Chapter 6: Scoping and Consultation

Contents

6 Scoping and Consultation

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This Chapter sets out the Scoping process that has been undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Proposed Development. It also details additional consultation that has been undertaken in respect of the Proposed Development with consultees.

6.1.2 The purpose of Scoping and consultation is to:

- ensure that statutory consultees and other bodies with a particular interest in the environment are informed of the Proposed Development and provided with an opportunity to comment at an early stage in the EIA process;
- obtain baseline information regarding existing environmental site conditions;
- establish key environmental issues and identify potential effects to be considered during the EIA;
- identify those issues which are likely to give rise to significant environmental effects and therefore which require more detailed study and those which can be justifiably excluded from further assessment;
- provide focus to the EIA process so that assessment is focussed in areas where there is likely to be significant effects; and
- provide a means of confirming the most appropriate methods of assessment.

6.2 Pre-Scoping Consultation

6.2.1 Pre-Scoping Consultation was carried out with NatureScot on the 24th of October 2019 with regard to Ornithological matters. In their response, NatureScot advised reviewing documentation from the previous Carn Gorm Wind Farm, and noted that Ben Wyvis National Nature Reserve should be given consideration when determining the scope of assessment. They confirmed the proposed survey approach was appropriate but recommended additional targeted bird surveys in certain areas, with further comments to follow at the formal scoping stage. Further consultation was carried out with the Highland Biological Recording Group (14th April 2023), the Highland Raptor Study Group (30th September 2020 and 11th July 2023) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (29th October 2019 and February 2025) for the provision of ornithological records within the vicinity of the site.

6.2.2 Pre-Scoping Consultation was also undertaken with a number of telecommunication link operators, including Arquiva, Atkins, BT, Joint Radio Company, MLL Telecom, Motorola Airwave Solutions, National Grid and Vodafone. Table 16-4, in Chapter 16 of the EIA Report summarises the consultation undertaken, and responses received from the link operators.

6.3 Scoping

6.3.1 An EIA Scoping Report (available from the ECU Portal[1]) for the Proposed Development, setting out the proposed scope of the EIA Report, was submitted to the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) on 30 June 2023 in support of a request for a formal Scoping Opinion.

6.3.2 Following the EIA Scoping Report submission, a list of consultees was agreed between the Applicant and the ECU. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain scoping advice from each consultee on environmental matters within their remit.

6.3.3 Consultation on the EIA Scoping Report commenced on the 4th of July 2023 and was due to close on the 25th of July 2023. Extensions to this until the 28th of August were granted to Historic Environment Scotland (HES), The Highland Council (THC) and Transport Scotland (TS).

6.3.4 The Scottish Ministers requested responses from their internal advisors, Transport Scotland and Scottish Forestry. Standing advice from Marine Scotland Science (MSS) was provided with the requirement to complete a checklist prior to the submission of the application for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989.

6.3.5 A list of the statutory and non-statutory consultees consulted on the Carn Fearna EIA Scoping Report and their date of response is set out in Table 6.1.

[1] https://www.energyconsents.scot/ApplicationDetails.aspx?cr=ECU00004851

Table 6.1: Summary of Scoping Opinion Responses

Consultee	Response Date
Statutory Consultee	
The Highland Council (THC)	25/08/2023
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	29/08/2023
NatureScot (NS)	21/07/2023
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	26/07/2023
Non-Statutory Consultee	
Aberdeen Airport	17/07/2023
British Horse Society	No Response
British Telecoms Plc	05/07/2023
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	No Response
Cromarty Firth Fishery Board	No Response
Crown Estate Scotland	25/08/2023
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	20/07/2023
Edinburgh International Airport	07/07/2023
Fisheries Management Scotland	No Response
Glasgow Airport	17/07/2023
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	04/07/2023
Highlands and Islands Airports Limited	20/07/2023
John Muir Trust	No Response
Joint Radio Company	04/07/2023
Mountaineering Scotland	19/07/2023
NATS Safeguarding	04/07/2023
Oban Airport	No Response
Office for Nuclear Regulation	06/07/2023
RSPB Scotland	20/07/2023
Scottish Forestry	10/07/2023
Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays)	No Response
Scottish Water	10/07/2023
Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT)	No Response
Scottish Wild Land Group (SWLG)	No Response
Transport Scotland	31/07/2023
Visit Scotland	No Response
Woodland Trust	No Response
Community Councils	
Beauly Community Council	No Response
Conon Bridge Community Council	No Response
Contin Community Council	Date of Response Not Provided
Cromarty Community Council	No Response
Dingwall Community Council	No Response
Ferintosh Community Council	20/07/2023
Garve & District Community Council	No Response
Kilmorack Community Council	No Response
Kiltearn Community Council	No Response
Marybank, Scatwell and Strathconon Community Council	No Response
Maryburgh Community Council	No Response
Muir of Ord Community Council	No Response
Resolis Community Council	No Response
Strathpeffer Community Council	No Response

6.3.6 An EIA Scoping Opinion was subsequently issued by the ECU on the 14th of September 2023[2].

6.3.7 A summary of the key issues raised at Scoping is provided in Technical Appendix 6.1. The EIA Scoping Opinion is further detailed in the consultation tables contained within each EIA Report Chapter (7 to 17), with reference to how the comments have been addressed. The EIA Report has been prepared with regard to the EIA Scoping Opinion and in conjunction with further consultation held with consultees and the ECU at Gatecheck Stages.

6.4 Further Consultation

6.4.1 In addition to the formal consultation undertaken at the EIA Scoping stage, further consultation was undertaken with a number of organisations regarding specific issues. In particular, follow-up conversations were had with:

- Dundonnell Mountain Rescue Team

[2] The full scoping opinion can be read on the ECU website here: Scottish Government - Energy Consents Unit - Application Details

- Environmental Health Officer (EHO) at THC
- HES
- HM Coastguard
- NatureScot
- Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS)
- Scottish Mountain Rescue
- THC
- Transport Scotland
- Various telecommunications operators (detailed in Chapter 16).

6.4.2 Detail of the content of those discussions is provided in the relevant technical chapters of the EIA Report (Chapters 7 to 16) and not repeated here.

