

Appendix 3.3 Kirkan Onshore Wind Farm Consultation Matrix

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Ofcom (Spectrum Licensing)	Ofcom Licensing	DEO@ofcom.org.uk	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 07/12/2017	Details of identified operator's links received 12 th December 2017.	Follow up with identified operators.
JRC	JRC Windfarm Coordinations	windfarms@jrc.co.uk	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential and mitigation via re-routing. Response received 12 th December 2017. JRC indicated they would object to the proposal as one radio link could be affected, unless mitigation was agreed	Follow up with identified operators.
JRC	JRC Windfarm Coordinations	windfarms@jrc.co.uk	Email from JRC to James McKenzie, ECU 25/05/18	JRC re-consulted at scoping stage regarding the final layout for the windfarm. Confirmation provided from JRC that one radio link (belonging to SSE Networks) could potentially be affected by six wind turbines while thirteen wind turbines would not have any impact on radio infrastructure. <i>The JRC objection will be withdrawn after simple analysis shows no issues; when a satisfactory coordination has been achieved and the zone of protection is implemented; or when an appropriate mitigation agreement is in place.</i>	Follow up with identified operators.
JRC	Ted Aksamit (Operations Director)	Ted.aksamit@jrc.co.uk	Email and phone correspondence December	Ongoing dialogue, involving production of Coordination and Mitigation Analysis reports by JRC, has resulted in agreed mitigation. Heads of Terms for mitigation being awaited from SSE (email from Ted Aksamit, 15 th March 2019).	Follow up with identified operators.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
			2017 to March 2019		
JRC	The Wind Farm Team	Wind Farm Ream The Joint Radio Company Limited, Dead Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London, SW1P 2AF 020 7706 5199	Email Received 25/05/2018	On assessing the potential of such development to interfere with radio systems, JRC concluded that there are affected links including 1GHz microwave point to point: SCHY 0929238/1 – The Local Utility. On this basis, JRC objects to the proposed development. The following six turbines are impacted by the development: T3 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 235583 868652 T4 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 235984 868971 T6 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 236076 868334 T9 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 236269 867871 T14 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 236604 867473 T19 hub 104m blades 71m Grid ref OSGB 236936 867127	JRC concerns have been addressed within Chapter 12 of the EIAR.
Ericsson	Tech Services	tech.servic es- tx@ericsson.com	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential for mitigation via re-routing. There is one link in the vicinity of the proposal. Response received 18 th December 2017 with Ericsson requirements (on behalf of their clients EE). Mitigation has been agreed.	Follow up with identified operators.
EE (client of Ericsson)	Chris Hudson (EE)	Chris.hudson@ee.co	Email and phone	Proposal for fibre optic re-routing obtained from BT Openreach June 2018, presented to and accepted by Chris Hudson (EE) as acceptable mitigation.	Addressed in Chapter 12

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
managed link)	Freddie Wilby (WHP Telecoms – agents for EE)	uk F.wilby@whptelecoms.com	correspondence May to June 2018		
BT (openreach)	Paul Atkinson	paul.3.atkinson@openreach.co.uk	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential for mitigation via re-routing. Response received 14 th December 2017. BT indicated they would object to the proposal if their radio links could be affected. BT require 100m minimum clearance from the Blade tip to the link path. Required clearance has been achieved.	Follow up with identified operators.
BT (openreach)	Paul Atkinson	paul.3.atkinson@openreach.co.uk	Email from BT to James McKenzie 07/06/18	BT re-consulted at scoping stage regarding the final layout for the windfarm. BT concluded that, the Project indicated should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	No further action required.
O2 Telefonica	Jose Sanchez	Jose.Sanchez@o2.com	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential for mitigation via re-routing. Response received 12 th December 2017. There is one link in the vicinity of the proposal the start and end coordinates and required clearance for which have been provided. Required clearance has been achieved.	No further action required.
Vodafone	Vodafone Group	ofcomapplications@vodafone.com	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential for mitigation via re-routing. Response received 12 th December 2017. Vodafone have 2 links in the vicinity of the proposal the start and end coordinates for which have been provided. They	No further action required.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				require 100m clearance from the tip of any turbine blade to fixed link radio path. Required clearance has been achieved.	
Atkins	Windfarm Support	windfarms@atkinglobal.com	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 12/12/2017	Asked for link ends coordinates, minimum separation buffer, and potential for mitigation via re-routing. Response received 28 th December 2017. Atkins would not object to the proposal.	No further action required.
MOD (DIO Safeguarding)	Safeguarding DIO	dio-safeguarding-wind@mod.gov.uk	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis Pre-planning pro-forma 16/02/2018	Submitted coordinates for max turbine area extents, max dimensions. No direct response received.	Follow up with identified operators.
MOD (DIO Safeguarding)	Safeguarding DIO	kalie.jagpal326@mod.gov.uk	Email from Katie Jagpal, DIO to James McKenzie, ECU 20/06/18	Scoping response confirmed that MOD had no objection to the proposal for 19 wind turbines.	No further action required.
NATS Safeguarding	Safeguarding NATS	NATS Safeguarding@nats.co.uk	Email from NATS Safeguarding	Scoping response confirmed that the proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with NATS safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.	No further action required.
Highlands and Islands Airport	Anne Phillips	safeguarding@hial.co.uk	Email from Trevor Hunter, Coriolis 19/02/2018	Submitted coordinates for max turbine area extents, max dimensions. No direct response received.	Follow up with identified operators.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Highlands and Islands Airport	Anne Phillips	APhillips@hial.co.uk	Email from Anne Phillips, HIAL 18/06/2018	Scoping response confirmed that calculations show that, at the given position and height, the development would not infringe the safeguarding surfaces for Inverness and Wick Airport.	Addressed in Chapter 12, Aviation, Radar and Telecommunications.
RSPB	Phil Dowling	Phil.Dowling@rspb.org.uk	Email correspondence, SLR Consulting 26/08/2016	<p>Provided comments in relation to proposed scope of ornithological surveys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend undertaking migratory vantage point surveys for geese • Recommend wildfowl, waders and raptors winter walkover surveys • Suggest targeted surveys for dotterel and wood sandpiper • Suggest survey for golden eagle in January to March, following the surveying guidance provided in Gilbert <i>et al.</i> (1998) • Subsequently provided local bird records via request in 2017. 	<p>Ornithology Chapter included within EIAR, see Chapter 7.</p> <p>Record details considered sensitive and restricted to Chapter 7, Ornithology, Appendix 7.3.</p>
RSPB	Phil Dowling	Phil.Dowling@rspb.org.uk	Email from Phil Dowling, RSPB 19/6/18	<p>In their Scoping response RSPB specifically, in relation to ornithology advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on all species should be adequately covered within the EIA Report. • Site is close to the Glen Affric SPA designated for breeding golden eagles. The potential impacts on golden eagle should therefore be a priority for assessment, including in relation to collision risk. • Consideration to be given to black grouse and ground nesting birds – golden plover. • If tree felling is required SNH (2016) guidance wind farm proposals on afforested sites – advice on reducing suitability for hen harrier, merlin and short eared owl. • Cumulative Impacts – Welcome proposal to include an assessment of cumulative impacts in relation to other projects, and this should be undertaken in accordance with relevant SNH advice. 	<p>Information provided used to inform species-specific survey, notably in relation to black grouse and breeding raptors.</p> <p>Record details considered sensitive and restricted to Chapter 7, Ornithology, Appendix 7.3.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Highland Biological Recording Group	HBRG Records	records@hbrg.org.uk	Email correspondence, SLR Consulting 12/08/2016	Request for ecological records and designated sites for nature conservation. Records received, including those for sensitive breeding species.	Ornithological and Ecological impacts are found within chapters 7 and 6. Record details considered sensitive and restricted to Chapter 7, Ornithology, Appendix 7.3.
RSPB	Data unit	dataunit@rspb.org.uk	Nicole Robinson Avian Ecology Ltd. 09/01/2017	Request for ornithological records out to at least 8km from the approximate site centre. Records received, including those for sensitive breeding species.	Ornithological details are found within Chapter 7. Record details considered sensitive and restricted to Chapter 7, Ornithology, Appendix 7.3.
