

Technical Appendix 2.1: Scoping Consultation Table

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
Overarching Comments		
East Ayrshire Council (EAC) Formal Scoping Opinion 11/12/25	Non-technical Summary: noted to use simple non-technical terms including a summary of the main issues in the EIA report, significant effects, mitigation and a site plan.	Noted. The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) can be found in Volume 1 of the EIA Report.
	Summary of Environmental Information: noted to provide a good summary in the EIA report.	Noted. Refer to Chapter 13: Summary of likely Significant Effects .
	List of qualifications and evidence of competency: requested a competency/expertise list of the team involved in the EIA report production.	This is presented in Technical Appendix 1.1: Statement of Expertise of the EIA Report.
	Format of the EIA: noted to provide two full paper copies including appendices to the EAC and a public copy. Upload e-copy to the e-planning portal. For the e-copies, name them accordingly and split into manageable sizes. Confidential annexes should be marked clearly and provided separately.	Noted. Chapter 1: Introduction provides details of where paper copies and electronic copies of the EIA Report are available for viewing. All confidential information presented in the EIA Report can be found in Volume 5: Confidential Documents and has been issued to EAC, NatureScot and RSPB Scotland only.
	EAC noted that the proposed structure is considered to be acceptable.	Noted. The structure of the EIA Report is presented in Chapter 1: Introduction .
	Consideration of alternatives: Refer to Schedule 4, paragraph 2 of the TCPA EIA Scotland Regulations 2017.	Noted. Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy of the EIA Report sets out the design alternatives considered for the Proposed Development in accordance with Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations.
	Baseline Information: Refer to EAC's State of the Environment Report: https://www.east-ayrshire.gov.uk/PlanningAndTheEnvironment/Development_plans/State-of-the-Environment-Report.aspx	Noted.
	EIA Assessment Methodology: noted to be flexible with reporting the significance of the impacts as moderate effects can be taken as significant in EIA Regulation terms and would be based on the assessor's judgement.	Noted. As noted in Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA , moderate and major effects are considered to be significant in the context of the EIA Regulations within the EIA Report. Where the approach to determining significant effects varies from this i.e. in Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration and Technical Appendix 4.4: Shadow Flicker Assessment , this is clearly explained in the relevant assessment methodology.
	Planning Monitoring Officer: EAC noted that the Council promotes the use of a PMO on all major infrastructure	Noted.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	developments and recommends that the developer funds the cost of a PMO for the scheme and secure this by a Section 75 legal agreement. The PMO ensures a robust discharge of planning conditions and a reliable independent overview during the construction phase and afterwards and subsequently by the Council and the developer. The use of the PMO need not necessarily be an integral part of the EIA Report, however, the Council's approach should be given consideration as part of the wider suite of monitoring and environmental best practice considered by the EIA Report.	
	Shadow Flicker: EAC noted that there is no level of shadow flicker deemed to be acceptable as set in the guidance. Any shadow flicker identified in the assessment will require mitigation. The 10 rotor diameters' distance is a guide and does not guarantee that shadow flicker effects will not be experienced beyond this distance, and EAC has experience of shadow flicker impacting on a property despite it being more than 10 rotor diameters' distance from the turbine in question. As such, if there are properties which are beyond such a distance but not too distant, consideration should be given as to the potential of shadow flicker on such properties as they may still face impacts. EAC noted that the only reasonable mitigation for shadow flicker would be the switching off of turbines responsible during the dates/times when it is likely to occur.	Drawing upon all available guidance and evidence on shadow flicker from wind turbines, it has been necessary to take a pragmatic approach to the assessment of shadow flicker effects as informed by professional judgement and standard industry practice. The study area adopted (noting that this was, until recently, supported in Scottish Government guidance)¹ and approach to determining the significance of effects is described in Technical Appendix 4.4: Shadow Flicker Assessment.
Landscape and Visual Amenity		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion-Landscape 11/12/25	EAC noted that the landscape methodology is deemed appropriate.	Noted. Full details of the methodology adopted for the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) (including cumulative assessment) is presented in Technical Appendix 5.1: LVIA and Visualisation Methodology .
	EAC noted that the wirelines for certain views (VP 13, 14 and 17) are acceptable.	Noted. Viewpoints have been agreed with EAC through post-scoping consultation. All representative viewpoints assessed are included in Table 5.3 of Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment . Viewpoint visualisations are presented in EIA Report Volume 3b: Landscape and Visual Amenity

¹ Scottish Government (2014) Onshore Wind Turbines: Planning Advice. Although this guidance was withdrawn in December 2025, it has not been replaced by any new empirical study which has determined that the use of x10 the rotor diameter is not appropriate as a general rule to determine the study area for shadow flicker assessment. Until such time as new guidance emerges, this x10 rotor diameter consideration has been used in this assessment.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		Visualisations (Part 1) and Volume 3c: Landscape and Visual Amenity Visualisations (Part 2) and Cultural Heritage Visualisations.
	EAC requests that a cumulative night time aviation assessment should also be undertaken.	Noted – where interaction with aviation lighting on operational, consented or proposed wind farms within the study area is likely, this is discussed in Technical Appendix 5.3: Aviation Lighting Night-Time Impact Assessment.
	EAC is satisfied with the 45 km study area.	Noted. The study area is detailed in Technical Appendix 5.1 and Chapter 5.
	EAC noted that aviation lighting mitigation should be detailed. Night time views should be focused on locations more likely to be frequented at night time.	Aviation lighting mitigation is described in Technical Appendix 5.3. Night time views are represented by visualisations prepared for Viewpoint 1: A77, near Drumbo (Figure 5.2.1 in Volume 3b) which is close to the busy M77, and Viewpoint 7: Dunlop Road, Stewarton (Figure 5.2.7 in Volume 3b), the largest settlement in proximity to the Proposed Development. These were agreed with EAC through post-scoping consultation – see Chapter 5.
	EAC noted that the cumulative assessment approach is deemed appropriate and the Applicant to keep abreast of any changes to the cumulative situation.	Post-scoping consultation was undertaken with EAC to agree the cumulative list. East Renfrewshire Council (ERC) was also approached for comment but no response was received. Cumulative developments considered are shown in Figure 5.1.7 in Volume 3a: Figures of the EIA Report. The cumulative assessment methodology is presented at Technical Appendix 5.1.
	EAC noted that the 2 km study area for RVA is deemed appropriate.	Post-scoping consultation was undertaken with EAC to agree the scope of the residential visual amenity assessment (RVAA) (see Technical Appendix 5.2.).
NatureScot 31/10/25	No landscape comments provided.	No response required.
Fenwick Community Council 15/11/25	The Community Council considers that the cumulative effects must be assessed alongside the following consented or proposed major developments, reference numbers: NOD-190-001, CIN-190-001, ECU00002198, 23/0398/HS, 25/0022/PP and repowering Whitlee Wind Farm.	The scope of the cumulative assessment was agreed with EAC post-scoping – see Chapter 5 and Figure 5.1.7a-b in Volume 3a of the EIA Report.
	The EIA should fully address the East Ayrshire Council Local Development Plan 2 and the East Ayrshire Landscape Wind Capacity Study.	The EAC Landscape Wind Capacity Study has been considered in Chapter 5 , and relevant planning policy within the EAC LDP2 has been addressed in the Planning Statement which accompanies the planning application.
	It is unacceptable to use outdated consultation information, as the	A comprehensive review of the landscape and visual baseline within the study area