6.4.3 Section 6.6 of this chapter provides information on the public exhibitions and community consultation undertaken by the Applicant.

6.5 Community Consultation

6.5.1 Public consultation, whilst not a statutory requirement, is a key element of the EIA process; therefore, as part of the wider consultation process, community engagement was undertaken with regard to Planning Advice Note (PAN) 3/2010: Community Engagement and the Energy Consents Unit Good Practice Guidance for Applications under Section 36 and 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 (Scottish Government, 2022).

6.5.2 Engagement with the local community has been a key element as the Proposed Development has progressed. A summary of the engagement undertaken is provided below. Further details of community engagement and consultation undertaken for the application are available in the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report submitted along with the Application.

6.5.3 In addition to statutory and non-statutory consultation as part of the Scoping process, engagement with the local community was undertaken through several mechanisms. A dedicated website with contact details was launched when the Proposed Development went into scoping, providing an opportunity for stakeholders and residents to view and comment on proposals.

6.5.4 The host and neighbouring Community Councils, locally elected Ward Members for the host and neighbouring wards, Member of the Scottish Parliament (MSP) and Member of Parliament (MP) for the Proposed Development were identified and contacted with information about the Proposed Development at the time of Scoping in June 2023, when the project Proposed Development first entered the public domain.

6.5.5 Local stakeholders were offered the opportunity to meet with the Proposed Development team, virtually or in person.

6.5.6 Invites and feedback forms were sent to more than 1,700 residents and business surrounding the Proposed Development at the start of each of the consultation periods. Mailing lists were updated ahead of the second exhibition to take account of local population changes.

6.5.7 Emails were sent to host and neighbouring Community Councils and the locally elected representatives. The project team regularly attended meetings of the Host Community Council to provide updates and address any issues, as well as attending appropriate meetings of neighbouring Community Councils The first public exhibitions were held from 21 to 23 November 2023 in Contin, Tarvie, Strathpeffer, and Dingwall. Members of the project team were on hand to discuss the proposals for the Proposed Development and any questions that members of the public had. Feedback forms were also available to attendees to record comments on the proposals. All the exhibition material was also available online for a period of 4 weeks on the project website.

6.5.8 A second round of public exhibitions was held In May 2024. Three in-person events were hosted on 15 and 16 May 2024 in Contin, Garve, and Strathpeffer.

6.5.9 The exhibitions were advertised in the Press and Journal and the Ross-shire Journal. Adverts were provided to Community Councils and Councillors to share on their social media. A direct mail invitation was sent to more than 1,700 households and business ahead of each of the consultation periods. The invitations included information about the Proposed Development, the location, the timings and what information would be made available, contact details and how to get involved. A feedback card and freepost envelope was included in the mailing to make it easy for local people to return their views on the proposal.

6.5.10 Engagement with the local community has been a key element as the Proposed Development progressed. Table 6.2 outlines engagement that has been undertaken with the local community to date. Further details of community consultation and the responses received are provided in detail in the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report submitted with the Application.

Table 6.2: Summary of Community Engagement (full and further details available in PAC Report)

Date	Exercise
July 2023	Scoping report goes live on Energy Consents Unit Website
31st July 2023	Introductory project letter and sample Statkraft introduction newsletter issued to elected representatives and Community Councils, providing information on project and offering meetings
30th August 2023	Presentation at Garve & District Community Council meeting
3rd October 2023	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
7th November 2023	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
21st-23rd November 2023	Public exhibitions held in Contin Community Hall, Tarvie Café, Strathpeffer Community Centre and Ross County Football Club
5th December 2023	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
30th January 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
5th March 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
9th April 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
6th May 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
15th-16th May 2024	Public exhibitions held in Contin Community Hall, Garve Public Hall and Strathpeffer Community Centre.
23rd July 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
11th September 2024	Attended Strathpeffer Community Council meeting to provide project update
5th November 2024	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update
4th March 2025	Attended Garve & District Community Council meeting to provide project update

6.5.11 The Applicant will continue to engage with the local Community Councils and other key stakeholders post the Application submission, to advise of application submission and progress through the consenting process.

6.6 Gate Check

6.6.1 Prior to an application being submitted, there is a two-stage 'gate check' process undertaken with the ECU as set out in the ECU Good Practice Guidance for Applications under Sections 36 and 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 (Scottish Government, 2022).

Gate Check Stage 1

6.6.2 In order to satisfy the requirements of the gate checking procedures for Applications under section 36 of The Electricity Act 1989, a Gate Check Stage 1 Report was submitted to the ECU on 19 July 2024, specifically to outline consultations with statutory and non-statutory consultees, engagement with the local community, and how matters raised during the scoping process would be dealt with in the EIA Report.

6.6.3 The Gate Check Stage 1 Report outlined the key considerations that had been taken into account during the design evolution of the Proposed Development.

6.6.4 The Gate Check Stage 1 Report was issued to THC, SEPA, NatureScot, and HES. The ECU confirmed on 3 September 2024 that the Gate Check 1 process was complete.

6.6.5 The following responses were received:

- HES – noted that they are broadly content that matters raised by them have been addressed, noting however that *"We notice that the summary of our responses to the Highland Major Pre-application consultation in Page 34 – 35 has mentioned that "Note new Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS, 2019) was adopted on the 1 May 2019, which replaces the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS, 2016)". The applicant should note that we did not make the above comment. It may be the case that the applicant is referring to our comment "The applicant may wish to note that the new*

strategy for Scotland's historic environment "Our Past, Our Future" has been adopted in June 2023 in lieu of "Our Place in Time (OPiT 2014)" (Section 10.5.2 refers)", which was made in our scoping response."