Highland Raptor Study Group	HRSR Chairperson		Email correspondence, SLR Consulting 24 th August 2016	Request for ornithological records out to at least 8km from the approximate site centre. No response provided.	Follow up request. Ornithological details are found within Chapter 7.
Highland Raptor Study Group	HRSR Chairperson		Email correspondence from Nicole Robinson, Avian Ecology 09/01/2017	Request for ornithological records out to at least 8km from the approximate site centre. Response received in relation to records for sensitive breeding species.	Information provided used to inform species-specific survey, notably in relation to breeding raptors. Record details considered sensitive and restricted to Chapter 7, Ornithology, Appendix 7.3.
Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit	James McKenzie	Consents Manager 0131 244 1081	Email from Joe Somerville, RSK 25/01/2018	Request for a short and informal chat or teleconference to learn a bit more about the background to the projects before kick off with inception meetings	No further action required.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		07870 90 50 90 James.Mckenzie@gov.scot			
SNH	Liz McLachlan	Liz.McLachlan@snh.gov.uk	Email correspondence, SLR Consulting 26/08/2016	<p>Provided comments in relation to the scope ornithological and ecological surveys.</p> <p>Advised that overall, proposed survey methodologies suggested look fine, with the provision that they will need to be undertaken fully in accordance with SNH guidance.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to ornithology advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the findings of the Lochluichart and Corriemoillie surveys there seems little need for additional migratory wildfowl surveys. Winter walkovers in this part of the Highlands tend not to provide much useful data but black grouse info might be useful. SNH don't consider there is any real connectivity between the site and the wood sandpiper and dotterel SPAs so no dedicated surveys needed. Survey data from the 2015 national golden eagle survey to be sourced and relate species activity to possible nests. 	<p>Surveys undertaken in accordance with relevant SNH guidance.</p> <p>Information request to be submitted to RSPB/HRSG to obtain golden eagle records from 2015 national species survey.</p> <p>Chapter 7, Ornithology, outlines the scope of bird related surveys. Technical appendix 7.1 outlines the methodology and results of studies.</p>
SNH	Liz McLachlan	Liz.McLachlan@snh.gov.uk	Email correspondence, Nicole Robinson Avian Ecology Ltd. 20/10/2017	<p>Provided further comments in relation to the scope of Year 2 ornithology surveys, based on findings from Year 1 surveys.</p> <p>Advised on the known presence of breeding golden eagle in the area and outlined the requirement for monitoring of the territory in 2018 to establish any breeding outcome.</p> <p>Outlined that further survey effort in relation to breeding divers was not required on the basis of existing information on the species within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Outlined that the proposed effort for Vantage Point surveys remained acceptable and that further winter walkovers were not required.</p>	<p>Response fully considered when undertaking technical assessments for Chapters 7 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Technical appendix 7.1 outlines the methodology and results of studies.</p>
SNH	Nathan	Nathan.mc	Scoping report	Specifically, in relation to ornithology advised:	A section containing "Information

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
	McLaughlan	laughlan@snh.gov.uk CNS/REN/ WF/Kirkan windfarm	and response. Response dated 18/06/2018	A Habitats Regulations Appraisal for Glen Affric to Strathconon Special Protection Area should be carried out (regarding golden eagle activity).	to inform a HRA” is presented at the end of Chapter 7, Ornithology.
SNH	Nathan McLaughlan	Nathan.mcLaughlan@snh.gov.uk CNS/REN/ WF/Kirkan windfarm	Scoping report and response. Response dated 18/06/2018	No specific comments made regarding ecological features, and instead confirmed they are happy with the approach followed, as long as SNH guidance is adhered to.	Ecological surveys have been carried out following the most recent SNH guidance. Addressed in Chapter 6, Ecology.
SEPA	Cerian Baldwin	Senior Planning Officer Planning Service, SEPA, Graesser House, Dingwall Business Park, Dingwall IV15 9XB 01349 860415 cerian.baldwin@sepa.org.uk	Email 01/05/2018	SEPA provided their generic Windfarm scoping response prior to the pre-scoping meeting hosted by THC and a response to the meeting minutes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unless it can be demonstrated that infrastructure sharing is likely to result in a greater environmental impact then SEPA is unlikely to support proposals for new infrastructure where existing infrastructure is available. SEPA are unlikely to support proposals on GWDTEs or deep peat. SEPA would welcome any opportunity to comment on draft scoping or information and find this works best if developers simply email these directly. SEPA are happy to attend any further meetings and would encourage the use of HC’s Major Pre App Service as recommended during the meeting 	Design iterations are explained in Section 2.6 of the Proposed Development chapter. Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4. Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
SEPA	Cerian Baldwin Senior Planning Officer	Reference PCS/158128 Senior Planning Officer Planning Service, SEPA, Graesser House, Dingwall Business Park, Dingwall IV15 9XB 01349 860415 cerian.baldwin@sepa.org.uk	Email – Formal Pre-Application Response 01/05/2018	<p>Key Points</p> <p>To avoid delay and potential objection the following information must be submitted in support of the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications. b) Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers. c) Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers. d) Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals. e) Map and table detailing forest removal. f) Map and site layout of borrow pits. g) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures. h) Decommissioning statement. <p>Site specific comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the presence of existing tracks and infrastructure, which are already shared by two different windfarm operators, the site layout must make best of use of these minimising the disturbance of previously undisturbed ground. We already advised this during the previous pre- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assessment of all activities that may affect the water environment is provided in Section 8.6 Flood risk is covered in Section 8.5.19. Details relating to CAR applications are provided in Technical Appendix 8.1. Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan. Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment. b) Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for full GWDTE assessment. c) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures. This includes all relevant details and risk assessment. Private water supplies and related

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>application meeting with the applicant, ECDU and SNH on 13 April 2017. We are disappointed the applicant has not revised their designs. For the avoidance of doubt, we will object unless site access is taken from the existing windfarm access routes or it can be demonstrated that the impact upon the environment would be less from the creation of a new access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As much of the site is on peat, we would expect the layout to be designed to minimise the disturbance of peat and be supported by a full site-specific Peat Management Plan. We note that an NVC Survey has already been undertaken. Much of the site is likely to be peatland and/or wetland and we will expect the layout to avoid Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems. Details of how the existing water supply will be protected should be submitted. As long as watercourse crossings are designed to accommodate the 1 in 200 year and other infrastructure is located well away from watercourses we do not foresee a need for detailed information on flood risk to be provided. 	<p>pipework are included within Section 8.6.</p> <p>d) Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.</p> <p>e) Forestry details are found in Appendix 2.1.</p> <p>f) Location and layout of borrow pits is confirmed in Chapter 2.</p> <p>g) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>Design iterations are explained in Section 2.6 of the Proposed Development chapter.</p>
Scottish Government	James McKenzie	Consents Manager 0131 244 1081 07870 90 50 90 James.Mckenzie@gov.scot	Email – Formal Pre-Application Advice Service: Response	<p>Key Points:</p> <p>The Scottish Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> agrees that the current Scottish Planning Policy, the Energy Strategy and Onshore Wind Policy Statement should be addressed by the application echoes the advice from Highland Council to consider the Control of Woodland Removal Policy recommends that any potential impacts on freshwater fisheries are considered, with an outline of any proposals for water quality analysis and monitoring including macroinvertebrate and fish surveys recommends that an investigation is carried out into the presence of any 	<p>Private water supplies and related pipework have been identified. Details and risk assessment are provided in Section 8.6.</p> <p>Effects on fisheries are considered in Chapter 6, with a Fish Habitat Survey included as Appendix 6.4.</p> <p>Details of proposed water quality monitoring are provided in Table 8.9 and Figure 8.5.</p> <p>Forestry has been considered within Appendix 2.1.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				drinking water (including private) supplies or Scottish Water assets which may be impacted by the development, and if any are found, that an assessment is carried out of the potential impacts, risks and mitigation measures.	
The Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit	James McKenzie Consents Manager	Ref: 18/00618/ PREAPP01 31 244 1081 07870 90 50 90 James.McKenzie@gov.scot	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Issued 01/05/2018	As Above.	As above.
The Highland Council Landscape Officer	Anne Cowling Landscape Officer	Ref: 18/00618/ PREAPP 01463 785 151 Anne.cowling@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Issued 01/05/2018	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accordance with SG assessment criteria • Full exploration of impacts of ancillary elements • Receptor Led Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (including detailed assessment of local landscape in terms of composition and interactions.) 	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included within Chapter 4 of the EIAR.
Scottish Natural Heritage	Nathan McLaughlan	01349 865 333 Nathan.mclaughlan@snh.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref:	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and visual impacts including wild land • Impacts on designated sites • Impacts on protected species including bats, otters, wildcat, red squirrel, 	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included within Chapter 4 of the EIAR. Wild Land Impact Assessment is Appendix 4.6 of the EIAR. Viewpoint Assessment is in Appendix 4.7. Landscape

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
			18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	<p>pine marten, water vole and badger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on birds • Impacts on Peat • Impacts of the proposal on deer and impacts of the dispersal of deer onto the surrounding area, in particular onto the adjacent designated sites should be assessed 	<p>Designations information is included within Appendix 4.3 of the EIAR.</p> <p>Impacts on birds has been addressed in Chapter 7, Ornithology. Technical appendix 7.1 outlines the methodology and results of studies.</p> <p>Impacts upon designated sites and protected species have been assessed within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Baseline surveys have been undertaken in accordance with SNH guidance and as agreed through scoping. Full details of methodologies and findings are provided within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report and associated appendices.</p> <p>An Outline Habitat Management Plan has been included as Appendix 6.6.</p> <p>An assessment of the potential impacts upon deer has also been included as Appendix 6.5.</p> <p>Bat Activity Surveys are outlined in</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
					Appendix 6.3, and Protected Species in Appendix 6.2. Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details relating to peat, and relevant mitigation.
The Highland Council Contaminated Land Team	Esther MacRae	Scientific Officer, Contaminated Land 01463 228 734 Esther.macrae@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	No comment regarding potential land contamination issues at this site.	No further action required.
The Highland Council Environmental Health	Robin Fraser	Environmental Health 01349 868 445 Robin.fraser@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise – in terms of operational noise, the applicant will be required to submit a noise assessment regarding the operational phase of the development, taking into account cumulative impacts. In terms of construction noise, where there is potential for disturbance from construction noise, the application will need to include a noise assessment. Regardless of whether this is required, it is expected that best practice means will be implemented to reduce the impact of noise from construction activities. Private water supplies – An investigation will be required to identify any private water supplies, including pipework, which may be adversely affected by the development. Details of proposed measures to prevent contamination or physical disruption should be submitted. 	The noise assessment is included within Chapter 10 of the EIAR. Predicted impacts are found within 10.6, Mitigation within 10.7. Appendix 10.1 is the technical report, including the cumulative assessment. Private water supplies and related pipework have been identified. Details and risk assessment are provided in Section 8.6.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust – where houses are in close proximity to the construction area or access track, the potential for dust should be assessed and if required, a scheme for the suppression of dust should be submitted. 	
The Highland Council Transport Planning Team	Jane Bridge	Transport Planning 01463 252 965 Jane.bridg@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	Key Points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early clarification of point of access onto public road network (prior to TA) Wear and Tear Agreement may be required 	Appendix 11.1 contains a drawing illustrating the site access proposals. The construction details of this will be secured through a planning condition, as is the typical route.
Transport Scotland	John McDonald	Transport Scotland 0141 2727 386 John.mcdonald@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agrees that it is acceptable for an air quality assessment and the operational phase of the proposed development to be scoped out. Looks for the EIA Report to include a Traffic and Transport Assessment Chapter. 	Traffic and Transport chapter included as Chapter 11.
The Highland Council Flood Risk Management Team	Alison Fernie	Flood Risk Management 01349 868 800 Alison.fernier2@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP	Key Points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 50m buffer zone around waterbodies. Management of surface water to be assessed in a Drainage Impact Assessment for events up to the 1 in 200 year return period. Discharge to be limited to greenfield runoff rates. Flood Risk Assessment may be required. 	All development work is at least 50 m away from watercourses and waterbodies, except where crossings are required, and the site entrance construction compounds which make use of existing infrastructure. Please see Figure 8.5.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		nd.gov.uk	Issued 01/05/2018		<p>Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment.</p> <p>Flood risk is considered in Section 8.5.19.</p>
SEPA	Cerian Baldwin	SEPA 01349 860 415 Planning.Dingwall@sepa.org.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	<p>As per SEPA’s previous response (Formal Pre-Application Response SEPA reference PCS/158128), the Key points:</p> <p>To avoid delay and potential objection the following information must be submitted in support of the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications. b) Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers. c) Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers. d) Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals. e) Map and table detailing forest removal. f) Map and site layout of borrow pits. g) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures. h) Decommissioning statement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assessment of all activities that may affect the water environment is provided in Section 8.6 <p>Flood risk is covered in Section 8.5.19.</p> <p>Details relating to CAR applications are provided in Technical Appendix 8.1.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
					<p>Watercourse Crossing Assessment.</p> <p>b) Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for full GWDTE assessment.</p> <p>c) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures. This includes all relevant details and risk assessment. Private water supplies and related pipework are included within Section 8.6.</p> <p>d) Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.</p> <p>e) Forestry details are found in Appendix 2.1.</p> <p>f) Location and layout of borrow pits is confirmed in Chapter 2.</p> <p>g) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>Design iterations are explained in Section 2.6 of the Proposed Development chapter.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
The Highland Council Historic Scotland Team	Kirsty Cameron	Archaeologist 01463 702504 Kirsty.Cameron@highland.gov.uk	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideally, direct impacts to the historic environment can be avoided by careful design and micro-siting. Indirect (setting) impacts must be assessed. 	The environmental impact assessment process in Sections 5.5 baseline, 5.6 impact assessment and 5.7 mitigation. Cumulative impacts and impacts on setting are discussed in Section 5.6. with appropriate illustrations.
Historic Environment Scotland	Dr Mary MacLeod Rivett	Historic Environment Scotland 0131 668 8688 Mary.MacLeod@hes.scot	Letter/Email – Pre-application Advice Pack Ref: 18/00618/PRE APP Issued 01/05/2018	Key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have previously responded to a scoping consultation by Scottish Government on 11 April 2017 in relation to scoping for this proposal. According to the information provided, there are no designated historic environment assets within the proposed development site. There are a number of heritage assets in our interest in the wider area surrounding the proposed development, the setting of which may be impacted upon as a result of the proposal. Any Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken should therefore include a thorough assessment of the turbines' effects on these. Any Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken should therefore include a thorough assessment of the turbines' effects on these, focusing on the setting of heritage assets which are located within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility. Therefore, if the applicant wishes to submit a ZTV, or a list of heritage assets which are located within the ZTV which they are including as part of their assessment, we would be happy to review this prior to submission of an EIA. 	Studies and impacts relating to historic environment interests are included in Section 5.6 of the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter.
Fisheries Management Scotland (FSM)	Brian Davidson Dir Communications and	Fisheries Management Scotland,	Email Received 28/05/2018	Recommended following the FMS and Marine Scotland Science advice on terrestrial windfarms throughout the planning, construction and monitoring phases of the proposed development.	FMS and Marine Scotland advice has been taken into account in Chapter 6 (ecology) and 8 (hydrology). Appendix 6.4 is the

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
	Administration	11 Rutland Square, Edinburgh, EH1 2AS			Fish Habitat Survey.
