

Table 1: Mill Rig WF Scoping Table

Consultee	Date	Key Comments	Updates to project and action to be undertaken in EIA Report
South Lanarkshire Council (Formal Scoping Opinion)	18.01.2019 NOTE: LVIA scope was clarified responding to the comments on 6th March 2020 and refined scope agreed by SLC on 8th April 2020. The refined scope is reflected in this table.	Landscape and Visual	
		Detailed information should be included to show how the iterative design process sets out to minimise the landscape and visual impacts.	This will be included within the EIAR.
		In relation to the assessment on landscape character, a radius should be specified that would identify areas where landscape character would be likely to be significantly altered. Given the height of the turbines proposed and the requirement for night-time lighting it is expected that this would extend to approximately 15km from the site.	A study area of 10km was proposed and agreed in the subsequent scoping clarification consultation. This is considered to remain representative for the tip height increase from 220m to 250m.
		Agree that 2km should be the minimum distance for the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment.	Noted a 2km distance from the nearest turbines which have intervisibility with the residential property will be included within the RVAA.
		The viewpoints proposed within the scoping report are very similar to those used for Bankend Rig. The viewpoints should demonstrate a clear focus on the proposed development as some may not be appropriate and may require micrositing.	Taking account of this comment, viewpoints were reviewed, and an updated set agreed in the scoping clarification. These are shown with the current ZTV on Figure 3 and comprise: 1 - Local road to north of site 2 - B745 south of Drumclog 3 - B743 adj. Glengavel reservoir 4 - Loudon Hill 5 - Drumclog 6 - Gilmourton 7 - B743 east of Sorn 8 - North edge of Darvel 9 - Newmilns snow and sports complex 10 - A70 11 - Strathaven Warmemorial 12 - Cairn Table 13 - A76 north of Mauchline 14 - B7046 East of Skares
		The final EIA Report must include a full, detailed assessment with regard to the night-time assessment. A similar methodology to that used for the Kype Muir extension would be appropriate. A written description from all viewpoints where aviation lighting would be visible. Additionally, this description should identify the baseline night-time characteristics and how aviation lighting would fit into this baseline.	This will be included and will follow the same approach as for Kype Muir extension. Given that this is a developing area of assessment, any modifications to the approach made as a result of changing best practice or the emergence of new guidance will be either explained in detail in the chapter or agreed in advance if this is deemed appropriate. The proposed viewpoint locations for night-time photomontages are shown on Figure 3 and comprise viewpoints 5, 6 and 8, representing the nearby settlements of Drumclog, Gilmourton and Darvel.
		While Aviation has been scoped out from further assessment, aviation lighting is considered under Landscape and Visual. SLC would advise that if these topics are to form one chapter of an EIA Report, as set out within the Scoping Report, they should be clearly differentiated and each relevant technical appendix clearly cross referenced.	The effects of lighting will be considered as part of the LVIA chapter. Information in relation to aviation will be presented in a separate technical chapter/appendix.
		Cumulative assessment should be limited to all known operational, consented and in planning, wind farm turbines over 70m (to blade tip) within 5km of the site.	The subsequent scoping clarification in March/April 2020 agreed the following for cumulative assessment: 1) <i>The location of wind farms of 3 turbines (or more) and 70m to tip (or greater) will be identified within the 25km LVIA study area for context. These will be listed within the cumulative assessment and identified on a plan, including their planning status.</i> 2) <i>Full detail (including turbine locations and heights) will be included for wind farms of 3 turbines (or more) and 70m to tip (or greater) within the 15km cumulative study area. The 15km radius will be applied flexibly such that wind farms only just beyond this distance and/or those that are judged to be particularly relevant to the assessment based on the assessed effects of the proposed development will also be included in full detail.</i> 3) <i>Full detail of all wind developments of 50m tip (or greater) within 5km will also be included.</i> 4) <i>The visualisations will only model those developments identified within items 2 and 3 above.</i> 5) <i>... Except by specific request from consultees, or where applications are known to be imminent, wind farms at the scoping stage will not be considered.</i> It is not proposed that this should be altered as a result of the tip height increase.
		The cumulative assessment should be as up to date as possible. Cumberhead and Hagshaw Hill repowering are now in application form and should be accounted for.	We have agreed criteria for inclusion, rather than a list, in order to achieve an up-to-date assessment. As long as the criteria are agreed, we will undertake a review of sites meeting those criteria just before commencement of baseline panorama preparation and assessment site work. We will verify the list of sites at that stage with consultees to ensure that they are not aware of others that merit inclusion.
		Ecology	
With regard to reptiles, the NBN Atlas shows point records for adder, common lizard and slow worm adjacent to the site and therefore it is feasible that these species are present on similar habitat within the site boundary. It is considered that additional species surveys would be required for reptiles.	Good practice working methods will avoid impacts on reptile species which are unlikely to be present on the site at a density which would make survey feasible or useful. As discussed with SNH, detailed surveys are not proposed to be carried out.		