- NatureScot - responded advising it was content that the issues previously raised had been noted by the Applicant.
- SEPA – stated that:
    - The Applicant should demonstrate that in relation to deep peat the proposed layout accords with the avoidance element of the mitigation hierarchy that informs NPF4 Policy 5 (Soils).
    - Since providing scoping comments, it has stepped back from providing input on peat restoration. It requires clarity on avoidance of deep peat 'where possible'.
    - Forestry comments are from NatureScot rather than SEPA, and forestry can potentially be scoped out.
    - A 50m buffer to watecourses beneficial is for flood risk, pollution prevention and minimising impacts to the water environment.
    - Drainage comments are from THC and not SEPA. It's scoping response highlighted an issue in regards to borrow pits and regulatory advice.
    - It welcomes pre-application engagement on Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems.
    - Mitigation measures should be set out in full in the EIA Report. We note that an ECoW will be appointed to oversee the construction phase.
    - THC should determine if a Planning Monitoring Enforcement Officer is required.
    - Private Water Supplies (PWS) guidance is being updated. The EIA Report should accord with guidance in place at the time ofn submission.
    - It welcomes the commitment to identify existing tracks on site plans. It would be very useful if existing tracks, upgraded tracks and new tracks are colour coded.

- THC – no response received to date.

Gate Check Stage 2

6.6.6 The principal function of Gate Check Stage 2 is to manage the administrative requirements of the submission of an application under section 36 or 37 of the Electricity Act 1989. Within two weeks of submitting the Application to the ECU, the Applicant will confirm the administration process with ECU regarding the formal submission of the Application, including uploading the documents to the ECU portal, payment of application fees to the ECU, and dealing with notices.

6.7 Matters Scoped Out of Detailed Consideration

6.7.1 Paragraph 76 of Planning Circular 1/2017: Environmental Impact Assessment regulations is clear that it is the 'significant' environmental effects to which a proposed development is likely to give rise that should be the primary focus of the EIA Report and that the requirement "*is to include the information that may reasonably be required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the project on the environment".* Other lesser impacts may need *"only brief treatment to indicate that their possible relevance has been considered*" (Scottish Government, 2017).

6.7.2 Paragraph 3.1 of Planning Advice Note 1/2013 Environmental Impact Assessment (PAN 1/2013) similarly outlines that EIAs should be proportionate and fit for purpose. "*Proportionality can best be achieved by seeking information from the planning authority and the Consultation Bodies on the scope of the assessment, paying attention to their views from the outset, and by focussing on the significant environmental effects of the proposed development".* (Scottish Government, 2013). A similar emphasis is contained at paragraph 5.4 of PAN 1/2013 which outlines that the EIA Report should contain a clear analysis of the significant areas of impact and should highlight key issues relevant to the decision.

6.7.3 On the basis of the desk-based and survey work undertaken, the professional judgement of the EIA team, experience from other relevant projects, policy guidance and standards, and with the agreement of the consultees, a number of topic areas have been 'scoped out'. These are outlined by discipline below with further detail set out in the technical chapters of the EIA Report.

Decommissioning

6.7.4 Over the period of operation of the Proposed Development it is recognised that there are likely to be changes in legislation and guidance, best practice, environmental designations, the status/condition of sensitive environmental receptors and stakeholder objectives that may affect decommissioning and

restoration methodologies. An assessment of the decommissioning of the Proposed Development is included within each EIA chapter however, it should be noted that at this stage the future baseline conditions cannot be predicted accurately, the exact proposals for repowering and/ or decommissioning are unknown, and the future regulatory context is unknown.

6.7.5 Mitigation measures which may need to be implemented during decommissioning would be agreed with the key stakeholders at that time via a Decommissioning Restoration and Aftercare Strategy (DEAS). The detail of the DRAS is likely to be similar to the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) in line with best practice measures at that time.

Landscape and Visual Amenity (Chapter 7)

6.7.6 To allow a focused assessment, receptors unlikely to be affected by the Proposed Development, either through having little or no theoretical visibility, or being distant from the Proposed Development, are scoped out of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

6.7.7 The following are not included in the assessment:

- Landscape Character Types (LCTs) outwith a 20 km radius;
- designated landscapes other than the Ben Wyvis SLA;
- Wild Land Areas (WLAs) other than WLA 29 Rhiddoroch – Beinn Dearg – Ben Wyvis;
- settlements within 20 km that are not included in Local Developmemt Plan mapping and all settlements outwith a 20 km radius;
- routes outwith a 20 km radius;
- individual assessment on views from core paths due to the number of such routes (however, viewpoints located on core paths are included in the representative viewpoint list);
- Single turbines, those under 50 m to blade tip, those outwith a 45 km radius, and the proposed Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks (SSEN) 400 kilovolt (kV) overhead line (OHL) between Spittal and Beauly, in the Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CLVIA);

6.7.8 Scoping stage wind farms are not included in the CLVIA unless they are of particular relevance or if their application date is anticipated to be prior to or around the same time as the application for the Proposed Development. In this case, it has been agreed with THC that four scoping wind farms - Ballach, Ceislein, Fairburn Extension and Tarvie - are illustrated in a separate set of wirelines (Technical Appendix 7.3) in order that the relationship between these sites and the Proposed Development can be seen. These sites are not included in the written cumulative assessment due to the lack of certainty that they will form part of the future cumulative situation and the potential for the layouts/dimensions of the turbines to change prior to an application being made.

Ecology (Chapter 8)

Statutory Designated Sites

6.7.9 By virtue of the spatial separation, embedded mitigation and sensitively located and designed infrastructure, there is considered to be no anticipated significant effects between the site and the statutory designated sites with ecological qualifying features, as listed in below. The potential for indirect effects upon the ecological qualifying interests of these designated sites are therefore scoped out of assessment.

6.7.10 The assessment does not consider construction or operation effects on the following:

- Ben Wyvis Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), **with the exception of potential effects in relation to deer displacement in relation to potential impacts on habitat/vegetation which are scoped in to detailed assessment**;
- Ben Wyvis National Nature Reserve (NNR);
- Conon Islands SAC;
- Lower River Conon SSSI;
- Loch Ussie SAC and SSSI; and
- Allt nan Caorach SSSI.

6.7.11 In an EIA context, it is considered that embedded design mitigation and good practice will be sufficient to prevent any significant effects from occurring on these sites during either construction and/or operation.

Non-Statutory Designated Sites

6.7.12 Part of the site is located within the Transitional Zone of the Wester Ross Biosphere Reserve. The site is, however, located approximately 37 km away from the nearest core zone of this Biosphere Reserve. On

account of spatial separation between the site and the core zone, embedded mitigation and sensitively located and designed infrastructure, no effect upon this Biosphere Reserve is anticipated. Effects on this site are therefore scoped out of detailed assessment.