SEPA	Cerian Baldwin Senior Planning Officer	SEPA ref: PCS/159309 SEPA, Graesser House, Fodderty Way, Dingwall Business Park, Dingwall, IV15 9XB Planning.dingwall@sepa.org.uk 01349 862 021	Email Received 30/05/2018	<p>To avoid delay and potential objection, the information outlined below and in the attached appendix must be submitted in support of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications. b) Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers. c) Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers. d) Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals. e) Map and table detailing forest removal. f) Map and site layout of borrow pits. g) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures. h) Decommissioning statement. <p>Site specific comments:</p> <p>1.1 Given the presence of existing tracks and infrastructure, which are already shared by two different windfarm operators, the site layout must make best of use of these minimising the disturbance of previously undisturbed ground. We already advised this during the previous pre-application meeting with the applicant, ECDU and SNH on 13 April 2017. We are disappointed the applicant has not revised their designs. For the avoidance of doubt, we will object unless site access is taken from the existing windfarm access routes or it can be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assessment of all activities that may affect the water environment is provided in Section 8.6 Flood risk is covered in Section 8.5.19. Details relating to CAR applications are provided in Technical Appendix 8.1. Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan. Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment. b) Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for full GWDTE assessment. c) Please see Section 8.6 for

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>demonstrated that the impact upon the environment would be less from the creation of a new access.</p> <p>1.2 As much of the site is on peat, we would expect the layout to be designed to minimise the disturbance of peat and be supported by a full site-specific Peat Management Plan.</p> <p>1.3 We note that an NVC Survey has already been undertaken and an NVC map is submitted. Once the site layout is further progressed we would welcome the opportunity to review this and the full NVC survey. Much of the development is likely to be peatland and/or wetland and we will expect the layout to avoid Groundwater Dependant Terrestrial Ecosystems.</p> <p>1.4 Details of how the existing water supply will be protected should be submitted.</p> <p>1.5 As long as watercourse crossings are designed to accommodate the 1 in 200 year and other infrastructure is located well away from watercourses we do not foresee a need for detailed information on flood risk to be provided.</p> <p>Regulatory advice for applicant</p> <p>Regulatory requirements such as authorisation under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) required.</p> <p>Appendix 1: Detailed scoping requirements</p> <p>SEPA happy to comment on draft submission.</p> <p>Advice is provided on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site Layout 2. Engineering activities which may have adverse effects on the water environment 3. Disturbance and re-use of excavated peat and other carbon rich soils 4. Disruption to Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) 5. Existing groundwater abstractions 	<p>mitigation and pollution prevention measures. This includes all relevant details and risk assessment. Private water supplies and related pipework are included within Section 8.6.</p> <p>d) Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.</p> <p>e) Forestry details are found in Appendix 2.1.</p> <p>f) Location and layout of borrow pits is confirmed in Chapter 2.</p> <p>g) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>Design iterations are explained in Section 2.6 of the Proposed Development chapter. This includes the access track route.</p> <p>Ecological surveys have been carried out following the most recent SNH guidance. Addressed in Chapter 6, ecology. NVC Survey is included within Appendix 6.1.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Forest removal and forest waste 7. Borrow pits 8. Pollution prevention and environmental management 	
NATS Safeguarding	NATS Safeguarding	natssafeguarding@nats.co.uk 01489 444687 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hants, PO15 7FL	Email Received 30/05/2018	Notes that the proposed development does not conflict with NATS safeguarding criteria, and as such, has no objection to the proposal.	No further action required.
Cromarty Firth District Salmon Fishery Board	S.A. McKelvey, Director	S.A. McKelvey, Director Cromarty Firth Fishery Board & Cromarty Firth Fishery Trust CKD Galbraith,	Email Received 04/06/2018	Would like for any potential impacts on fish stocks within and downstream of the proposed development to be fully considered in an Environmental Impact Assessment. They would like for mitigations to be put in place, with a monitoring programme established to check their effectiveness.	Ecology, including fish stocks, has been assessed for potential impacts, as seen in Chapter 6. Appendix 6.4 is the Fish Habitat Survey.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Reay House, 17 Old Edinburgh Road, Inverness, IV2 3HF cromartyfish@hotmail.co.uk			
				<p>Have not done surveys of the watercourses on the site but have done habitat survey and electro-fishing survey of Glascarnoch River and upper Blackwater downstream of the site. Both watercourses are stocked with juvenile salmon annually, as part of the mitigation for the Conon Basin Hydro Electric Scheme. Although not surveyed, the watercourses onsite are likely to support brown trout and, in the lower reaches, salmon.</p> <p>About to update fishery management plan but are waiting for a new template for plans to be agreed with Fishery Management Scotland and Marine Scotland Science. If required, the old fishery management plan can be downloaded from Cromarty.dsfb.org.uk.</p>	<p>Information from the Cromarty Fisheries Board provided an indication of the fish species likely to be present.</p> <p>Watercourses, including those within the study area, and Glascarnoch River and Blackwater were included as part of the fish habitat survey.</p> <p>Addressed in Chapter 6, Ecology. The Fish Habitat Survey is seen in Appendix 6.4.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland	Urszula Szupsznska	Our ref: AMN/16/H Our case ID: 300019418	Email Received 06/06/2018	<p>Overall content with the methodology and approach to assessment.</p> <p>Noted and were pleased that their pre-scoping comments from April 2017 were taken on board.</p> <p>Cultural heritage receptors within the ZTV to be identified and visited to assess</p>	<p>Studies and impacts relating to historic environment interests are included in Section 5.6 of the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Urszula.Sz upsznska@ hes.scot		any potential impacts, with cumulative assessment being considered too. Data should be gathered for a 15km buffer from the boundary of the project area.	
The Highland Council	Dorothy Stott Principal Planner	Our Ref: 18/02433/ SCOPGlen rquhart Road, Inverness, IV3 5NX	Email Received 18/06/2018	<p>Notes specific issues to be addressed Water Environment, GWDTes and Peat</p> <p>Regarding SEPA's response of 30th May 2018 (SEPA ref: PCS/159309), the proposed development will be likely to have a significant effect on the water environment. SEPA's requested information in their response should be provided. In summary this must include:</p> <p>a) Map showing assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications;</p> <p>b) Map showing assessment of all impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers;</p> <p>c) Map showing assessment of all impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers.</p> <p>d) Peat depth survey map and table detailing re-use proposals.</p> <p>e) Map and table detailing forest removal.</p> <p>f) Map and site layout of borrow pits.</p> <p>g) Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>h) Decommissioning statement.</p> <p>Recommended that the EIA Report contains an assessment of the impact on the proposal on peat, peatland habitats and carbon-rich soils, outlining any mitigation measures. SNH advice should be followed.</p> <p>Impact on wild Land Area/Landscape and Visual Impacted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of the impact on the Wild land area and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required. Viewpoints for the LVIA must be discussed and agreed with the Highland Council in consultation with 	<p>a) Assessment of all activities that may affect the water environment is provided in Section 8.6</p> <p>Flood risk is covered in Section 8.5.19.</p> <p>Details relating to CAR applications are provided in Technical Appendix 8.1.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment.</p> <p>b) Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for full GWLTE assessment.</p> <p>c) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures. This</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>SNH.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will have significant landscape implications, both individually and cumulatively with other operational and proposed windfarms. Cumulative landscape and visual impacts of this proposal in association with Lochluichart (and its extension) and Corriemoillie are likely to be a key issue. Impact on the A835 as a gateway road with changing views unfolding as you travel north and west should be considered. Wild land assessment should follow SNH new technical guidance. Expects that a Landscape Clerk of Works would be present on site during construction works. Their role and responsibilities should be set out. <p>Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected species surveys should be undertaken. Bird survey work, and a HRA for golden eagle activity should be undertaken. Habitat survey should be undertaken. A deer management plan should be proposed. A CEMP should set out mitigation measures, and a Habitat Management Plan provided as part of mitigation and restoration proposals. Expects an Ecological Clerk of works to be present on site during construction works. <p>Forestry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 of the 19 turbines fall within the woodland area. Expect more detailed information to be provided given the potential impact on the existing woodland. Unclear whether turbines are to be integrated within woodland or if woodland will be removed. A dedicated forestry chapter will be required in the EIA Report. A 'without windfarm' and 'with windfarm' Forest Plan should be provided. 	