	Impacts to the Darks Skies region have been assessed and further details are presented within Chapter 5 of the EIA Report.
Crown Estate Scotland	4 May 2022	Confirmed that Crown Estate Scotland assets are not affected by the Proposed Development.	Noted.
Ministry of Defence (MOD) – Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Wind)	11 May 2022	Concerns that as the Proposed Development is located within Tactical Training Area 20T (TTA 20T) that it would introduce a physical obstruction to low flying aircraft operating in the area.	The Applicant has consulted further with relevant aviation bodies. A detailed aviation assessment is provided in Technical Appendix 2.2 .
		Request that turbines are fitted with MOD accredited aviation safety lighting.	Turbines will be fitted with MOD accredited aviation safety lighting. Further details are provided within Technical Appendix 4.6 .
		Request that the MOD is consulted and notified of any progression and subsequent applications of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant has consulted further with relevant aviation bodies. A detailed aviation assessment is provided in Technical Appendix 2.2 .
East Ayrshire Council	14 April 2022	Suggested that the LVIA considers an additional viewpoint at Blackcraig Hill within the Southern Uplands LCT.	Blackcraig Hill has been considered as an additional viewpoint and has been assessed (VP12). Further detail is provided within Chapter 5 .
		Suggested that the EIA considers how the Proposed Development supports or otherwise the overall principles of the Galloway and Southern Ayrshire UNESCO Biosphere (GSAB).	The Proposed Development is in line with GSAB's support for renewable technologies. Impacts to wild land, carbon rich soils (peat), statutory designated sites and landscapes within the GSAB have been considered and assessed where applicable in the EIA Report and avoided or mitigated. Further detail is provided within Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 . The Proposed Development is located in the GSAB 'transition zone' where wind farms have been accepted.
Edinburgh Airport	04 April 2022	Confirmed that the Proposed Development falls outwith the Aerodrome Safeguarding zone for Edinburgh Airport and have no objection/comment.	Noted.
Fisheries Management Scotland (FMS)	15 April 2022	Noted that the Proposed Development falls within the catchment relating to the Nith DSFB and the Nith Catchment Fisheries Trust. Consultation should be undertaken with the local DSFB & Trust.	The Applicant has consulted with Nith DSFB and the Nith Catchment Fisheries Trust (see below).

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Recommend that the Proposed Development follows the guidelines developed by FMS and Marine Scotland Science.	Standard and best practice mitigation will be in place to ensure no effects to fisheries will occur as a result of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter 7 as well as Technical Appendix 4.1, 4.3 and 7.3 .
Fisheries – Nith Catchment Fishery Trust	8 April 2022	Recommend conducting Fresh Water Pearl Mussel (FWPM) surveys in potentially impacted watercourses.	The ecology surveys undertaken included fish habitat surveys which appraised watercourses adjoining and flowing through the Site for their potential to support notable fish populations and also FWPM. This followed standard survey methodology and NatureScot guidance. Standard applied mitigation will be put in place to protect watercourses during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix 4.1, 4.3 and 7.3 .
		Request detailed aquatic monitoring plans to be agreed.	A Surface Water Monitoring Plan is included within the outline CEMP as part of Technical Appendix 4.1 submitted with the EIA Report.
Fisheries – Nith District Salmon Fishery	7 April 2022	Strongly object that a walkover survey is sufficient and a full aquatic assessment will not be undertaken.	A fish habitat survey was undertaken to inform the Scoping Report. Fish surveys have not been undertaken to inform the EIA as agreed by NatureScot. Standard mitigation will be put in place to protect fisheries during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Further details have been provided in Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix 7.4 .
		Request aquatic surveys to be carried out which include fish, aquatic macro invertebrates and invasive species, and should be repeated annually during construction and post-construction.	As above. A Fish Monitoring Plan will be included as a condition post consent. No further surveys are required at this time. Further details have been provided in Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix 7.4 .
		Request a fish monitoring plan as part of the planning conditions.	As above.
		Object to the Proposed Development due to insufficient commitment to gather information on the species the Board is statutorily responsible for.	Noted. As above.
Glasgow Prestwick Airport (GPA)	26 April 2022	Potential adviser effects have been identified which the Airport requires to assess further. A full Air Traffic Control (ATC) Operational Impact Assessment will be undertaken in conjunction with the Applicant.	The Applicant has been in dialogue with GPA over an extended period of time to explore what, if any, mitigation will be required due to visibility of the turbines on GPA radars. Discussions are ongoing at the time of writing. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 2.2 .