Habitats and Species (including impacts on Peatland)

6.7.13 As a result of embedded mitigation measures, it is considered that there is no route to impacts from dust, pollution and run-off to habitats likely to lead to significant adverse effects upon Annex 1, Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) or potential Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystem (GWDTE) habitats. These mitigation measures include (but are not restricted to), the implementation of good practice construction measures, pollution prevention controls, sediment management and sensitive techniques with regards to construction near water, and similar measures to be implemented during operation,

6.7.14 Therefore, indirect effects on these habitats are scoped out of detailed assessment, **with the exception of potential drying effects to hydrologically dependant habitats (i.e. blanket and modified bog, wet dwarf shrub heath and flush).**

6.7.15 Direct effects on habitats are not anticipated to occur during the operational phase, due to the implementation of embedded mitigation, including (but not restricted to) pollution prevention controls and operational vehicles keeping to defined access tracks. Such direct effects during operation are therefore scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.16 As such, effects upon Annex 1, SBL or potential GWDTE habitats through habitat loss only during the construction stage is scoped into detailed assessment

6.7.17 Habitats within the site which are Annex 1, SBL or potential GWDTE habitats, but not subject to direct or indirect effects of the Proposed Development by virtue of distance from the Proposed Development are scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.18 Habitats and vegetation communities which are not listed in Annex 1 (of the Habitats Directive) or the SBL, or which are considered of low groundwater dependency, are also scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.19 Species scoped out of this assessment where evidence of presence was recorded in the field surveys are:

- badger;
- pine marten;
- water vole;
- mountain hare;
- deer; and
- all other terrestrial mammals.

6.7.20 Other species, where no evidence of their presence was recorded during field surveys, scoped out of assessment are:

- otter;
- red squirrel;
- Scottish wildcat;
- fish;
- reptiles;
- amphibians; and
- invertebrates.

6.7.21 Embedded mitigation measures, including (but not restricted to), the implementation of good practice construction measures, pollution prevention controls, sediment management, sensitive techniques with regards to construction near water, pre-construction surveys (as detailed in Chapter 8, Section 8.7), species protection plans (where required), the presence of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) and licencing requirements (where applicable), are considered appropriate to avoid any potentially significant adverse effects upon badger, otter, pine marten, red squirrel, water vole, Scottish wildcat and mountain hare. In addition, a Fish Monitoring Plan (FMP) will also be implemented to record pre-, during and post-construction fish populations in watercourses on and adjoining the site.

6.7.22 All bat species are protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 (as amended). They are also SBL priority species. No trees or structures with the potential to support maternity roosts and/or significant swarming or hibernation roosts were identified within 200 m

plus rotor radius of the Proposed Development turbines. Roosting bats are therefore scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.23 Adverse effects on habitats and species (excluding bats) during the operation of the Proposed Development have also been scoped out. No further damage or disturbance is anticipated to habitats during operation, and maintenance visits will be infrequent and unlikely to result in disturbance to protected species. Although these ecological features are scoped out of assessment, consideration will be afforded to the provision of precautionary embedded mitigation to be included in the CEMP and Operational Management Plans to ensure legislation compliance with regard to the protection afforded to these species under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (the Habitats Regulations) (as amended in Scotland) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended in Scotland), as relevant.

Cumulative Assessment

6.7.24 Non-wind farm proposals are scoped out for the cumulative assessment.

6.7.25 Whilst single or small-scale wind turbine developments (three turbines or less) may contribute to cumulative effects, these have been scoped out of assessment, in line with NatureScot guidance (SNH, 2012), as applications for such developments do not generally consider the potential for impacts upon ecological features in sufficient detail so as to enable meaningful assessment, and information is often not readily available for small-scale developments.

Ornithology (Chapter 9)

6.7.26 The assessment is based on two full years of ornithology surveys, in line with NatureScot guidance.

6.7.27 In accordance with NatureScot guidance (SNH, 2017a) effects on passerines, which are not sensitive to wind farm developments, are also scoped out of detailed assessment, and are not considered further.

6.7.28 The construction and operation of the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in potentially significant disturbance/displacement effects to the species set out below. Effects on these species are scoped out of detailed assessment:

- osprey;
- peregrine;
- barn owl;
- goshawk;
- golden plover;
- curlew;
- greenshank;
- oystercatcher;
- teal;
- snipe;
- ptarmigan;
- greylag goose;
- pink-footed goose;
- whooper swan;
- hen harrier;
- merlin;
- short-eared owl;
- white-tailed eagle;
- divers;
- other wetland species (including mallard, grey heron and goosander);
- other species (including common crossbill, red grouse and raven);
- commoner raptors (buzzard, kestrel and sparrowhawk); and
- slavonian grebe and capercaillie.

Dotterel – Ben Wyvis SPA & SSSI

6.7.29 The Ben Wyvis Special Protection Area (SPA) is 2.38 km from the site boundary and has breeding dotterel as its qualifying interest, NatureScot and RSPB asked for dotterel to be considered in the assessments, so dotterel was included as a target species during the two years of surveys.

6.7.30 The baseline data gathering exercise did not record any evidence of dotterel in the study areas. The species was not recorded during two years of survey, nor did the desk study return any contemporary records since 2010. Only two historic records were returned from 1998 and 1999 of breeding dotterel greater than 2 km from the site boundary from within the Ben Wyvis SPA.

6.7.31 Dotterel typically breed in high altitude sites (over 900 m above sea level, (a.s.l) where they breed on scree slopes, boulder fields and corries where they nest hidden in rock cavities and between rocks (Rare Breeding Birds Panel, 2023). The site is considerably lower than 900 m, with the highest area in the extreme north-east of the site (763 m a.s.l), but with most of the site (and all turbines) located at less than 500 m a.s.l. As well as the site being considerably lower than the breeding sites which dotterel use, the site also does not contain suitable nest sites, like scree and boulder fields. The site is therefore not considered suitable for supporting breeding dotterel.