<p>includes all relevant details and risk assessment. Private water supplies and related pipework are included within Section 8.6.</p> <p>d) Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.</p> <p>e) Forestry details are found in Appendix 2.1.</p> <p>f) Location and layout of borrow pits is confirmed in Chapter 2.</p> <p>g) Please see Section 8.6 for mitigation and pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>Impact on wild Land Area/Landscape and Visual Impacted</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been included within the assessment as part of Chapter 4. Predicted landscape impacts are presented in Section 4.4.</p> <p>A Wild Land Assessment is</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended that the Highland Council Forestry Team and Forestry Commission Scotland are consulted at an early stage. <p>Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural Heritage and Archaeology methodology and score is acceptable. The assessment should include a walkover survey of the development area. <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise assessment required for the operational phase of the development, taking into account the potential cumulative effects. Where there is potential for disturbance from construction noise, the application will need to include a construction noise assessment. <p>Access and Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for access to the site from the public road should be detailed on dimensioned drawings. EIA Report should include a Transport Assessment. Routes for goods vehicles and abnormal loads to be identified. Swept path analysis of the route is required. A trial run to demonstrate suitability of the route may be required. The Traffic Analysis should include a framework Construction Traffic Management Plan. Provision of an appropriate road bond of similar security (Wear and Tear Agreement) may be required. <p>Public Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A plan detailing the following should be submitted as part of the EIA Report: 1) existing core paths and wider access paths on site. 2) Details of how public access will be managed during construction. 3) Details of any access restrictions proposed following construction. 	<p>provided within Appendix 4.6. This follows SNH's consultation and new technical guidance.</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Baseline surveys to inform the assessment of effects upon protected species and habitats have been undertaken and are detailed within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report and associated appendices.</p> <p>An assessment of the impacts upon deer is provided as Appendix 6.5.</p> <p>An Outline Habitat Management Plan has also been included as Appendix 6.6 and will be further detailed in consultation with interested parties.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to avoid the potential for significant effects upon ecological features have been outlined where relevant and as a matter of best practice the appointment of an Ecological Clerk of Works over the course of the construction and decommissioning phases is detailed.</p> <p>Forestry</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>Summary:</p> <p>The significant issues for consideration as part of the submitted proposal are impacts (including cumulative impacts) on landscape; the water environment, peat and GWDTEs; impact on the Wild Land Area; impacts on designated natural heritage sites and protected species; impact on the historic environment; and impact on the trunk and local roads network. An assessment of potential alternative proposals and a comparison of the environmental effects should be included, as set out in the Regulations.</p> <p>The ES should be a single comprehensive document, with a non-technical summary.</p>	<p>6 turbines and 1 met mast fall within wooded area. Forestry aspects are considered within Appendix 2.1.</p> <p>Cultural Heritage and Archaeology:</p> <p>Walkover survey completed. Detailed results included in Appendix 5.2. Results inform the environmental impact assessment process in Sections 5.5 baseline, 5.6 impact assessment and 5.7 mitigation.</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Noise, including cumulative noise effects, has been considered in Chapter 10, with appendix 10.1 showing the full details of the noise assessment.</p> <p>Access and Transport:</p> <p>An assessment of impacts has been undertaken within Chapter 11, meeting the requirements of a Transport Statement. This includes construction traffic while post-construction traffic has been</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
					<p>scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>Appendix 11.1 contains a drawing illustrating the site access proposals. The construction details of this will be secured through a planning condition, as is the typical route.</p> <p>Hydrology, Peat and GWDTEs</p> <p>Effects on the water environment are considered in Section 8.6. Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.</p>
VisitScotland	Douglas Keith	Douglas Keith, Government and Parliamentary Affairs, VisitScotland Redacted	Email Received 14/06/2018	<p>Recommends that any potential detrimental impact of the proposed development on tourism be identified and considered in full.</p> <p>Notes that the importance of tourism should not be diminished, and that for each site considered, an independent tourism impact assessment should be carried out.</p> <p>Urges consideration of tourism concerns, related to the impact that any proliferation of developments may have on the local tourism industry, and therefore the local economy.</p>	<p>Tourism and socio-economic impacts was scoped out of the assessment (see Appendix 3.1 Scoping Report). Consideration of socio-economic effects of the development is included in the accompanying Planning Statement prepared by JLL.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment includes impacts on recreational and tourist areas/routes, seen in Section 4.7 of the EIAR.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Mountaineering Scotland	Davie Black Access and Conservation Officer	Davie Black The Granary, West Mill Street, Perth, PH1 5QP 01738 493 942	Email Received 15/06/2018	<p>Notes that there is analysis to show an adverse impact upon tourism from windfarms built in landscapes defined as of high quality.</p> <p>Welcome the number of viewpoints that are relevant to mountaineering interests.</p> <p>Reservations about viewpoints as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewpoint 10 is named as Beinn a’Bhathaich (NH 362434) but we assume this is actually Beinn a’Bha’ach Ard (Nh 360434) • Viewpoint 9 is the shoulder of a hill – a more logical choice would be Sgurr a’Muillin (NH2655). • Viewpoint 13 is at 36km distance, and even with a 175m structure, they have doubts about the ability of any visualisation or wireline to represent the image received by the human eye at this distance. • If viewpoint 13 is included they think there should also be a viewpoint representing An Teallach, whose Munroe summits lie closer at c.30km from the proposed development. 	Response has been considered within Chapter 4 of the EIA Report.
Forestry Commission Scotland	Agata Baranska	Regulations and Development Manager Highland & Islands Conservancy “Woodlands”, Fodderty Way	Email Sent 15/06/18	<p>Woodland removal may result in a requirement for compensatory planting being required. FSC will seek that this is a condition of approval and that any compensatory planting would be in place prior to construction commencing.</p> <p>Recommends consulting neighbouring forest/woodland owners in case the proposed development has any impact on forest management on their properties.</p>	Forestry appendix has been included within the assessment as Appendix 2.1.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Dingwall, IV15 9XB 0300 067 6950 Email: Agata.baranska@forestry.gsi.gov.uk			
Scottish Natural Heritage	Nathan McLaughlan Operations	SNH Ref: CNS/REN/ WF/Kirkan windfarm Scottish Natural Heritage Fodderty Way Dingwall Business Park Dingwall IV15 9XB	Email Received 18/06/2018	SNH previously provided pre-application comments (within their remit) in relation to the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Description of the proposed development 2. Landscape and visual 3. Ecology (non-avian) 4. Ornithology 5. Access, traffic and transport 6. Hydrology and hydrogeology 7. Forestry and Landuse Key Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of the siting, scale and design of the proposal on the wild land areas and potential significant effects on the qualities of these areas. • The impact of the siting, scale and design of the proposal in relation to the Corriemoilie/Lochluichart wind farm cluster. SNH are happy to provide further advice in relation to this issue. Based on the limited information available to date it is possible that we may	Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details relating to peat, and relevant mitigation. Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for the GWDTE Assessment. Landscape - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been included within the assessment as part of Chapter 4. Predicted landscape impacts are presented in Section 4.4. Mitigation is within Section 4.5. Effects on the amenity of transport routes, including along the A835, have been considered in Sections 4.7.21 - 4.7.30. A Wild Land Assessment has been undertaken, and is presented