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	countryside surrounding the development has developed significantly since application 15/0584/PP was refused in October 2018.	has been undertaken through desk-based study and fieldwork. As such, the LVIA has considered the current landscape and visual baseline at the time of writing. All cumulative developments up to the cumulative cut-off date (28 th January 2026) have been considered in the cumulative LVIA (CLVIA) as part of Chapter 5 . New photography has been taken for the assessment of visual effects from the representative viewpoints (apart from Viewpoint 13: Loudon Hill, A71, Viewpoint 14: Kilbirnie Connelston, A760 and Viewpoint 17: Clyde Muirshiel Regional Park Visitor Centre), as agreed with EAC. See Chapter 5 . New photography is presented in Volumes 3b and 3c of the EIA Report.
Cultural Heritage		
Historic Environment Scotland (HES) 14/11/25	HES welcome that cultural heritage effects have been scoped into the EIA. Stated their desire that any EIA undertaken in support of the proposals would include a full assessment of impacts on the historic environment.	Noted. A full assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development (including in-combination with the Likely Grid Connection Route) on heritage assets has been undertaken and is presented in Technical Appendix 6.1: Historic Environmental Assessment (HEA) . The findings of the HEA are summarised in Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage .
	HES ask that the study area should not be limited to a simple distance and instead should be informed by a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Assessment should consider views from and towards cultural heritage assets.	A bare earth Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been utilised to screen in and out assets from detailed assessment with respect to changes to their setting. Assets from beyond the 10km Outer Study Area have been considered during this process – see Annex B of Technical Appendix 6.1 of the EIA Report.
	HES requested that the setting assessment should make reference to the Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting guidance document.	Noted. The setting assessment has been undertaken in line with the latest best practice guidelines. See Technical Appendix 6.1 and Chapter 6 .
	HES requested that the EIA contain consideration of mitigation by design to avoid, reduce and offset setting impacts on cultural heritage assets.	Noted. Mitigation by design is discussed with Section 6.6: Embedded Design Mitigation of Chapter 6 .
	HES stated that the Proposed Development could result in significant impacts on the setting of the scheduled monument Moyne Cairn (SM12856) due to existing wind farms being present within close proximity to the monument. HES requested that cumulative impacts be specifically assessed and that the wireline / photomontage for the asset be angled towards the Proposed Development with the cairn mound in the foreground.	A detailed assessment of this asset as a result of setting change (including cumulatively) has been undertaken in Technical Appendix 6.1 , and effects are reported in Chapter 6 . The assessment is informed by Figure 6.5a-d: CHVP1 Moyne Cairn (SM12856) - Wireline Drawing and Photomontage in Volume 3c of the EIA Report.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		The viewpoint location for the visualisation has been reviewed and updated in accordance with this request.
	HES stated that there is potential for additional cumulative impacts on Dunwan Hillfort (SM12882) due to changes within its setting. HES requested that a photomontage be produced to allow for an assessment of impacts on the asset from the Proposed Development.	A photomontage has been produced for this asset to assist in the assessment of effect in relation to setting change on the asset. See Figure 6.6a-d: CHVP2 Dunwan Hill, fort (SM12882) - Wireline Drawing and Photomontage in Volume 3c of the EIA Report. Further updates regarding recommended visualisations for this asset can be found within the consultation with HES in March 2026 (see below).
	HES requested further clarity on the location of the visualisations for Rowallan GDL (GDL00333) (CHVP6 and CHVP7).	Post-scoping consultation was undertaken with HES regarding Rowallan Castle (LB12523)/GDL 00333 and Rowallan House (LB12524)/GDL 00333 and the supporting visualisation requirements. See Chapter 6 and Figure 6.10a-b: CHVP6 Rowallan Castle (LB12523)/ Rowallan GDL (GDL00333) - Wireline Drawing and Figure 6.11a-c: CHVP7 Rowallan House (LB12524)/ Rowallan GDL (GDL00333) - Wireline Drawing and Baseline Photograph in Volume 3c of the EIA Report.
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion-Ecology 11/12/25	EAC noted that the Applicant should ensure that appropriate surveys are undertaken to inform the assessment of potential effects on species present, including mitigation measures to mitigate impacts where these are identified. Survey shelf-life, particularly for bat surveys, should be considered. NatureScot guidance should be followed in relation to surveys. Any Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) within the Site/within 5 km of the Site that may be directly or indirectly impacted by the Proposed Development should be assessed in the EIA Report. In line with Policy 3 of NPF4, biodiversity enhancement measures should be considered separately to compensation/mitigation measures. Biodiversity enhancement should include nature networks and provide significant enhancement resulting in the Site being in a better condition than without intervention.	The following ecological surveys have been undertaken for the Proposed Development: National Vegetation Classification (NVC) habitats; protected species (including daytime bat walkover); static bat detector; and fish surveys. Results are presented in Technical Appendices 7.1 – 7.4. NatureScot guidance has been adhered to in the assessment – see Chapter 7: Ecology. Details on LNCS within 5 km of the Site are provided in Table 7.7 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report. No LNCS are impacted by the Proposed Development. Guidance on the mitigation hierarchy has been followed in the assessment. Embedded mitigation measures relevant to ecology are included in Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report with an outline Species Protection Plan (SPP) provided as Technical Appendix 7.5: Outline Species Protection Plan of the EIA Report. Separately, proposals for biodiversity enhancement are included in Technical Appendix 7.6: Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (OBEMP) of the EIA Report with proposed Habitat Management Unit (HMU) areas shown in Figure 1. Note that certain proposals relate to protected species which