		Request to be consulted upon should the final aviation lighting scheme consider the use of Aircraft Detection Lighting System (ADLS) dependent upon Electronic Conspicuity (EC) Equipment(s) and be part of any alternate proposed lighting scheme.	Further details on aviation lighting are provided in Technical Appendix 4.6 .
		Advise that further detailed radar modelling assessments/flight trials need to be undertaken to confirm the number of turbines visible to the Airport's primary radars and any mitigation can be implemented.	As above; the effect on the PSR will be minimal as detailed further in Technical Appendix 2.2 .
		Request that the Applicant engages with the Airport to agree who undertakes the IFP Assessment to establish if there is a likely impact on the published Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP's).	Further discussions with GPA have resulted in a request for a Stage 1 IFP assessment. The Applicant will be instructing such an assessment and continuing the dialogue with GPA to confirm that this is not a key issue in this location. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 2.2 .

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Advise a detailed Technical Safeguarding Assessment (TSA) may be required in respect of the Airport's Runway 30 instrument Landing System (ILS) and VHF Ground to Air Radio Navigation Equipment(s) performance.	At a distance of over 40 km, there is no possibility of the Proposed Development having an effect on the ILS and given the minimal exposure of only three turbines there is also no possible effect on VHF radio performance. It is understood that GPA will not be objecting in relation to these issues. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 2.2 .
		Concerns over the cumulative impact and proliferation of wind farms in the vicinity of the Proposed Development on the low-level coverage that the Airport receives from the NATS Lowther Hill SSR and on the Airport's Communications, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) equipment.	In relation to cumulative effects, with the use of the Terma Scanner wind farm mitigation radar there is no cumulative effect as each wind farm will be mitigated using the capabilities of the radar. NATS has been consulted as detailed below.
		Advise mitigation will be required if the turbines are visible to the Airport's primary surveillance radar.	As above.
		Likely to object until the aviation matters are appropriately addressed.	As above; discussions with GPA are ongoing.
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	12 April 2022	Advised that JRC does not foresee any potential problems based on known interference scenarios and data provided by the Applicant but that the proposal would need to be re-evaluated should any details of the Proposed Development change.	Noted.
NATS Safeguarding	11 April 2022	Objects to the Proposed Development due to impacts on Lowther RADAR and Prestwick Centre ATC.	Noted.
		Reminded that the Applicant has a legal obligation to consult with NATS prior to submission of a planning application.	NATS have been consulted prior to submission of the application for consent.
RSPB Scotland	19 April 2022	Confirm that the RSPB has no comments regarding the Proposed Development.	Noted.
Scottish Borders Council	28 March 2022	No comments to offer.	Noted.
Scottish Forestry	31 March 2022	Advised that design approaches that reduce the scale of felling required to facilitate the Proposed Development must be considered, integration of the Proposed Development with the existing woodland structure is a key part of the consenting process.	Noted. The design iterations have aimed to avoid unnecessary felling. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 .
		The Applicant should consider the potential cumulative impact of existing and the Proposed Development on the forest resource in respect to the local and regional context.	Information on woodland management and tree felling, including mitigation, is provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 . A detailed assessment of potential effects on forestry in EIA terms has not been undertaken, however the area of proposed felling is relatively limited in the context of the wider forest resource of Dumfries and Galloway and compensatory planting will be undertaken, resulting in no net loss of forestry.
		Stated the EIA Report should include a stand-alone chapter on 'Woodland management and tree felling' (a forest plan) prepared by a suitably qualified professional, supported by existing records, site surveys and aerial photographs.	Information on woodland management and tree felling, including mitigation, is provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 to the EIA Report.
		Advised a long-term forest plan should be provided as part of the EIA Report (as a technical appendix for context) to give a strategic vision to deliver environmental and social benefits through sustainable forest management and describes the major forest operations over a 20 years period	Information on woodland management and tree felling, including mitigation, is provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 to the EIA Report.
		Details of the proposed mitigation measures must be included in the EIA Report, not left to post-consent Habitat Management Plans (HMP) (or others) to decide and implement.	Information on woodland management and tree felling, including mitigation, is provided in Technical Appendix 4.2 to the EIA Report.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Consultation with SF should take place prior to submission of a planning application.	Scottish Forestry will be consulted on the application for consent and invited to comment on the EIA Report.
Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays)	03 May 2022	Noted that no rights of way cross or are close to the Site boundary.	Noted.