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>ultimately object to a proposal in this location.</p> <p>Comments on the scoping report</p> <p>The scoping letter includes all of the topics that they think need to be covered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that each chapter of the EIA Report is saved in a separate pdf file (max size 10MB). <p>Annex A – details to assist with the EIA for Kirkan wind farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LVIA Scope <p>SNH agree that how the proposal relates to the existing wind farm cluster of Corriemoillie and Lochluichart and their extensions in terms of design fit should be a key consideration. Of particular relevance is the mitigation embedded for these schemes where gaps were left in the landscape to improve on the design whilst reducing wider landscape and visual effects. SNH would not wish to see that mitigation undermined by this new proposal.</p> <p>Landscape Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that the siting of the windfarm so close to the A835, a major tourist route will result in an increase in visibility of turbines along part of this important gateway route. <p>Design issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SNH strongly encourage the applicant to substantially reduce the turbine height (currently 175m) to reflect those turbines of Lochluichart and Corriemoillie (125m) as this element alone could result in such significant landscape and visual effects that SNH may result in SNH objecting. 	<p>within Appendix 4.6.</p> <p>A Viewpoint Assessment is within Appendix 4.7.</p> <p>Ornithology – Refer to Chapter 7 in relation to ornithology aspects, with Appendix 7.1 confirming the methodology and surveys completed.</p> <p>Baseline surveys have been undertaken in accordance with SNH guidance and as agreed through scoping. Full details of methodologies and findings are provided within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report and associated appendices.</p> <p>Where required mitigation measures to ensure the protection of protected species throughout the construction and decommissioning phase of the development are detailed.</p> <p>An Outline Habitat Management Plan has been included as Appendix 6.6.</p> <p>The NVC survey and habitats & vegetation details are provided in</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that a wild land assessment is undertaken on the Rhiddorochis, Beinn Dearg and Ben Wyvis WLA 29 and the Fisherfield, Letterewe, Fannichs WLA28 to identify the extent of any significant effects on the qualities of these areas. Given the extent of visibility, particularly across and into the interior of WLA 29, effects on the qualities of this WLA may be significant and to the degree that SNH may object on this aspect alone. <p>Viewpoint selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content with the preliminary viewpoints – suggest NH450665 in addition to the summit of Ben Wyvis, An Cabar for those walking this accessible and popular Munro. <p>Peat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the impact on peat should be made – demonstrating that a wind farm can be built on the site without significant loss and damage. Should contain details of mitigation measures. <p>Ornithology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Habitats Regulations Appraisal for Glen Affric to Strathconon Special Protection Area should be carried out (regarding golden eagle activity). Protected species Content that the list of species surveys should pick up the notable protected species. Ecological methodologies should be detailed with results and mitigation measures in the EIA report. If suitable habitat is present then a species protection plan should be included. <p>Other terrestrial habitats</p>	<p>Appendix 6.1.</p> <p>Woodland – Forestry appendix has been included as Appendix 2.1.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of NVC and Phase 1 surveys should be presented in the EIA report. EIA report should record, describe measures to avoid impacts on nationally rare and scarce plant species. Produce a Habitat Management Plan to include any mitigation and/or compensation measures. <p>Woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification required if tree felling will be required as part of the proposed development – if it is required they recommend that FCS is contacted as early as possible. <p>Access and recreation</p> <p>With reference to the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003, the applicant should pay due regard to the potential use of the area for recreation by the general public when designing and planning the proposed development.</p>	
Highlands and Islands Airports Limited	Anne Phillips Safeguarding Team	HIAL Ref: 2018/0080 /INVHighlands and Islands Airports Ltd Head Office, Inverness Airport, Inverness, IV2 7JB safeguardi	Email Received 18/06/2018	Calculations undertaken by HIAL confirm that the development would not infringe the safeguarding surfaces for Inverness and Wick Airports. Red aviation warning lighting is required to be fitted at the hub height for some of the turbines. Highlands and Islands Airports would like to have the assurance that the development will not affect the operation of Inverness Airport.	A lighting assessment has been provided as Appendix 4.8.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		ng@hial.co.uk			
Cromarty Firth District Salmon Fishery Board	Simon McKelvey Director Cromarty Firth Fishery Board	Cromarty Fisheries CKD Galbraith Reay House 17 Old Edinburgh Road Inverness IV2 3HF simon mckelvey <cromartyfish@hotmail.co.uk>	Email 04/06/2018	Request for existing fisheries records and information on barriers to fish migration for the site and immediate surrounding area (Glascarnoch River and Black Water) issued 25 th June 2018. “We do have some timed and fully quantitative electro fishing data for the Glascarnoch and upper Blackwater but not for the smaller watercourses on the site which are likely to contain brown trout and may also contain salmon in their lower reaches. Downstream from Glascarnoch there are natural falls at Rogie and Silver Bridge as well as a fish trap at Loch na croic. Glascarnoch and the upper Blackwater are stocked with juvenile salmon from the Contin hatchery as part of the mitigation for the hydro scheme.”	Fishing aspects are considered within Chapter 6, Ecology, with the Fish Habitat Survey presented as Appendix 6.4. Sediment management and pollution prevention are covered in Section 8.6. A schedule of mitigation is provided in Section 8.6. Water quality monitoring is set out in Table 8.9 and Figure 8.5.
Cromarty Firth District Salmon Fishery Board	Simon McKelvey Director Cromarty Firth Fishery Board	Cromarty Fisheries CKD Galbraith Reay House 17 Old Edinburgh Road	Email 04/06/18	The Board’s main concerns would be potential impacts on habitats downstream of the development. The most likely impacts on fish habitat would arise from; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in hydrology and land drainage. • Crossings of watercourses. • Construction of access tracks and associated drainage. • Mobilisation of sediment particularly from track building and felling of forestry. • Disturbance of deep peat. 	Please see Technical Appendix 8.1 for the Drainage Impact and Watercourse Crossing Assessment for details of land drainage, watercourse crossings, access track design and drainage. Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details relating to peat, and relevant mitigation. Sediment management and

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Inverness IV2 3HF Simon Mckelvey <cromartyfish@hotmail.co.uk>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution of water courses. Cromarty Fisheries would like any potential impacts on fish stocks within and downstream of the proposed development to be fully considered in an Environmental Impact Assessment. We would also like to see mitigations put in place and a monitoring programme established to check their effectiveness.	pollution prevention are covered in Section 8.6. A schedule of mitigation is provided in Section 8.6. Water quality monitoring is set out in Table 8.9 and Figure 8.5. A Fish Habitat Survey has been included within the EIAR as Appendix 6.4. Access track information is included within Section 2.6 of the EIAR, the proposed development options and design iterations.
Cromarty Fisheries Board	Simon McKelvey	cromartyfish@hotmail.co.uk	Email 25/06/18	Have not done surveys of the watercourses on the site but have done habitat survey and electro-fishing survey of Glascarnoch River and upper Blackwater downstream of the site. Both watercourses are stocked with juvenile salmon annually, as part of the mitigation for the Conon Basin Hydro Electric Scheme. Although not surveyed, the watercourses onsite are likely to support brown trout and, in the lower reaches, salmon. About to update fishery management plan but are waiting for a new template for plans to be agreed with Fishery Management Scotland and Marine Scotland Science. If required, the old fishery management plan can be downloaded from Cromarty.dsfb.org.uk.	Information from the Cromarty Fisheries Board provided an indication of the fish species likely to be present. Ecology Chapter 6 of the EIA used this information within the impact assessment. The Fish Habitat Survey is included as Appendix 6.4. Watercourses, including those within the study area, and Glascarnoch River and Blackwater were included as part of the fish habitat survey.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Scottish Wildcat Action	Roo Campbell (SNH)	Roo Campbell <Roo.Campbell@snh.gov.uk>	Email 07/02/2018	Consulted on local species records and monitoring effort in February 2018. Subsequently provided additional advice on monitoring methods.	Response to be considered within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report. Record details considered sensitive to be restricted to a confidential appendix of the EIA Report, circulated to SNH.
Scottish Wildcat Action	Roo Campbell (SNH)	Roo Campbell < Roo.Campbell@snh.gov.uk >	Email 06/02/2018	Provided confirmation of a wildcat record from October 2015 located outside the study area to the north-east, and another wildcat record from 2013/14 from woodland to the east of the study area. Advised on effective camera trap surveys to detect wildcat, and that valerian root is appropriate bait. Also provided a link to best practice for camera trapping wildcat: http://www.scottishwildcataction.org/media/42480/camera-trapping-leaflet-compressed.pdf	Surveys for wildcat were carried out throughout the study area. Valerian root was used as bait at camera traps as recommended, and the methodology in the best practice leaflet was followed. Chapter 6 of the EIAR.