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		cannot be disclosed due to their sensitive nature. These details are therefore presented in a separate version of Technical Appendix 7.6 in Volume 5: Confidential Documents which has been shared with EAC, NatureScot and RSPB Scotland.
Ecology and Ornithology		
NatureScot 31/10/25	The Applicant should consult NatureScot pre-application guidance for onshore wind farms and guidance on peatlands. Details of survey methodology and results should be provided in the EIA Report. NatureScot agree with the mitigation measures proposed to minimise operational effects on bats. Post-construction monitoring should be undertaken to ensure mitigation measures are appropriate. Further details on species-specific buffers should be detailed in the EIA Report. Areas of priority peatland habitats have been identified within the Site, which could raise issues of national interest. NatureScot agree to scope out effects on Brother and Little Lochs SSSI and agree that there is no hydrological connectivity between the Site and the SSSI. NatureScot agree to scope out effects on badger (<i>Meles meles</i>), red squirrel (<i>Sciurus vulgaris</i>), pine marten (<i>Martes martes</i>) and water vole (<i>Arvicola amphibius</i>).	NatureScot guidance has been adhered to the ecology assessment. Effects on peat is assessed in Chapter 9: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Peat of the EIA Report. Results of the ecological surveys undertaken for the Proposed Development and respective methodologies are presented in Technical Appendices 7.1 – 7.4 of the EIA Report. The outline SPP (Technical Appendix 7.5 of the EIA Report) details how all protected species will be protected pre- and during construction activities, including any species-specific buffers that will be applied. Embedded mitigation measures relevant to ecology are included in section 7.6 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report, including maintenance of a 50 m buffer from turbine blade tip to important habitat edges to mitigate bat collision/barotrauma risk, and turbine feathering whilst idling. Should the Proposed Development be consented, operational bat monitoring may be implemented as a condition of consent. Further, proposals included as part of biodiversity enhancements detailed in the Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (OBEMP) would create and improve bat foraging habitat and corridors (Technical Appendix 7.6 of the EIA Report). NVC surveys have been carried out (Technical Appendix 7.1 of the EIA Report) and the Proposed Development has been designed to avoid priority peatland

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		habitats insofar as practicable (Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy of the EIA Report). Details of priority peatland habitat within the Site are presented in Technical Appendix 7.1: National Vegetation Classification and Habitats Survey Report. As set out in Section 7.11 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report, blanket bog and wet modified bog have been scoped into the assessment. Priority peatland habitat and deep peat has formed a key design consideration throughout the iterative design process – see Chapter 3: Site Selection and Design Strategy. Peatland enhancement forms a key component of the biodiversity enhancement objectives for the Site as discussed in Technical Appendix 7.6. Further details of ecological features scoped out of the assessment based on desk-based research, survey results and professional judgement are provided in section 7.10 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) 20/11/25	The EIA Report should demonstrate how the mitigation hierarchy (as defined by NPF4) has been followed, to firstly avoid areas of peat, natural and near natural condition peat habitat.	The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid sensitive peatland habitats and deep peat insofar as practicable (see Chapter 3 of the EIA Report). No near natural peatland (blanket bog) will be impacted by the Proposed Development. Embedded mitigation measures relevant to ecology are included in section 7.6 of Chapter 7 of the EIA Report. Further, Technical Appendix 7.6 of the EIA Report includes forest to bog restoration as part of the outline biodiversity enhancement proposals.
NatureScot 31/10/25	The Proposed Development is approximately 66 km from Ailsa Craig SPA / SSSI which lies within the mean maximum foraging ranges for herring gull and lesser black-backed gull which are qualifying interests of the SPA and associated SSSI. Given the potential for connectivity between the Ailsa Craig SPA and the proposed development, appraisal of the potential impact on these qualifying species must be undertaken. If likely significant effects are ascertained, then North [East] Ayrshire Council will be required to conduct a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). The EIA should contain enough information to inform the Council's HRA.	A Shadow Habitats Regulations Appraisal has been undertaken to determine if the Proposed Development could affect the integrity of the SPA. Refer to Technical Appendix 8.5: Shadow Habitats Regulation Appraisal for the Ailsa Craig Special Protection Area of the EIA Report.
Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Peat		
EAC	EAC stated that a private water supply (PWS) risk assessment should be	PWS data was obtained from EAC and PWS questionnaires were sent to all