		Anticipate that impacts on the local core path network and the Striding Arches, including amenity, will be fully assessed.	Impacts to visual amenity from the local core path network and the Striding Arches have been assessed. Further details are provided within Chapter 5 .
		Recommend adhering to the Advice Note provided.	We note the information provided and adhere to standard policies and guidance.
		Request to see a plan with the on-site track layout.	The on-site track layout is shown on Figure 4.2a-d .
		Assess impacts to Core Path 51 within the Site boundary and in relation to forestry traffic.	Impacts to visual amenity from the local core path network have been assessed and further details are provided within Chapter 5 .
		Anticipate recreational amenity and landscape impacts will be assessed.	Landscape and recreational amenity impacts have been assessed and further detail is provided within Chapter 5 .
		Concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of turbines.	A cumulative assessment of effects will be presented within each specialist assessment chapter (Chapters 5-11).
		Recommend that the Applicant consults with DGCs access team for their input on the AMP for the Proposed Development.	The Applicant welcomes further discussion with DGC in relation to access management.
		Request confirmation that ScotWays and DGCs access team is included in the list of stakeholders to be consulted.	ScotWays and DGC have been included in the list of stakeholders to be consulted.
Scottish Water	11 April 2022	No objection to the Proposed Development.	Noted.
		Request the grid references of each turbine to understand which turbines provide the most risk to the Drinking Water Protected Area (DWPA).	Further details in relation to the DWPA are provided within Chapter 6 .
		Request further involvement at the more detailed design stages and request that Scottish Water is notified three months in advance of any works commencing.	The Applicant will notify Scottish Water in advance of any works commencing.
South Ayrshire Council	13 April 2022	Satisfied that matters will be addressed appropriately and proportionately.	Noted.
Transport Scotland	14 April 2022	Consider that the guidance used for the assessment is appropriate.	Noted.
		Request that the Study Area includes the trunk road approach routes.	The Transport Study Area will include the trunk road approach routes. Further detail is provided within Chapter 11 .
		Satisfied with the application of growth but request that all trunk road traffic data is sourced directly from Transport Scotland.	Details of the relevant data used to inform the assessment are provided in Chapter 11 .
		Noted that Transport Scotland will be required to be satisfied that the size of the turbines proposed can negotiate the selected trunk road route and that transportation will not have a detrimental effect on structures within the trunk road route path.	Noted.
		Request a full Abnormal Loads Assessment to identify key pinch points on the trunk road network.	A detailed assessment of the transport effects, including an Abnormal Loads Assessment, will be provided within Chapter 11 .
		Noted that any proposed changes to the trunk road network must be discussed and approved by the Area Manager prior to the movement of abnormal loads.	Noted. Any proposed changes to the trunk road network will be discussed with Transport Scotland.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
Tynron Community Council	9 May 2022	Consider that the proposed approach to assessment of decommissioning is inadequate. Request that the impacts of decommissioning on our residents, residential amenity, local businesses, cultural heritage, biodiversity, hydrology and our communities is fully considered.	The effects associated with the construction phase can be considered to be representative of worst-case decommissioning effects. It is likely that a decommissioning strategy would be made a condition of a grant of consent for the Proposed Development. Full details of any subsequent decommissioning plan would be agreed with the appropriate authorities prior to any decommissioning works commencing in line with appropriate guidance and policy at that time.
		Concerns about access to the Site. Advise that the A702 and the road up the Shinnel Glen are unsuitable for heavy, long, wide transport.	Noted. A Traffic and Transport Assessment has been undertaken as part of the EIA which has considered the access routes and is reported within Chapter 11 of the EIA Report.
		Concerns about the impact of decommissioning and commissioning on the historic built environment, as well as water supply pipes, road surface, and drains.	Impacts to the historic built environment and hydrology have been assessed. Further details are provided within Chapters 9 and 6 respectively. A road condition survey will be undertaken prior to construction; further details are provided in Chapter 11 .
		Requested existing and proposed wind farms to be cumulatively assessed.	A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as part of each of the technical chapters of the EIA Report (Chapters 5-11).
		Consider the landscape viewpoint locations to be inadequate.	Consultation with NatureScot regarding the viewpoint locations has been ongoing and the final list has been confirmed. Further details are provided within Chapter 5 .
		Concerns regarding the visibility of turbines and screening through vegetation.	The impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape and visual receptors has been assessed. Further details are provided within Chapter 5 .
		Request Dark Skies Park and the local Dark Skies to be assessed.	Dark Skies Park and the local Dark Skies have been assessed within Chapter 5 .