(MOD) DIO Safeguarding	Kalie Jagpal Assistant Safeguarding Officer	Ref: DIO 10043421 Ministry of Defence Safeguarding – Wind Energy Kingston Road Sutton Coldfield West Midlands B75 7RL	Email 20/06/2018	MOD has no objection to the proposal. In the interests of air safety, the MOD request that the development is fitted with aviation lighting in accordance with Article 219 of the Air Navigation Order. If application is altered in any way MOD should be consulted again as even the slightest change could unacceptably affect them.	A lighting assessment has been included within the EIAR as Appendix 4.8.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		Kalie.jagpa l326@mod .gov.uk			
Kyle of Sutherland Fisheries	Dr Keith Williams Director	director@k ylefisherie s.org	Email 18/06/18	Kyle of Sutherland District Salmon Fishery Board does not wish to comment on the proposed Kirkan Wind Farm scoping opinion request.	No further action required.
Marine Scotland Scottish Government	Dr Emily E Bridcut	Freshwater Fisheries Laboratory Faskally Pitlochry Perthshire PH16 5LB Emily.bridcut@gov.scot	Email 14/06/18	In summary, MSS recommends the developer to carry out the following and present the details in the EIAR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site characterisation surveys to assess the presence and abundance of fish species; • and water quality; • to draw up appropriate site specific mitigation measures; and • to establish an integrated water quality and fish monitoring programme before, during and after construction. 	Baseline water quality status is detailed in Section 8.5. A schedule of mitigation is provided in Section 8.6. Water quality monitoring is set out in Table 8.9 and Figure 8.5. Monitoring relating to fish population is covered in Chapter 6. The Fish Habitat Survey is included as Appendix 6.4 of the EIAR.
RSPB	Phil Dowling Assistant Conservation Officer	North Scotland Office Etive House Beechwood Park Inverness IV2 3BW Phil.Dowli	Email 19/06/18	Main Comments: Bird Species of Conservation Concern and Designated Sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on all species should be adequately covered within the EIA Report. • Site is close to the Glen Affric SPA designated for breeding golden eagles. The potential impacts on golden eagle should therefore be a priority for assessment, including in relation to collision risk. • Consideration to be given to black grouse and ground nesting birds – golden plover. • If tree felling is required SNH (2016) guidance wind farm proposals on 	Potential impacts on birds and avian aspects are included within Chapter 7, with methodology and survey details in Appendix 7.1. Forestry and woodland aspects are considered in Appendix 2.1. Effects on peat and GWDTEs are addressed in Technical Appendices 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
		ng@rspb.org.uk		<p>afforested sites – advice on reducing suitability for hen harrier, merlin and short eared owl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that Habitat Management Plan is prepared (seek to avoid any development on deep peat and seek to enhance key habitats such as blanket bog occurring within the area). Peatland and carbon balance – Welcome peatland and carbon balance assessment being undertaken. Recommend that the ECU request validation by SEPA of the carbon calculation. Cumulative Impacts – Welcome proposal to include an assessment of cumulative impacts in relation to other projects, and this should be undertaken in accordance with relevant SNH advice. 	<p>Potential impacts upon ecology are explored within Chapter 6. HMP is included as Appendix 6.6.</p> <p>Carbon balance calculations are outlined in Chapter 13 and Appendix 13.1.</p>
Scotways	Eleisha Fahy Senior Access Officer	<p>The Scottish Rights of way and Access Society</p> <p>24 Annandale Street Edinburgh EH7 4AN</p> <p>Tel: 0131 558 1222</p> <p>e-mail: info@scotways.com</p>	Email	<p>The National Catalogue of Rights of Way (CROW) shows that right of way HR46 is affected by the area within the site boundary marked on the Scoping Report's Figure 2 Site Layout Plan. A map is enclosed with right of way HR46 highlighted in green. As there is no definitive record of rights of way in Scotland, there may be other routes that meet the criteria to be rights of way but have not been recorded as they have not yet come to our notice.</p> <p>Right of way HR46 is known as the Fish Road and is promoted by the Heritage Paths project for its historic interest as an old trade route put to later use as a drove road. The Fish Road is also shown on the Heritage Paths in Scotland map leaflet - a copy can be provided upon request. A signposted variant to HR46 is described in our popular publication Scottish Hill Tracks. For ease of reference, this variant to HR46 is highlighted in pink on the enclosed map.</p> <p>EIA Report should provide confirmation of the separation distance between turbines and right of way HR46.</p> <p>With regard to effects on Landscape and Visual Amenity, we welcome the inclusion of Viewpoint 3 on right of way HR46 (the Fish Road). However, we request an additional viewpoint on this directly affected historic right of way, preferably at its high point (circa NH372683).</p>	<p>Impacts on the Fish Road discussed in Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Chapter.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is included within Chapter 4. The Viewpoint Assessment is within Appendix 4.7.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				We remain unclear that the selection of viewpoints adequately assesses impacts on recreational access and known destination hilltops in the wider assessment area such as Munros and Corbetts.	
Transport Scotland	John McDonald	Ref: ECU00000 563 Transport Scotland Trunk Road and Bus Operations Buchanan House 58 Port Dundas Road Glasgow G4 0HF	Email 18/06/18	<p>Site Access</p> <p>It is proposed that access to the site will be taken from the A835(T) to the north of the site via an existing junction to a car park (approx. 600m east of Aultguish). It should be noted that any proposed amendments to Trunk Road junctions will require to be discussed and agreed with the Area Manager, and will require to be designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>For the planning application, we would ask that a 1:500 scale general arrangement plan is submitted showing any amendments that are to be made to the existing access junction to serve the development.</p> <p>Abnormal Loads</p> <p>The SR indicates that the turbine components are likely to originate from the ports of Inverness and Invergordon, as well as Dingwall and Alness.</p> <p>The main construction traffic access routes are identified as the following: B817 (Invergordon), A9(T) (Alness), A835(T) A862 (Dingwall), A862, A835(T) A9(T) (Inverness), A835(T)</p> <p>Transport Scotland will require to be satisfied that the chosen route(s) can accommodate both conventional HGV traffic and the movement of abnormal loads associated with the development.</p> <p>In terms of abnormal loads, the details required would include a report which considers the movement of abnormal loads including swept path analysis and potential mitigation measures required including the temporary removal of street furniture, any proposed junction widening, traffic management etc to ensure that transportation will not have any detrimental effect on structures within the trunk</p>	<p>Appendix 11.1 contains a drawing illustrating the site access proposals. The construction details of this will be secured through a planning condition, as is the typical route.</p> <p>An assessment has been undertaken and potential constraints identified for further investigation or resolution prior to construction (Section 11.5 and 11.6)</p> <p>An assessment of impacts has been undertaken (Section 11.5, 11.6), meeting the requirements of GEART for construction traffic, while operational traffic has been scoped out of the assessment.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>road route path.</p> <p>Assessment of Environmental Impacts</p> <p>In the case of the EIA report, the methods adopted to assess the likely traffic and transportation impacts on traffics flows and transportation infrastructure, should comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of the baseline traffic and transportation conditions, and the sensitivity of the site and existence of any receptors likely to be affected in proximity of the trunk road network; • Review of the development proposals to determine the predicted construction and operational requirements; and • Assessment of the significance of predicted impacts from these transport requirements, taking into account impact magnitude (before and after mitigation) and baseline environmental sensitivity. <p>The SR states that a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be developed as part of the proposed development. This is welcomed and we would ask that a copy of this be forwarded to the Area Manager when it becomes available.</p>	
<p>Visit Scotland</p>	<p>Douglas Keith Government & Parliamentary Affairs</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>14/06/18</p>	<p>Recommend that any potential detrimental impact of the proposed development on tourism – whether visually, environmentally and economically – be identified and considered in full.</p>	<p>Tourism and socio-economic impacts was scoped out of the assessment (see Appendix 3.1 Scoping Report). Consideration of socio-economic effects of the development is included in the accompanying Planning Statement prepared by JLL.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment includes impacts on recreational and tourist areas/routes, seen in Section 4.7 of</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
					the EIAR.
Highland Council Environmental Health	Carol Rattenbury, Simon Pearse	Carol.rattenbury@highland.gov.uk ; simon.pearse@highland.gov.uk	10/04/2018	Provided details of all Private Water Supplies around the site for which the council holds information.	Private water supplies and related pipework have been identified. Details and risk assessment are provided in Section 8.6.
Scottish Water		help@scotishwater.co.uk	11/07/2018	Referred to commercial providers of SW infrastructure details.	No further action required.