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
11/12/25	undertaken if it is found that any PWS are located within the study area or same catchment as the proposed infrastructure.	properties within 1 km of the Site boundary to inform the assessment. The assessment considers potential effects to PWS within 1 km of the Site, with effects to PWS scoped out of the assessment as a result of there being no hydrological connectivity between PWS sources and proposed infrastructure – see Chapter 9 . A map showing private water supplies (PWS) and abstractions near the Site is shown in Figure 9.1 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report.
	Borrow pits: noted that if this is part of the proposed development details should be provided in the EIA report including associated impacts.	There are no borrow pits proposed. All stone will be imported from nearby quarries – see Chapter 4: Development Description .
	Peat excavation: any potential for the release of water from peat excavation should be considered as a potential cause of flooding. There is some 1 in 200-year flood risk in various locations throughout the site based on SEPA's flood mapping, though the nature of this is likely to be capable of being avoided through appropriate siting and design, however on the basis there are flood risks on site then flooding should be scoped into the EIA report.	The Proposed Development has been designed to fully avoid flood risk areas, where practicable. Flood risk is scoped into the assessment in Chapter 9 .
	Fisheries board: The relevant fisheries boards should be consulted to discuss their expectations and requirements regarding the extent of hydrological surveys required to inform the assessment of hydrological impacts, including water quality impacts / monitoring, which also links to the ecology chapter and any potential ecological impacts on aquatic life.	Ayrshire Rivers Trust (ART) were consulted and ART undertook fish surveys for the baseline assessment. The results of the fish surveys are referenced in Chapter 7: Ecology and presented in detail in Technical Appendix 7.4: Fish Survey Report . No other consultation with ART has been undertaken.
	Carbon Calculator: noted to provide a full report from the Scottish Government's Carbon calculation, accounting for carbon emissions and losses through construction and savings over the lifetime of the development as part of the EIA.	Noted - see Technical Appendix 12.1: Carbon Balance Assessment of the EIA Report.
	Climate Change: EAC noted that effects on climate change be addressed within the EIA Report by incorporating into separate, related chapters.	Noted. Climate change effects are considered in detail in Chapter 12: Climate Change of the EA Report. The hydrology assessment has considered climate change by avoiding development in flood risk areas where practicable, as defined by SEPA future flood maps (which take account of an appropriate uplift for climate change). In addition, new permanent watercourse crossings will be designed to account for local fluvial geomorphology and will be

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		designed for the 200-year + climate change flow, as per SEPA guidance.
EAC Environmental Health 30/10/25	No objection to the approach to PWS outlined in the scoping EIA.	Noted. Further details on PWS are provided in Chapter 9 of the EIA Report.
NatureScot 31/10/25	Regarding peatland and habitats: NatureScot are pleased that Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs) will be scoped in, but they note that there are areas of peatland habitats, blanket bog and wet modified bog identified in the Scoping report, notably M18 Sphagnum papillosum, and M19 Calluna vulgaris, which could raise issues of national interest. NatureScot recommend following their advice on peatlands provided in NatureScot (2023) Advising on peatland, carbon-rich soils and priority peatland habitats in development management. (https://www.nature.scot/doc/advising-peatland-carbon-rich-soils-and-priority-peatland-habitats-development-management).	Hydrological and ecological surveys have been conducted to identify and assess GWDTEs within the Site based on National Vegetation Classification (NVC) and hydrological walkover surveys. No GWDTEs were identified. The assessment of effects on peatland and the enhancement proposals associated with peat presented in Technical Appendix 7.6 , follows NatureScot (2023) guidance.
	Much of the site has peat over 1 m deep, raising potential issues of national interest. The proposal must follow the NPF4 mitigation hierarchy and include biodiversity enhancement to compensate for any peat loss.	Detailed maps of the peat depths across the Site are provided in Figure 9.7: Peat Depths and in Technical Appendices 9.3 and 9.4 of the EIA Report. The NPF4 mitigation hierarchy has been followed and evidence of the design iteration to avoid deeper peat and minimise excavation during the design process is provided in Chapter 3 of the EIA Report. The Outline Peat Management Plan (OPMP), Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA) and Outline Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (OBEMP) – Technical Appendices 9.3, 9.4 and 7.6 respectively cover peatland mitigation and forest-to-bog habitat enhancement as part of the Proposed Development.
Scottish Water 20/10/25	A review of our records indicates that there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.	Noted and used to inform the hydrology baseline in Chapter 9 .
	Scottish Water wish to ensure that there are no surface water connections into their combined sewer systems. There are limited circumstances in which they would	No combined sewer system connections are planned as part of the Proposed Development.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	allow such a connection, such as brownfield sites. However, this would require significant justification.	
	All developments that propose a connection to the public water or waste water infrastructure are required to submit a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form via our Customer Portal prior to any formal technical application being submitted, allowing us to fully appraise the proposals.	The Proposed Development will not require connection to Scottish Water infrastructure.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) 20/11/25	The EIA submission must include clear, scaled drawings of sensitivities (for example, peat depth, peat condition, GWDTE, proximity to waterbodies) overlain with proposed permanent and temporary development. This is needed to ensure the EIA process has informed the layout of the development to firstly avoid, then reduce and then mitigate significant impacts to the environment.	Figures 9.2 and 9.7 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report show the temporary and permanent infrastructure overlain on waterbodies and peat, with relevant buffers at a scale suitable to show how the layout was informed by these constraints. No GWDTEs were identified through extensive survey.
	SEPA note that the Phase 1 peat survey has identified peat across much of the site. SEPA therefore expects comprehensive peat survey work and a site-specific Peat Management Plan to accompany the application. This must meet SEPAs requirements set out section 2 of Appendix 1. SEPA note that the EIA must demonstrate compliance with NPF4 policy 5 and clearly demonstrate how the mitigation hierarchy (as defined in NPF4) has been followed, to firstly avoid areas of peat, natural and near natural condition peat habitat, and, where this is not possible, to minimise the amount of peat that requires to be excavated.	Extensive Phase 2 peat survey were carried out to support the design process – see Technical Appendix 9.2 of Volume 4 of the EIA Report. The peat survey methodology complies with SEPAs requirements set out in section 2 of Appendix 1 and Scottish Government, Scottish Natural Heritage & SEPA (2017) ² guidance. An outline Peat Management Plan (PMP) for the Site is provided at Technical Appendix 9.3 of Volume 4 of the EIA Report.
	Based on information provided in the Scoping Report, it seems unlikely that any development will take place within 250m of a groundwater supply source. If this is the case, the EIAR should evidence this.	A map showing private water supplies (PWS) and groundwater abstractions within 1 km of the Site is provided in Figure 9.1 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report . A postal survey of properties within a 1 km radius of the Site, consultation with EAC and two rounds of public consultation was undertaken to identify abstraction sources near the Site and used to inform the PWS baseline assessment. There are no groundwater supply sources within 250m of the Proposed Development's limit of micro-siting, and effects on PWS has been scoped out of the assessment presented in Chapter 9 .