		Request that nighttime assessment considers cumulative effects.	A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as part of the technical chapters of the EIA Report (Chapters 5-11). This includes consideration of cumulative night time effects where relevant.
		Request Whiteneuk and Cloud Hill wind farms to be considered part of the cumulative assessment.	A cumulative assessment has been undertaken as part of the technical chapters of the EIA Report (Chapters 5-11). Cloud Hill wind farm has been included as part of the cumulative assessment, however Whiteneuk has not been included as the application has been withdrawn.
		Provide a list of further viewpoints to be considered.	Consultation with NatureScot and DGC regarding the viewpoint locations has been undertaken and the final list has been confirmed. Further details are provided within Chapter 5 .
		Request anyone within 20 km of the development to be impacted by visual and lighting effects to be consulted, as well as ScotWays.	Consultation has been undertaken and visual and lighting effects have been assessed. Further details are provided within Chapter 5 and Technical Appendix 5.2 of the EIA Report.
		Request residential properties within the area to be consulted for accurate information regarding their PWS.	Consultation regarding PWS has been undertaken and has been reported and assessed within Chapter 6 .
		Request local homeowners to be consulted regarding private micro-hydro schemes.	The Site does not include any of these schemes.
		Note local community council will be able to provide recent and historical local flooding information and flood defences set up in response to these events.	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Consider that the proposed hydrology methodology is lacking in the inclusion local knowledge of water supplies, flooding risk and impacts on local businesses.	Consultation has been undertaken regarding PWS. Standard hydrology methodology has been utilised and has been consulted upon with SEPA. Further details are provided within Chapter 6 .
		Consider the list of proposed effects scoped for hydrology are not appropriate in relation to the impacts on PWS and local hydrology.	Consultation has been undertaken with SEPA related to the scope of the hydrology Chapter of the EIA. An assessment of effects on PWS is provided in Chapter 6 .
		Consider the proposed mitigation for hydrology is not appropriate.	Standard mitigation will be implemented to protect hydrological features and is detailed within the EIA Report. Consultation has been undertaken with SEPA. Further details are provided within Chapter 6 .
		Request avoidance of peat areas greater than 0.5 m.	Design has sought to avoid areas of peat where possible, taking into consideration other environmental constraints. Further details are provided within Chapter 4 and Chapter 6 .
		Agree with the desk study sources and surveys but request the consideration of local knowledge and surveys.	Relevant information from local sources will be considered.
		Request further information is provided for the reasoning for protected species to be scoped out.	Surveys have been undertaken and consultation has been undertaken with NatureScot regarding the scope of the EIA. Appropriate mitigation will be put in place to protect ecological receptors during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in Chapter 7 .
		Consider that the range of effects identified for the ecology chapter is not adequate or proportionate to the Proposed Development.	Standard methodology has been utilised following NatureScot guidance. The Ecology Chapter of the Scoping Report and Chapter 7 of the EIA Report has been undertaken by competent specialists (further details are provided in Technical Appendix 1.1). Consultation has been undertaken with NatureScot regarding the scope of the assessment.
		Request local eco-tourism businesses to be consulted for the Ecology and Ornithology Chapter.	The public consultation meetings were available for all interested parties to attend, and comments on the application are welcomed.
		Disagree with ecological designated sites being scoped out of assessment that are greater than 2 km away.	Standard methodology has been utilised following NatureScot guidance and consultation has been undertaken with NatureScot regarding the scope of the assessment.
		Disagree with the proposed scope of the cumulative assessment for ecology and ornithology.	As above.
		Request further studies from local Citizen Science projects should be drawn upon for the ornithological assessment.	The ornithological assessment has drawn on relevant legislation, guidance documents, professional literature, and field surveys for its conclusions. Further detail is provided within Chapter 8 of the EIA Report.
		Disagree that the range of likely effects for the ornithological assessment is adequate and proportionate.	Noted. The ornithological assessment has been undertaken by competent and experienced specialists, and in consultation with NatureScot. Further detail is provided in Chapter 8 .
		Disagree with the features and rationale that have been scoped for the Ornithology Chapter.	See above.
		Disagree that the key cultural heritage concerns have been identified. Note the UNESCO Galloway and Southern Ayrshire Biosphere. Also concerned that the mitigation includes local commercial forestry in respect of felling.	Noted. The relevant assessments have been undertaken by competent and experienced specialists, and in consultation with relevant consultees.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
		Provide a list of additional cultural heritage assets that should be assessed.	A full list of assets assessed is included within the EIA. Where assets have been scoped out from detailed assessment, a robust explanation is detailed. Further details are provided within Chapter 9 .