6.7.32 The field surveys did not identify any dotterel activity through the site (dotterel was a target species during VP flight activity surveys and MBBS), and the historic desk study information suggests breeding dotterel are confined to the highest peaks (> 900 m a.s.l) within the Ben Wyvis SPA. Effects on the Ben Wyvis SPA (breeding dotterel) are scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.33 The Ben Wyvis Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is 1.35 km from the site boundary and has breeding dotterel as its qualifying interest. As above with regards to the Ben Wyvis SPA, there is no evidence the site is used by dotterel, and conditions on-site are suboptimal for the species. Effects on the Ben Wyvis SSSI (breeding dotterel) are scoped out of detailed assessment.

Ben Wyvis NNR

6.7.34 The Ben Wyvis National Nature Reserve (NNR) is 1.35 km from the site boundary and although it does not have specific qualifying ornithological interest, species listed as being possible to see within the NNR are golden eagle, dotterel, ptarmigan and snow bunting. Effects on golden eagle are scoped into detailed assessment, and effects on the other listed species are scoped out of detailed assessment (with full justification provided in Chapter 9 of the EIA Report). With respect to ornithology interest of the Ben Wyvis NNR, effects are scoped out of detailed assessment (with the exception of Golden Eagle) .

Cromarty Firth and Inner Moray Firth SPAs and Ramsar Sites

6.7.35 NatureScot asked for these designated sites and greylag goose to be considered in the EIA, so initial studies were undertaken, which confirmed no detailed assessment was required.

6.7.36 The Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site is 10.82 km from the site boundary and has non-breeding greylag goose, non-breeding waterbird assemblage, breeding osprey and breeding common tern as qualifying interests. The SPA supports 1,782 non-breeding greylag geese (based on the SPA citation dated 2018, as reported in NatureScot's Sitelink, 2025).

6.7.37 The Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site is 16.58 km from the site boundary and has non-breeding greylag goose, non-breeding waterbird assemblage, breeding osprey and breeding common tern as qualifying interests. The SPA supports 2,651 non-breeding greylag geese (based on the SPA citation dated 2018, as reported in NatureScot's Sitelink, 2025).

6.7.38 The distance of the both the Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site, and the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar exceeds the core foraging range (where documented) for qualifying species (see SNH, 2016a), with the exception of greylag goose with a core range of 15-20 km.

6.7.39 However, as stated in the guidance (SNH, 2016a) the distribution of feeding geese from Mitchell (2012) enables identification of areas where impacts on geese may be of concern, or conversely where areas (although within 20 km of a goose SPA) have no connectivity with the qualifying interests. The known greylag goose feeding distributions from Mitchell (2012) reveal that the site (and adjacent habitats) does not constitute important feeding grounds for greylag goose from the SPA and Ramsar site. Furthermore, the site and immediately surrounding area (out to 500 m) are unsuitable for foraging or roosting geese.

6.7.40 During the baseline data gathering exercise only very low greylag goose activity was recorded (across the two years of survey), comprising of two 'at collision risk' flights in Year 1 (total of 17 geese) and one such flight in Year 2 (two geese). These flights were recorded in November 2019, April 2020 and October 2020. One of the flights with the greatest number of geese (15 birds in November 2019) comprised of a direct flight at the highest height band (180 + m). Note, flights within this height band had to be treated as 'at collision risk' as a precaution given some of the turbines have tip heights of up to 200 m. The reality is flights recorded solely at 180 + m, particularly with regards to traversing migratory geese (not associated with habitats on-site, or close to the site), are likely to have been considerably higher than 'at collision risk'.

No CRM analysis was carried out on greylag goose, given the very limited number of 'at collision risk' flights recorded. Accordingly, collision risk for the species is considered to be negligible.

6.7.41 The maximum number of geese passing through 'at collision risk' (at the highest height band, 180 + m) was 15 birds, which is <1 % of the SPA population. The Proposed Development is not anticipated to have any adverse effects on greylag geese from the Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site, or from the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site, either through effects on feeding habitat or through collision risk or through any displacement/barrier effect on any established movement routes.

6.7.42 Effects on the Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site and on the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site are scoped out of detailed assessment. However, information to inform an HRA is provided in Chapter 9, Section 9.14, in relation to Cromarty Firth SPA and Ramsar site (non-breeding greylag goose) and in relation to Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site (non-breeding greylag goose).

Geology, Hydrogeology, Hydrology and Peat (Chapter 10)

6.7.43 On the basis of the desk based and survey work undertaken, policy, guidance and standards, the professional judgement of the EIA team, feedback from consultees and experience from other relevant projects, the following topics have been scoped out of the assessment:

- Detailed flood risk assessment: Published mapping confirms that most of the site, except for the Off-site turning circle, is not located in an area identified as being at flood risk. A (Level 1) screening of potential flooding sources (fluvial, coastal, groundwater, infrastructure etc.) is presented in Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 and measures that would be used to control the rate and quality of run-off have been specified and will be included in the final CEMP at the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development. The Off-site turning circle will also be designed at the detailed design stage to avoid impacts on flood risk receptors, which is discussed in Section 10.7 of Chapter 10.
- Drainage Impact Assessment: Principles for the design of any watercourse crossings and for the control of run-off from the Proposed Development have been specified in Chapter 10. It is expected that these would be developed as part of the detailed site design, should the Proposed Development be granted planning permission, and a site-specific drainage plan would be a pre-development planning condition.
- Baseline water quality monitoring: As the assessment is informed by classification data available from SEPA and there are no known sources of potential water pollution, no additional baseline water quality monitoring is considered necessary to complete the assessment. Water quality monitoring would be undertaken prior to construction, throughout the construction phase and immediately post construction if the Proposed Development were to be granted consent. Details of monitoring suites, locations, frequencies, and reporting would be specified in the final CEMP.
- Potential effects on geology: With the exception of peat, there are no protected geological features within the site or study area. Furthermore, the nature of the activities during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development would not alter regional superficial or solid geology. NatureScot agreed with the approach to scope out assessment of impacts on Carn Gorm Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Potential effects on peat and carbon rich soils are scoped in to the assessment and are considered in full.

Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (Chapter 11)

6.7.44 The following have been scoped out:

- effects on the setting of heritage assets more than 10 km from the Proposed Development with the exception of Henge, 180 m W of Teanagairn Cottage (SM1668), located over c.16 km south-east of the site, which was identified as being particularly sensitive to change; and
- effects on the setting of designated heritage assets within the study area that are beyond the ZTV, and so would not be anticipated to be intervisible with the Proposed Development (no 'third points' or potential for non-visual changes have been identified).

Noise and Vibration (Chapter 12)

<u>Low Frequency Noise and Infrasound</u>

6.7.45 A study, published in 2006 by acoustic consultants Hayes McKenzie on the behalf of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), investigated low frequency noise from wind farms (Hayes McKenzie, 2006). This study concluded that there is no evidence of health effects arising from infrasound or low frequency noise generated by wind turbines, but that complaints attributed to low frequency noise were possibly due to a phenomenon known as Amplitude Modulation (AM).

6.7.46 Further, in February 2013, the Environmental Protection Authority of South Australia published the results of a study into infrasound levels near wind farms (Environment Protection Authority, 2013). This study measured infrasound levels at urban locations, rural locations with wind turbines close by, and rural locations with no wind turbines in the vicinity. It found that infrasound levels near wind farms are

comparable to levels away from wind farms in both urban and rural locations. Infrasound levels were also measured during organised shutdowns of the wind farms; the results showed that there was no noticeable difference in infrasound levels whether the turbines were active or inactive.

6.7.47 Bowdler et al. (2009) concludes that: "...there is no robust evidence that low frequency noise (including 'infrasound') or ground-borne vibration from wind farms generally has adverse effects on wind farm neighbours."

6.7.48 Therefore, low-frequency noise and infrasound have been scoped out of detailed assessment.

Amplitude Modulation

6.7.49 A study was carried out on behalf of the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) by the University of Salford, which investigated the incidence of noise complaints associated with wind farms and whether these were associated with Amplitude Modulation (AM) (University of Salford, 2007). This report defined AM as aerodynamic noise from wind turbines with a greater degree of fluctuation than normal at blade passing frequency (occasionally referred to elsewhere as 'other AM' (OAM)). Its aims were to ascertain the prevalence of AM on UK wind farm sites, to try to gain a better understanding of the likely causes, and to establish whether further research into AM is required.

6.7.50 The study concluded that AM has occurred at only a small number of wind farms in the UK (4 of 133), and only for between 7% and 15% of the time. It also states that, at the time of writing, the causes of AM were not well understood, and that prediction of the effect was not currently possible. This research was updated in 2013 by an in-depth study undertaken by RenewableUK, which identified that many of the previously suggested causes of AM have little or no association to the occurrence of AM in practice (RenewableUK, 2013). The generation of AM is based upon the interaction of several factors, the combination and contributions of which are unique to each site. With the current knowledge, it is not possible to predict whether any particular site is more or less likely to give rise to AM, and the incidence of AM occurring at any particular site remains low, as identified in the University of Salford study.

6.7.51 In 2016, the Institute of Acoustics (IOA) proposed a measurement technique to quantify the level of AM present in any particular sample of wind farm noise (Institute of Acoustics, 2016). This technique is supported by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS, formerly the Department of Energy & Climate Change) who have published guidance, which follows on from the conclusions of the IOA study in order to define an appropriate assessment method for AM, including a penalty scheme and an outline planning condition (BEIS, 2016). Section 7.2.1 of the IOA GPG therefore remains current, stating: "The evidence in relation to 'Excess' or 'Other' Amplitude Modulation (AM) is still developing. At the time of writing, current practice is not to assign a planning condition to deal with AM".

6.7.52 Therefore, Amplitude Modulation has been scoped out of detailed assessment.

Construction and Operational Vibration

6.7.53 Research undertaken by D. J. Snow found that levels of ground-borne vibration 100 m from an operational wind turbine were significantly below criteria for 'critical working areas' given by British Standard BS 6472:1992 Evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings (1 Hz to 80 Hz) and were lower than limits specified for residential premises by an even greater margin (Snow, 1997).

6.7.54 Ground-borne vibration from operational wind turbines can be detected using sophisticated instruments several kilometres (km) from a wind farm site, as reported by Keele University (Keele University, 2005). This report clearly shows that, although detectable using highly sensitive instruments, the magnitude of the operational vibration is orders of magnitude below the human level of perception and does not pose any risk to human health.

6.7.55 The nature of works and distances involved in the construction of a wind farm are such that the risk of significant effects relating to ground-borne construction vibration are very low. Notwithstanding this, in the event that stone is required to be extracted from borrow pits by blasting, such effects will be recommended to be managed through mitigation measures outlined in the CEMP.

6.7.56 Extensive research has been carried out on the subject of traffic-induced vibration impacting a range of buildings of various ages and types, and no evidence has been found that this is a source of significant damage to buildings (Watts, 1990).

6.7.57 Therefore, vibration has been scoped out of detailed assessment.

Operational Road Traffic Noise

6.7.58 The number of vehicles required to access the site during the operation of a wind farm are very low and infrequent. Therefore, no likely significant effects are anticipated in the context of the existing road network and as such an assessment of road traffic noise impacts during operation is scoped out.

Site Access, Traffic and Transport (Chapter 13)

Traffic during operation

6.7.59 Transport demand during operation would be much lower than during construction, since during operation there would be only occasional visits from maintenance or inspection vehicles. These would be unlikely to amount to more than a handful of trips per day and would therefore not be significant. The transport impacts of the Proposed Development during operation have therefore been scoped out of this assessment.

Decommissioning

6.7.60 The operational period of the Proposed Development is intended to be 50 years after which it would be decommissioned. The number of vehicle movements generated during decommissioning would likely be lower than the number generated during construction. Mitigation measures which may need to be implemented during decommissioning would be agreed with the key stakeholders in line with best practice measures at that time.

6.7.61 However, decommissioning would take place too far into the future for any meaningful assessment to be made at the time of writing (baseline traffic flows, for example, would be hard to predict that far into the future). The transport impacts of the Proposed Development during decommissioning have therefore been scoped out of this assessment.