² SEPA (2025), WAT-G-030 EASR Guidance: Engineering: Meeting Good Practice v1

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	Buffers should be based on the outer extent of any proposed micrositings, and this must be shown on the drawings. Micrositing must also not increase impacts on sensitivities, like peat and watercourse for example.	Maps of all engineering activities and 50 m micrositings extents is provided in Figure 9.1 and 9.2 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report. The maps show all water environment features and relevant buffers. There will be no micrositings undertaken which moves infrastructure closer to sensitive water features and deeper peat. All micrositings will be subject to approval of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECOW).
	Detailed peat surveys, peat condition mapping and excavation plans are required. EIA must demonstrate avoidance of near-natural peatland and of peat greater than 1 metre depth, and avoidance of and minimisation of peat excavation where avoidance is not possible.	Details of peat depth surveys undertaken are provided in Technical Appendix 9.2 and reuse proposals described in Technical Appendix 9.3 of Volume 4 the EIA Report. Details of the iterative design approach are provided in Chapter 3 of the EIA Report and form the first tier of the peat management strategy ('prevent') for the Proposed Development. No near natural peatland (blanket bog) will be affected by the Proposed Development.
	Detailed plans should be provided showing: a) Peat depth survey showing peat probe locations, colour coded using distinct colours for each depth category. b) Peat depth survey showing interpolated peat depths. c) Peatland condition mapping	Figure 9.7 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report provides detailed plans of peat probe depth and interpolated peat depth across the Site in relation to the Proposed Development. Peatland condition is described in the baseline assessment and Technical Appendix 9.2 of Volume 4 the EIA Report.
	A detailed site-specific peat management plan is required; it must cover quantified peat volumes, reuse, restoration, storage and disposal proposals and regulatory considerations.	The outline PMP for the Site is detailed in Technical Appendix 9.3 of Volume 4 of the EIA Report and lays out full details of peat volumes, reuse, restoration, storage and disposal proposals.
	The EIA must show how impacts on hydrology and the water environment have been minimised. Measures should be put in place to protect any downstream sensitive receptors. Drawings must show infrastructure footprint, both temporary and permanent, overlain with water bodies.	A map of all watercourses, 50 m watercourse buffers and SEPAs Recommended Riparian Corridors with the Proposed Development overlain is shown in Figure 9.2 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report. Further detail on watercourses and mitigation measures to protect downstream receptors are described in this chapter.
	The minimum buffer around each waterbody, as detailed in Table 1 of Recommended Riparian Corridor Layer for use in Land Use Planning, from all construction activities including working and storage areas, or 50m where subsurface activities are more than 1m in depth. If these minimum buffers cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of	A 50 m buffer from watercourses where excavations exceed 1 m has been incorporated from an early design stage. Relevant minimum buffers around waterbodies (i.e. Recommended Riparian Corridor Layer for temporary infrastructure with subsurface excavations less than 1 m and the 50 m buffer) are shown in Figure 9.2 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report. In the locations where minimum buffers could not be achieved, details of buffer

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	the location, dimensions of the waterbody, drawings of what is proposed in terms of any engineering works, and details of why the minimum buffer cannot be achieved and mitigation measures to protect the feature.	breaches are provided in Technical Appendix 9.1: Watercourse Crossings and Buffer Assessment of Volume 4 of the EIA Report. An assessment of likely significant effects and additional mitigation measures to protect the feature, if required, is presented in Chapter 9 .
	A map showing the location, size, depths and dimensions of all borrow pits overlain with all waterbodies within 250m and showing a site-specific buffer around each waterbody proportionate to the depth of excavations.	There are no borrow pits proposed. Materials will be sourced and transported to the site from local suppliers, where possible.
	Phase 1 habitat surveys and National Vegetation Classification surveys must be undertaken where relevant.	NVC surveys have been carried out (see Technical Appendix 7.1 of Volume 4) for the Site and potentially groundwater-dependent areas were assessed for groundwater dependency during hydrological surveys. Hydrology surveys confirmed that the <i>potential</i> groundwater dependent areas identified by habitat surveys were either associated with surface water features (i.e. watercourses) or forestry drainage within the forestry rides and are not groundwater dependent. There are no GWDTE identified within the Site.
	SEPA expect developments and infrastructure to be designed and constructed such that the water environment, including existing water abstractions, are protected. Buffer distances must be demonstrated; risk assessment and monitoring are required where buffers cannot be achieved.	A comprehensive PWS survey and assessment was carried out. A map showing private water supplies (PWS) and groundwater abstractions within 1 km of the Site is provided in Figure 9.1 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report. Extensive efforts have been made through postal survey within a 1 km radius of the Site, liaison with EAC and two rounds of public consultation to identify abstraction sources near the Site. There are no PWS sources or abstractions within 250m of the Proposed Development micro-siting limit which will be affected by the Proposed Development, and effects on PWS are scoped out of the assessment presented in Chapter 9 .
	Engagement with Scottish Water is required where public supplies may be affected.	Scottish Water were consulted (see above) and confirmed that there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas under the Water Framework Directive, in the area that may be affected by the proposed activity.
	The source (rather than the property it supplies) of both public and private water supply abstractions should be identified. The survey needs to extend beyond the	Sources have been identified, where possible and the survey extends beyond the Site boundary. See Figure 9.1 in Volume 3a .