The Highland Council Environmental Health	Robin Fraser	Environmental Health 01349 868 445 Robin.fraser@highland.gov.uk	Letter issued to consultee 03/04/2018 Subsequent email discussion	Letter setting out proposed noise baseline assessment methodology and proposed monitoring locations. Consultee response referenced previous comments made in response to scoping request and was in general agreement with the proposed survey methodology and locations.	Section 10.2 confirms the methodology of the noise assessment.
SNH	Nathan McLaughlan	Nathan McLaughlan Nathan.McLaughlan@nature.scot.nhs.uk	Email from 27/09/2018	Writing in response to letter of 31-8-2018 setting out viewpoints for LVIA. SNH declare themselves content that An Cabar has been removed from the VP list, as the summit of Ben Wyvis will sufficiently capture the effects from this direction. However, they consider that, given the likely cumulative effects with the adjacent Lochluichart and Corriemoillie windfarms, that an additional VP at Little Wyvis (approx. NH414620) is necessary to allow assessment of the extended array of turbines from this popular Corbett which lies South-East of the proposal. SNH also propose repositioning of VP16 within the wild land area, as they consider it does not appear to gain full visibility of the proposal (although SNH did not have a wire frames will confirm this) and suggest an alternative location	Technical Appendix 4.7 is a Viewpoint Assessment for the proposed development. Viewpoint selection took SNH's advice and guidance into account.

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>closer summit of Meall a Ghrianain (NH 365775) which is representative of the same receptors and sensitivities. SNH declare themselves content with the other VPs suggested.</p>	
<p>The Highland Council</p>	<p>Dorothy Stott Principal Planning Officer, The Highland Council</p>	<p>Dorothy Stott Dorothy.Stott@highland.gov.uk</p>	<p>Email from Dorothy Stott 05/11/2018</p>	<p>While we are glad to see the inclusion of VP 3 particularly to respond to the impacts on users of the Old Drovers Road, we consider that there is still a gap in the coverage for walkers in terms of the one of the main routes up Ben Wyvis, as referred to in the Landscape Officer's Pre-application response in April. It is noted from your letter of 31 August, that SNH had proposed an additional viewpoint at An Cabar, but that you have rejected this in favour of the main Ben Wyvis Summit (VP 7).</p> <p>This viewpoint would have the benefit of being on approximately the same orientation in regard to the proposed development that a viewpoint on the access route would have, although at a different elevation. This viewpoint would also include the 'straight shot view' up Loch Glascarnoch, which is very arresting and similar to views obtained from the path. This view would also be broadly representative of effects from Little Wyvis and provides the reciprocal view to the A835 view on Loch Glascarnoch.</p> <p>As such, whilst we acknowledge that SNH has indicated that they are content for you to remove the An Cabar viewpoint, we do not share the same opinion and would therefore recommend the inclusion of the An Cabar viewpoint as being highly relevant for recreational visual receptors. We would also agree with SNH that a viewpoint on the summit of Meall a Ghrianain would be preferred to the viewpoint at the more distant viewpoint VP16 (Beinn a Chaisteil).</p> <p>The methodology you have outline for the assessment of lighting effects appears reasonable.</p>	<p>Technical Appendix 4.7 is a Viewpoint Assessment for the proposed development.</p> <p>Viewpoint selection took SNH's advice and guidance into account.</p> <p>The lighting assessment has been included as Appendix 4.8 of the EIAR.</p>
<p>Highland Council –</p>	<p>Dorothy Stott Principal</p>	<p>Dorothy Stott</p>	<p>Email 17/12/2018</p>	<p>Gate Check Consultation Response.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 of the EIAR is the Landscape and Visual Impact</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
Forestry, EHO, and Landscape Officer	Planning Officer, The Highland Council	Dorothy.Stott@highland.gov.uk		<p>THC wrote to say that that Forestry and Environmental Health Officers confirmed that the issues they previously raised have been covered in the EIA Report.</p> <p>THC relayed a response from their Landscape Officer, Anne Cowling. They said:</p> <p>I note that the developers have made moves with the design evolution to emulate the design mitigation achieved at Loch Luichart by using containment within a defined landform. However, because the landforms they propose using to contain Kirkan themselves lie outside the landforms which contain the Loch Luichart turbines, this approach still effectively removes or substantially reduces the design mitigation achieved for the previous development in the area. As such, landscape, visual and cumulative impact remain a concern with the evolving design.</p>	Assessment. Mitigation is included within Section 4.5.
SEPA	Aden McCorkell Part Time Senior/Planning Officer		Email 10/12/2018	<p>Gate Check Consultation Response</p> <p>Comment in relation to Gate Check Report:</p> <p>1) Peat and Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE)</p> <p>The Phase 1 Habitat Plan submitted with the Scoping Report demonstrated that there was potential for both deep peat and GWDTE habitat to be present. Although we welcome the design descriptions in Section 2.2 of the Gatecheck Report, it would be beneficial to see how the Design Iterations Map and subsequent Final Layout Map included with the Gatecheck Report have been informed by these surveys. We note that the design descriptions mention avoidance of areas ‘suspected as deepest peat’, it however does not specifically mention avoidance of GWDTE. We would therefore encourage the developer to share these survey results (overlaid with proposed infrastructure) with us at an early stage to ensure that any potential changes to the design can be more easily accommodated.</p>	<p>Please see Technical Appendix 9.2 for full GWDTE assessment.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 8 for Private Water Supply assessment.</p> <p>Please see Technical Appendices 9.1 and 9.4 for details on drainage impact and watercourse crossing assessment, and peat management plan.</p> <p>Design iterations are explained in Section 2.6 of the Proposed Development chapter. This includes the access track.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
				<p>We would also encourage the developer to submit a draft version of the Peat Management Plan and any proposals prepared to compensate or offset impacts to the site, which we would be happy to review prior to a formal submission.</p> <p>2) Access Track</p> <p>We would welcome a site access options appraisal be provided in the EIAR with an accompanying site plan of the alternative route(s) that was considered, overlaying the NVC and peat depth surveys. Again, we would encourage the developers to submit the EIAR in draft form, at which time we would be happy to discuss any alternative route appraisal findings directly with the developer.</p> <p>We also note that the proposed access track from the A835 will be making use of the already impacted drovers route. We would welcome further information on the current condition/specifications of this route supported with site photos.</p> <p>3) Borrow Pits</p> <p>We note that the Gatecheck Report has included the Final Layout Map (Figure 2), which proposes three borrow pit locations. As outlined above, it would be useful to review these proposals against the survey and assessment results prior to a formal submission. We would also welcome some further explanation as to why two borrow pits are required in such close proximity to each other, and whether any ground investigations have been completed to ensure suitable grades and quantities of material will be available in these locations.</p> <p>Regulatory advice was also provided for the applicant.</p>	<p>In relation to Borrow Pits: response to be considered fully within Chapter 4 and 9.</p>

Consultee	Contact Name (including title if available)	Reference & Contact Details	Method/ Date of Consultation	Comments received/ issues raised	Action Required/Taken
SNH	Nathan McLaughlan Operations Officer	Nathan McLaughlan Nathan.McLaughlan@nature.scot.nhs.uk	Email 12/12/2018	Gate Check Consultation response. Email confirmed to the ECU that SNH had a variety of pre-application communications with the applicant. They confirmed: "Subject to the level of detail being presented in the EIAR being as described in the Gatecheck Report, and the information we requested at scoping being included then we should have sufficient information to assess the proposal."	No further action required.
HES	HES	HES	Email to the ECU 29/11/2018	Gate Check Consultation response. Confirmed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are satisfied the report shows that the forthcoming application will contain information requested by us during the scoping exercise; • We are satisfied with the nature of studies in relation to our historic environment interests at the national level (scheduled monuments and their settings, category A-listed buildings and their settings, Inventory gardens and designed landscapes and Inventory battlefields) undertaken to date; • We are content that the developer has engaged with us in an appropriate manner and the report accurately reflects our position. 	Studies and impacts relating to historic environment interests are included in Section 5.6 of the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage chapter