Forestry (See Chapter 3 for more details)

6.7.62 A small amount of forestry felling (~1.2 ha) will be necessary for the construction of the Proposed Development. This is outlined in Section 3.5 of Chapter 3 (Description of the Development). Feedback from relevant consultees (THC, SEPA, NatureScot) was considered, the proposal was considered in the light of NPF4 Policy 11 and no further assessment was considered necessary.

Socio-Economics and Land Use (Chapter 14)

6.7.63 The construction of the Proposed Development would result in a total of 51 person-years of employment estimated to be generated in the local Wider Study Area economy during the construction period, however based on past experience of onshore wind farm projects of this scale, it is not expected that there would be a large influx of workers' families to the area during the construction phase (estimated to last for approximately 23 months), and those who would be working in the area would be there temporarily. Consequently, it is not expected that there would be a significant effect on the demand for permanent housing, health or educational services.

6.7.64 In terms of local direct and indirect jobs creation, the overall total number of jobs that could be created in the Wider Study Area (defined in Chapter 14) is between 11-13 jobs per annum (providing servicing, maintenance, repairs and other operational support) over the 50-year operational lifespan of the Proposed Development.

6.7.65 As such, the increased demand for permanent housing, health or educational services would be negligible and therefore effects on these are scoped out of further assessment.

6.7.66 Land use effects during the operational phase are scoped out. The operation of the Proposed Development would have minimal effect on current recreational or grazing activities occurring on the site, and these activities would be able to continue.

6.7.67 The chapter has not assessed the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to climate change (except windstorms).

6.7.68 The effects during the decommissioning phase are expected to be largely the same as those during the construction phase, albeit to a lesser degree and in approximately 50 years (and therefore unlikely to be significant in EIA terms). To avoid a repetition of the construction phase assessment, the potential effects on socio-economics, recreation and tourism during the decommissioning phase have been scoped out of the assessment. The methods and mitigation employed will follow best practice and guidance at the time of decommissioning.

Aviation (Chapter 16)

6.7.69 The closest Met Office radar is at Hill of Dudwick, near Aberdeen, over 150 km to the east of the site. The Met Office only require to be consulted in relation to wind turbine proposals within 20 km of their weather radar facilities

6.7.70 There will be no effect on Met Office radars and this issue is therefore scoped out of the EIA Report.

Other Environmental Considerations (Chapter 16)

<u>Shadow Flicker</u>

6.7.71 The shadow flicker assessment is based on properties located within 11 rotor diameters, rather than the standard 10, as requested by THC. Shadow flicker effects beyond this range are not considered.

Telecommunications

6.7.72 Effects on television and radio signals have been scoped out of detailed assessment for the following reasons:

- Operational effects on television: digital television is less likely to be affected by the atmospheric conditions that rendered analogue television unwatchable and does not suffer from reflection effects or ghosted image generation.
- Operational effects on radio broadcasting signals: radio broadcasting will not be affected by the Proposed Development once operational as the length of radio broadcast signal wavelengths are such that interference from wind turbines is unlikely and any interference to the radio signal is unlikely to noticeably affect the audio signal.

Ice Throw

6.7.73 Icing in Scotland is likely to be a rare occurrence, with the Icing Map of Europe (WECO, 2000) showing Scotland to be within a light icing area with an annual average of only 2-7 icing days per year. The risk associated with ice throw affecting members of the public is considered to be very low given the remote location of the Proposed Development. This risk is further minimised as the turbines are fitted with vibration sensors which shut them down should any imbalance, potentially caused by icing, is detected.

6.7.74 To further minimise the risk, the following mitigation measures will be taken:

- service crews will be trained regarding the potential for ice throw;
- ice risk conditions will be monitored by the wind farm operator; and
- public notices will be displayed at access points alerting members of the public and staff accessing the site of the possible risk of ice throw under certain weather conditions.

6.7.75 Ice throw is therefore scoped out of assessment within the EIA Report.

Air Quality

6.7.76 As the nearest property is over 500 m away from any substantial construction works, effects associated with dust or vehicle emissions are considered to be unlikely, therefore the effects of dust and vehicle emissions from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development with regard to air quality were scoped out of detailed assessment.

6.7.77 A Dust Management Plan is included within the outline CEMP (Appendix 3.1) which sets out mitigation measures to be implemented on-site including for site activities and the movement of construction traffic along with regular monitoring activities to ensure that dust as a result of construction of the Proposed Development is adequately controlled.

6.7.78 Consideration is given within the ecology and hydrology assessments (Chapters 8 and 10) to the potential impacts that dust generation could have on any identified sensitive ecological or hydrological receptors. Detailed mitigation as required is proposed within these chapters, otherwise air quality is scoped out of the EIA Report.

Major Accidents and Disasters

6.7.79 Major accidents or disasters have been scoped in where they represent a risk to the Proposed Development, either due to the proposed location of the Proposed Development, or due to the Proposed Development itself. A high risk is considered to be where there is reasonable likelihood of the accident or disaster occurring, or where the effect of the accident or disaster would lead to the requirement for mitigation which is beyond the usual scope of construction or operational activities. Table 6.3 shows where an accident or disaster is scoped in, which EIA Chapter considers it in further detail, and provides a summary of the conclusions for each topic scoped in.

Table 6.3: Summary of Major Accidents and Disasters Scoped in / out and Summary of Conclusions

Major Accident or Disaster	Risk due to location	Risk due to Project	Scoped in/out due to risk	Rationale	EIA Report Chapter and conclusions
Earthquakes	No	No	Out	Any earthquakes in the vicinity of the Proposed Development are predicted to be of a very small magnitude. The design of	n/a