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	site boundary where the distances require it.	
	The following information should be submitted where the assessment results indicate groundwater abstractions may be present: a) A set of drawings demonstrating the locations of the sources of all groundwater abstractions are out with a 10m radius of all activities, 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and out with 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m b) If the minimum buffers cannot be achieved a conceptual site model should be provided that includes interpretation of the hydrogeological setting, including the groundwater flow regime.	A map showing PWS, groundwater abstractions and buffers within 1 km of the Site is provided in Figure 9.1 of Volume 3a of the EIA Report.
	Crossings must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% annual exceedance probability flows with an appropriate allowance for climate change, or information provided to justify smaller structures.	All 12 new permanent watercourse crossings will be designed to the 1 in 200-year flood event with an allowance for climate change – see Technical Appendix 9.1 of the EIA Report.
	A flood risk assessment (FRA) must be submitted in order to establish that the five bullet points within NPF4 policy 22a have been satisfied and where it is considered the development could result in an increased risk of flooding to a nearby receptor.	Flood risk areas based on SEPA future flood maps were avoided, where practicable. However, small areas of the Proposed Development lie within the surface water and small watercourses flood risk area due to watercourse crossings. Flood risk is described in the baseline and assessment in Chapter 9. The Proposed Development will not result in an increased risk of flooding to any nearby receptors, and a stand-alone FRA is not required.
	SEPA generally discourage land raising and culverting unless policy tests are met.	No land-raising will take place within flood risk areas. The 12 new watercourse crossings will be designed as bottomless arch culverts or single span bridges in accordance with SEPA guidance³ - see Technical Appendix 9.1 of the EIA Report.
	Culverting for land gain would not be supported. If any works to alter watercourse channels are proposed, SEPA would expect betterment to the channel and utilisation of this opportunity to help reduce flood risk to the wider site and any other nearby receptors.	Noted – no culverting for land gain is proposed and there are no proposals to alter watercourse channels. Some re-routing of small forestry drains around proposed permanent infrastructure will be required as a means of additional mitigation. This is described in Chapter 9 and Technical Appendix 9.1 of the EIA Report.
	Policy 3 of NPF4 requires EIA developments to first fully mitigate any	An assessment of effects on terrestrial ecology and birds is provided in Chapter 7 :

³ SEPA: Engineering in the Water Environment Good Practice Guide – River Crossings, WAT-SG-25, 2010

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	potential negative impacts on biodiversity, and then deliver additional measures that conserve, restore, and enhance biodiversity and nature networks, ensuring they are in a better condition than if the development had not taken place.	Ecology and Chapter 8: Ornithology , respectively. Proposals for conserving, restoring and enhancing biodiversity are provided in Technical Appendix 7.6 of EIA Report. A summary of all mitigation, good practice, enhancement and monitoring measures are included in Technical Appendix 2.2 of the EIA Report. All micro-siting will be subject to approval of an EnvCoW.
	The submission must include a schedule of mitigation, which includes reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques (for example, limiting the maximum area to be stripped of soils and peat at any one time) and regulatory requirements.	
	A commitment must also be included in the schedule of mitigation that micro-siting will not encroach into sensitive areas, to avoid adversely affecting mitigation measures identified in the EIAR that seek to avoid and/or minimise adverse effects on sensitive receptors (e.g. peat, watercourse and GWDTE buffers).	
Noise and Vibration		
EAC Environmental Health Officer 30/10/25	EAC agree with: - Proposed noise assessment methodology and noise limits; - Chosen baseline noise monitoring locations which are considered representative of all noise-sensitive receptors; and - The conclusion that no additional nearby wind farm developments need to be included in a cumulative noise assessment.	Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration assesses construction and operational noise effects associated with the Proposed Development in line with the methodology set out in the Scoping Report, but has also been updated as necessary to reflect the terminology used in the Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Turbines (ARWTN) guidelines which were published in June 2026. Chapter 10 is supported by Technical Appendices 10.1-10.5 found in Volume 4 . Baseline noise measurements are detailed in Technical Appendix 10.1 and locations are shown in Figure 10.1 . Cumulative noise modelling and results are provided in Technical Appendices 10.4 and 10.5 respectively .
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion -Noise 11/12/25	EAC requests that the planning service would largely be led by the Council's independent noise consultant and detailed methodology be agreed with them with input from Environmental Health as required for the noise assessment to inform the EIA report. The use of lower end of the ETSU limits is recommended.	It is noted that EAC intend to use an independent noise consultant to review the noise assessment, and that EAC encourage the use of limits at the lower end of the ETSU-R-97 noise limit. It is noted that since the Scoping Report, ARWTN has replaced ETSU-R-97, but the same day limit range applies. Although the ARWTN upper day noise limit of 40 Db L _{A90} has been applied as the cumulative day LLV (i.e., at the maximum of the day lower limiting values), at all baseline noise measurement locations background sound levels were sufficiently high that adopting the lowest LLV (35 dB L _{A90}) would make no difference to the derived noise