		Agree with the proposed approach to baseline gathering and assessment for cultural heritage and request local knowledge to be included. Also agree with the proposed visualisations but request that the additional assets above are included.	See above.
		Concerned over the ETSU-R-97 methodology in relation to noise assessment.	Noted. The noise assessment has been undertaken by competent and experienced specialists using standard and best practice guidance and methodology. Further details are provided in Chapter 10 .
		Request that low frequency noise, amplitude modulation and decommissioning noise is not scoped out of the EIA.	See above.
		Request that the Shinnel Glen road is excluded from access proposals for any traffic.	Noted. All potential access routes have been assessed in consideration of other environmental constraints, and the most suitable access route has been assessed. Further details are provided within Chapter 11 . Access will be from the west of the Site. Shinnel Glen road to the east can't be used for construction, so has not been considered for access
		Request that local surveys and methodology are included in the traffic baseline information collation. Also request that local core paths and Southern Upland Way (SUW) be factored into the assessment.	Traffic baseline information is included as part of the assessment. Further details are provided in Chapter 11 . The local core path network and the SUW have been assessed as receptors within Chapter 5 .
		Request local timber traffic be included in the traffic flow data.	Timber traffic will be captured in the traffic volume data using Automatic Traffic Counts (ATC). Further details are provided within Chapter 11 .
		Disagree with the use of Low National Road Traffic Forecasts (NRTF).	Noted. The traffic and transport assessment has been undertaken by competent and experienced specialists using standard and best practice guidance and methodology. Further details are provided within Chapter 11 .
		Request that cumulative traffic flows include all projected flows for repairs and servicing, ongoing timber traffic, and traffic flows from local businesses.	See above.
		Request that socio-economic assessment includes local businesses including farmers, holiday accommodation providers, work-from-home residents and local tourism operatives.	A separate Socio-Economic Benefits Report has been submitted as part of the section 36 application, and does not assess tourism. Landscape and recreational amenity impacts related to tourism have been assessed within Chapter 5 . See also tourism discussion below.
Visit Scotland	5 April 2022	Request the consideration of the Scottish Government's 2008 research on the impact of wind farms on tourism.	Multiple published studies have examined whether there is a link between the development of wind farms and changes in patterns of tourism spend and behaviour, and the consistent conclusion is that there is little or no adverse effect. One of the most recent studies was undertaken by BiGGAR Economics (2021) and found that trends at a local authority level showed there was "no relationship between the growth in the number of wind turbines and the level of tourism-related employment."
		Recommends a tourism impact statement to be provided as part of the EIA Report which should identify and consider any impacts to tourism.	
		Recommends considerations of the impacts of the proliferation of developments on local tourism industry and the local economy.	

Consultee	Date of Response	Issues Raised at Scoping	Response
			<p>The 2021 study also considered trends at a more localised scale, where an analysis of 16 wind farms which were in the immediate vicinity of tourism-related employment and constructed between 2015 and 2019, as well as a further 28 less recent case studies, found that <i>"in the majority of cases, tourism-related employment in the vicinity of wind farms had outperformed the trend for Scotland as a whole and for the local authority area in which the wind farm was based"</i>.</p> <p>Of the full 44 wind farms analysed in the 2021 study, the study found that there was <i>"no relationship between tourism employment and wind farm development, at the level of the Scottish economy, across local authority areas nor in the locality of wind farm sites."</i></p> <p>When conducting academic reviews of other studies as part of the Scottish Government's Renewable Inquiry, a study by ClimateXChange (Dinnie, 2012) found that that <i>"there is no new evidence to contradict the earlier findings that wind farms have little or no adverse impact on tourism in Scotland"</i>, and a study by the University of Edinburgh (Aitchison, 2012) found that <i>"the findings from both primary and secondary research relating to the actual and potential tourism impact of wind farms indicate that there will be neither an overall decline in the number of tourists visiting an area nor any overall financial loss in tourism-related earnings as a result of a wind farm development."</i></p> <p>During operation, the patronage of local businesses would be markedly lower than that of the construction phase due to a smaller workforce being needed. The reduced workforce within the Site would result in no effect to local businesses. As demonstrated by the BiGGAR study (2021), there would be no effects on tourism assets and the tourism economy in the local or wider area due to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore has not included an assessment of tourism within the EIA Report. A separate Socio-Economic Benefits Report has been submitted a part of the section 36 application.</p>