Major Accident or Disaster	Risk due to location	Risk due to Project	Scoped in/out due to risk	Rationale	EIA Report Chapter and conclusions
				foundations would enable turbines to withstand such low magnitude events.	
Biological hazards: epidemics	Very Low	Very Low	Out	The likelihood of any epidemics affecting the construction or operation of the Proposed Development is predicted to be very low.	n/a
Biological hazards: animal and insect infestation	Very Low	Very Low	Out	The likelihood of any animal and insect infestations affecting the construction or operation of the Proposed Development is considered to be very low	n/a
Famine / food insecurity	Negligible	Very Low	Out	The likelihood of famine/food insecurity affecting the construction or operation of the Proposed Development is considered to be Negligible.	n/a
Tsunamis	No	No	Out	The location of the Proposed Development and its distance from the marine environment means there is no risk of Tsunamis affecting the Proposed Development	n/a
Volcanic eruptions	No	No	Out	There are no active volcanos anywhere near the Proposed Development	n/a
Displaced populations	Negligible	Very Low	Out	Displacement at a population level is not considered to have occurred or be likely to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Development.	n/a
Severe weather; droughts	Very low	No	Out	Drought conditions would not affect the operation of the Proposed Development.	n/a
Landslide/ subsidence	Low	Low	In	A peat landslide and hazard risk assessment (PLHRA) has been undertaken and is included as Technical Appendix 10.1.	Chapter 10, Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat The PLHRA concluded that regarding peat stability there is a negligible to low risk of peat instability over most of the main site, although some areas of medium and high risk have been identified. For these areas, a hazard impact assessment was completed which concluded that, subject to micro-siting and the employment of appropriate mitigation measures, all

Major Accident or Disaster	Risk due to location	Risk due to Project	Scoped in/out due to risk	Rationale	EIA Report Chapter and conclusions
					these areas can be considered as an insignificant hazard.
Severe Weather; storms	Medium	No	Out	Turbines have lightning conductors and when wind speeds are at a level which could cause damage to components turbines would automatically shut down.	n/a
Severe weather; extreme temperatures	Low	Very low	Out	The remote location of the Proposed Development leads to relatively low icing risk. As well as turbine sensors, mitigation would be as follows: • service crews would be trained in relation to ice throw; • ice risk conditions would be monitored by the operator of the Proposed Development; and • public notices to be displayed at access points to alert the public and staff the potential risk of ice throw under certain weather conditions.	Chapter 16, Other Environmental Considerations provides further information in relation to ice risk.
Cyber attacks	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Floods	Low	Very Low	In	Damage to infrastructure and / or turbines may result from flooding, or the Proposed Development may lead to increased flood risk elsewhere.	Chapter 2, Site Description and Design Evolution. Chapter 10, Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat Detailed flood risk assessment is scoped out: Published mapping confirms that most of the site, except for the Off-site turning circle, is not located in an area identified as being at flood risk. Measures that would be used to control the rate and quality of run-off have been specified and will be included in the final CEMP at the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development. The Off-site turning circle will also be designed at the detailed design stage to avoid impacts on flood risk receptors, which is discussed in Section 10.7 of Chapter 10.

Major Accident or Disaster	Risk due to location	Risk due to Project	Scoped in/out due to risk	Rationale	EIA Report Chapter and conclusions
					There would therefore be no significant effects predicted in respect of flooding.
Terrorist Incidents	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Disruptive industrial activities	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Public disorder	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Wildfires	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Poor Air Quality events	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a
Transport accidents	No	Yes	In – abnormal loads and increase in traffic from construction.	Abnormal loads or an increase in traffic could increase accident risk. Increase in risk would occur if public the road network is unsuitable for such traffic.	Chapter 2, Site Description and Design Evolution, and Chapter 13, Traffic and Transport. Chapter 13 concludes that there would be no significant effects in respect of accident risk.
Industrial accidents	No	Yes	In – from construction and maintenance	Increased risk of industrial accidents due to working at height, manual labour, high voltages and use of specialist plant. All relevant health and safety legislation and industry best practice would be followed.	Health and safety is sufficiently managed by health and safety legislation and regulations. In addition Chapter 2, Site Description and Design Evolution, Chapter 16, Other Environmental Considerations concludes there would be no significant effects as a result of industrial accidents.
Urban Fires	No	No	Out	n/a	n/a

6.8 References

HM Government (1981). *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981*. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69/contents.

HM Government (1989). The Electricity Act 1989. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/29/pdfs/ukpga_19890029_en.pdf.

HM Government (1994). Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1994/2716/contents.

Institute of Acoustics (2013). A good practice guide to the application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise. Available at: https://www.ioa.org.uk/sites/default/files/IOA%20Good%20Practice%20Guide%20on%20Wind%20Turbine%20Noise%20-%20May%202013.pdf.

Scottish Government (2010). Planning Advice Note 3/2010: community engagement. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2010/08/planning-advice-note-3-2010-community-engagement/documents/0103851-pdf/0103851-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/0103851.pdf.

Scottish Government (2013). Planning Advice Note 1/2013: Environmental Impact Assessment. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2013/08/planning-advice-note-1-2013-environmental-impact-assessment/documents/00521028-pdf/00521028-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00521028.pdf.

Scottish Government (2014). Onshore wind turbines: planning advice. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/publications/onshore-wind-turbines-planning-advice/.

Scottish Government (2017). Planning Circular 1/2017: Environmental Impact Assessment regulations. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2017/05/planning-circular-1-2017-environmental-impact-assessment-regulations-2017/documents/00518122-pdf/00518122-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00518122.pdf.

Scottish Government (2017b). The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/pdfs/ssi_20170101_en.pdf.

Scottish Government (2022). Energy Consents Unit Good Practice Guidance for Applications under Section 36 and 37 of the Electricity Act 1989. Available at: https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/advice-and-guidance/2022/02/good-practice-guidance-applications-under-sections-36-37-electricity-act-1989/documents/energy-consents-unit-good-practice-guidance-applications-under-section-36-37-electricity-act-1989-february-2022/energy-consents-unit-good-practice-guidance-applications-under-section-36-37-electricity-act-1989-february-2022/govscot%3Adocument/energy-consents-unit-good-practice-guidance-applications-under-section-36-37-electricity-act-1989-february-2022.pdf.

SNH (2016). Scottish Natural Heritage Assessing Connectivity with Special Protection Areas (SPAs) Guidance Version 3 – June 2016. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2022-12/Assessing%20connectivity%20with%20special%20protection%20areas.pdf

SNH (2017). Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore wind farms. Scottish Natural Heritage, Inverness. March 2017 v2. Available at: https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-06/Guidance%20Note%20-%20Recommended%20bird%20survey%20methods%20to%20inform%20impact%20assessment%20of%20onshore%20windfarms.pdf

WECO, (2000), Icing Map of Europe