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
		limits. The only exception to this is at Glenouther Farm at wind speeds below 5 m/s where the lower day noise limits would also be met. As the baseline measurement locations and assessment methodology were agreed with EAC, and there have been no deviations made to the agreed methodology, it was considered that there was no additional detailed methodology required and therefore further consultation was not necessary. It is noted that the overarching (TNAC) noise limits within ARWTN are the same as in ETSU-R-97.
Access, Traffic and Transport		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion -Access, Traffic and Transport 11/12/25	EAC noted that Transport Scotland (TS) nor ARA have not provided a formal consultation response. TS provided an initial response at the pre-application stage which remains relevant. EAC notes that the Applicant refers to the comments made at the initial pre-application stage and recommends engaging directly with ARA and TS at this early stage.	Comment noted. Transport Scotland were consulted regarding the proposed access strategy (see Technical Appendix 11.1: Transport Assessment - Annex A: High-level Access Review). No further response has been received from the ARA.
	General Advice EAC noted that the EIA Report should identify potential sources of materials (e.g. stone quarries) if these are off-site including the consideration of the impacts of access route to sites not excluding communities along the routes. The assessment should also include cumulative impacts with other developments. Use of borrow pits should be justified by including the appropriate environmental and/or supporting information within the EIA Report.	Potential quarries have been identified in Technical Appendix 11.1. The impact of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development on nearby roads and local communities within the study area has been assessed in Chapter 11: Access, Traffic and Transport, and a high-level review has been undertaken of the potential effects of the Likely Grid Connection Route. No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.
	EAC requested that a cumulative traffic assessment be done including any proposed in-planning / consented / under construction developments likely to generate notable volumes of traffic. This should not necessarily be limited to other wind farms as any traffic generating developments using the same local road network as the proposed wind farm have the potential to contribute to cumulative traffic impacts regardless of the nature of the development. The Applicant should monitor the cumulative situation and development applications in and around the area / using the same road network to inform the cumulative traffic assessment nearer the time, prior to submission of the	A sensitivity review rather than a detailed assessment has been undertaken as discussed in Chapter 11. Whilst a detailed assessment has not been undertaken, it is acknowledged that any potential cumulative traffic and transport interactions would be appropriately managed by an overarching Traffic Management and Monitoring Plan (TMMP). Further details of other considered schemes, including non-energy related schemes, are provided in Technical Appendix 11.1.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	application to ensure the cumulative assessment is up to date.	
	EAC requested that the EIA Report should detail the port of entry and delivery route for turbine components to site. Decommissioning phase can be scoped out of the traffic assessment as impacts are likely to be similar those during construction as can the operational period be scoped out.	A High-Level Access Review is provided in Annex A of Technical Appendix 11.1 which provides details on the delivery route from the proposed Port of Entry (PoE) at King George V (KGV) Docks to the Site, as well as information on proposed turbine components. Operational and decommissioning phases have been scoped out of the traffic assessment – see Chapter 11 .
	Any new or upgraded accesses on the road network will need to include any required visibility splays within the application site boundary so that any works necessary to form and maintain these can be included as part of the development.	The site access is located on the M77 service road which is used for the operation and maintenance of the M77. A visibility splay is therefore not necessary. The site access and approach to the site access will be managed through the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).
Climate Change		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	EAC noted that effects on climate change be addressed within the EIA Report by incorporating into separate, related chapters.	The effects on climate change have been assessed. See Chapter 12: Climate Change and Technical Appendix 12.1: Carbon Balance Assessment of the EIA Report.
Aviation		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	The Applicant should engage with Glasgow Airport, while considerably further from the site, they may also have comments to make in this regard.	The potential effects on of the Proposed Development on aviation interests have been assessed based on desk-based study and consultation with relevant consultees (see Technical Appendix 4.3: Aviation Assessment).
Glasgow Prestwick Airport 22/10/25	GPA is concerned about the following as it could affect the air traffic services for Runway 20: Effects on primary surveillance radar (PSR).	The potential effects on the Airport's PSR have been assessed and presented within Section 6 of Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.
	Effects on instrument flight procedures (IFPs) for runway 20.	The potential effects on the Airport's IFPs for runway 20 have been assessed and presented within Section 10 of the Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	Potential loss of Very High Frequency (VHF) air-to-ground radio communications.	The potential effects on the Airport's VHF air-to-ground radio communications have been assessed and presented within Section 11 of Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.
	Aviation lighting	A reduced lighting scheme has been derived that satisfies the design criteria set out in CAP 764, and this has been agreed with the CAA (see Section 12 of Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report). The visual effects of the proposed lighting scheme are assessed in Technical Appendix 5.3: Aviation Lighting Night-Time Assessment of the EIA Report.
	Cumulative VHF and PSR impact.	The cumulative effects have been assessed and presented in Sections 6 and 11 of the Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.
Ministry of Defence (MOD) 11/11/25	MOD raised concerns that the 5 wind turbines could create physical obstruction to military air traffic. The proposed site lies within Low Flying Area 16 (LFA16), where military aircraft may operate as low as 76.2m for low level training. They request as mitigation that aviation safety lighting is added, and that sufficient data is submitted to ensure that structures can be accurately charted to allow deconfliction.	A review of the aviation baseline through desk-based study shows that the Proposed Development Site is not located within a military low flying area and has therefore been scoped out. See Technical Appendix 4.3 .
NATS En Route plc (NERL) 21/10/25	NATS predict an impact on Lowther Hill, Cumbernauld and Glasgow Terma RADAR. Using theory calculations and development specific propagation profile, NATS has determined that the terrain screening available will not adequately attenuate the signal. This will likely cause false primary plots to be generated and a reduction in the RADAR's probability for detection for real aircraft is also predicted.	The potential effects on the PSRs have been assessed and presented within Section 7 and 8 of Technical Appendix 4.3 of the EIA Report.
Forestry		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	Impacts of the proposed development on forestry should be detailed as part of the EIA Report. Details of any compensatory forestry planting should be detailed and accompanied by relevant figures to demonstrate areas of loss and compensatory planting as relevant. Some details of species composition and design of any compensatory planting areas would be beneficial. It may be worth considering native broadleaf species if appropriate. It will be expected that compensatory planting takes place within the site as a first preference, though where this is not possible, it will be expected that justification is detailed as to why off-site planting is required and this will be	Information regarding tree removal, restocking and compensatory planting is presented in Technical Appendix 4.1: Wind Farm Forestry Plan and accompanying Figures 4.1.1-4.1.8 of the EIA Report. Information regarding proposed compensatory planting is presented at Section 6 of the Technical Appendix 4.1: Wind Farm Forestry Plan of the EIA Report. All existing open ground within the Site is unsuitable as the location for new woodland planting either due to the depth of the peat soils or the requirement to retain the necessary proportion of open ground within the forest required under the UK Forestry Standard. Consequently, the

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	expected to take place within the East Ayrshire local authority area.	compensatory planting will need to be implemented in a different location.
SEPA 22/11/25	If forestry is present on the site, the site layout should be designed to avoid large scale felling, as this can result in substantial amounts of waste material and a peak in release of nutrients which can affect local water quality. The submission must include drawings with the boundaries of where felling will take place and a description of what is proposed for this timber.	As above. Figures 4.1.3, 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 of Technical Appendix 4.1 illustrate the felling proposals. The potential effects of these proposals on run-off rates, flood risk and ground-water levels/recharge are assessed in Chapter 9.
Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	EAC accepts the scoping out of socio-economics provided a separate detailed assessment of impacts is provided. Any emerging metric from the Scottish Government or associated guidance should be kept under review in respect of the requirements of Policy 11c of NPF4 which notes development proposals for developments such as under consideration will only be supported where net economic impact, including local and community socio-economic benefits, are maximised. This will need to be detailed within the submission to evidence what steps will be taken to ensure such benefits will be maximised. EAC has no real preference as to the reporting of benefits, however, where effects relate to aspects of the EIA Report (such as landscape and visual impacts affecting tourism/recreation assets) then it may be just as easy to assess any socio-economic, tourism and recreational effects as part of the EIA Report. To comply with Policy SS10 of the EALDP2, a skills and employment plan is expected to be submitted with the application to satisfy the requirements of that policy.	A detailed assessment of the impacts on socio-economics, in line with the NPF4 Policy 11c has been undertaken and presented as a separate report (see the Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation Impact Assessment Report) which supports the planning application for the Proposed Development.
Fenwick Community Council 15/11/25	The Community Council disagrees with the proposal to scope socio-economics, tourism and recreation out of the EIA. They consider potential impacts on local businesses and employment to be significant, citing Harelaw Farm Weddings as a nearby example.	EAC's Formal Scoping Opinion confirmed that socio-economics can be scoped out of the EIA provided a separate detailed assessment of impacts is provided. A standalone Socio-Economic, Tourism and Recreation Impact Assessment has been prepared to support the Planning Application for Proposed Development. The report quantifies the anticipated economic and employment benefits of the Proposed Development, details how it will deliver social and community value, and presents an evidenced based analysis of the relationship between the Proposed Development, the local visitor economy and recreational assets.

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
Population and Human Health		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	A specific chapter may not be required as long as issues of public health are addressed within the specialist chapters where necessary. If not, a specific chapter for human health will be required.	The assessment of potential effects on human health has been scoped out of the EIA. There are no potential significant effects in relation to noise or shadow flicker which could result in a secondary impact on human health. See Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA .
Major Accidents and Disasters		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion - Other Issues 11/12/25	EAC suggested the inclusion of a summary or table to highlight each of the potential risks and provide a brief explanation as to why these are not deemed to be relevant or necessary of further detailed consideration within the EIA Report. For any risks which are deemed worthy of fuller assessment, this should be detailed in the relevant chapter of the EIA Report.	Major accidents and disasters have been considered in the context of peat slide risk and traffic and transport, and have been assessed separately in Technical Appendix: Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment and Chapter 11: Access, Traffic and Transport of the EIA Report. The construction and operation of the Proposed Development will be managed within the requirements of a number of health and safety related legislation, including the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 and the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974. As the Proposed Development is not considered vulnerable to any major accidents or disasters that could result in likely significant environmental effects, major accidents and disasters has been scoped out as a discrete topic in the EIA Report.
Decommissioning		
EAC Formal Scoping Opinion – Decommissioning & Restoration 11/12/25	EAC noted that an assessment of the likely impacts of decommissioning of the Proposed Development on all of the environmental topics shall form part of the EIA Report unless noted to be scoped out. This will ensure a reasonable idea as to what those impacts may be and what possible mitigation would be required. The application shall be accompanied by a decommissioning report which sets out a costed breakdown including restoration and aftercare works likely on site, based on the observations made within the EIA Report regarding decommissioning.	Decommissioning effects of the Proposed Development have been assessed in the relevant chapters of the EIA Report. Details of the standard approach to decommissioning is set out in Section 4.10 of Chapter 4 of the EIA Report. The decommissioning requirements will be agreed with EAC and other appropriate regulatory authorities in line with best practice guidance and requirements at the time. This would be done through the preparation and agreement of a Decommissioning Management Plan (DMP). Financial provision for the decommissioning will be provided. It is

Consultee and Date of Response	Issue Raised	Response/Action Taken
	EAC's independent consultants will require to review and inform the expected financial guarantee quantum which the Council would seek to secure via a Section 75 legal agreement. The Applicant should advise what mechanism they intend to secure this, such as a bond. These matters would inform the Council's assessment of the application. The complete removal of the development, including access tracks and ancillary infrastructure, as part of the decommissioning and restoration process is the preferred approach of this Council unless a better alternative (taking account of all relevant environmental, social and economic issues) can otherwise be demonstrated by the Applicant.	anticipated that the DMP will be enforceable through a planning condition.
Telecommunications		
Arqiva Limited 29/10/25	Arqiva has identified that turbine 4 would be located within 50m of an existing microwave link between their Darvel and Lochgoilhead sites. Arqiva requires a clearance of 100m minimum from turbine blades, this otherwise creates a risk of interference or damage to the link and potential network degradation. Telecommunications were proposed to be scoped out of the EIA, but notes that they were not consulted by the developer on this. Wind turbines can interfere with Super High Frequency and Ultra High Frequency digital broadcast signals affecting telecommunications reliability, as wind turbines can interfere with electromagnetic signals which damage or degrade the signal. Under Scottish Government National Planning Framework 4 (Policy 11), such impacts must not compromise telecommunications infrastructure.	Through additional consultation, the Applicant has considered the microwave link operated by Arqiva which runs through the western part of the Site. Modifications were made through the iterative design process of the Proposed Development layout and a buffer of 181 m (100 m clearance plus blade length) was applied to the link and maintained as part of the final design. Chapter 3 of the EIA Report details the technical and environmental site constraints identified and considered during the iterative design process which guided the positioning of both turbines and supporting infrastructure.
Other Issues		
The Coal Authority 17/10/25	The site to which this submission relates is not located within the defined coalfield. On this basis we have no specific comment to make.	Noted.