Consultee	Date	Key Comments	Updates to project and action to be undertaken in EIA Report
		The potential for impacts on bats and otter should be addressed through the construction management plan and the habitat management plan.	Updated otter and tree survey for bats are being undertaken in June/July 2020 due to age of data and changes in turbine layout/red line boundary. The otter survey will be undertaken within the new red line boundary and a 250m buffer, and a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the trees where the Bank End Rig (BER) track meets the public road will be undertaken. The badger survey is also being updated. On-site bat activity surveys were undertaken in the summer of 2019. The results of these surveys will be reported in an updated technical report with updated figures and assessed in the EclA.
		In addition to actual survey results, existing surveys as outlined in table 5.2 of the Scoping Report are considered to be sufficient.	A total of 140ha of habitat survey is needed to infill the area of missing habitat data due to the change in turbine layout. This will be undertaken in June/July 2020; the technical report and figures will be updated and IEF habitats assessed in the EclA.
Ornithology			
		The EIA Report should provide the necessary assessment materials to support the undertaking of a Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment as part of the planning application process.	A revised request to the Raptor Study Group (RSG) for any SPA breeding raptor data for 2019/2020 will be required. Based on the output from this, previous data searches and our own survey data, the definition of "historic" for raptor nest locations, and their relevant stand-off distances from keyhole edges, will be pre-agreed with SNH prior to compilation of the OIA. An additional breeding season of vantage point data was collected in 2019.
		The collision risk modelling can be limited to SPA species only.	Noted. No further action required.
		The proximity of turbine 12 to the boundary of the SSSI may lead to impacts on breeding birds within the site or on the suitability of the habitats and therefore it is important that the EIA Report considers these potential impacts on the SSSI.	Turbine 12 is no longer within the red line boundary being taken forward (see Figure X). Notwithstanding this, the breeding bird data is still considered to be sufficient and will be used to assess potential impacts on the SSSI.
Noise			
		It would be advisable to work towards a condition based on the controlling receptor principal (not apportionment).	TNEI have undertaken some initial cumulative modelling and layout design in line with the Institute of Acoustics document 'A good practice guide to the application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and rating of wind turbine noise' (IoA GPG) the use of which is endorsed by the Scottish Government; site specific noise limits have primarily been derived based on limit apportionment, which is considered an appropriate approach for the nearby noise assessment locations. The controlling property principle is only applicable in certain scenarios, and as such it will be considered where appropriate. Key findings were that noise limits to north west and north east will need to be derived carefully to account for the presence of existing cumulative wind developments. This will form part of the operational noise assessment.
		Hemispherical propagation should initially be considered then further discussion on the directivity based on wind direction can be considered. This will assist in ensuring that sufficient headroom is provided.	Noise predictions will be undertaken based on the recommendations and methodology contained within the IoA GPG. Hemispherical propagation will be considered, and directivity will also be considered where appropriate to do so. Key findings of the noise modelling undertaken to date are that it will be important to consider the effects of directivity on noise propagation, particularly for properties located between the Bankend Rig and Dungavel wind farms. This will form part of the operational noise assessment.
		When considering the cumulative emissions, the operational limit may require further reduction to ensure that the ETSU-R-97 level can be achieved.	This has been considered in modelling undertaken to date and will be present for all future noise modelling undertaken for this assessment. Site Specific Limits (applicable to the proposed development) will be set for each noise assessment location, which will ensure that the ETSU-R-97 Total Noise Limits (which should not be exceeded by the combined cumulative noise levels) are met at all noise assessment locations. These limits will be derived in accordance with the guidance in the IoA GPG. This will form part of the operational noise assessment.
		The candidate turbine should be based on the turbine likely to be selected at the time of compiling the report.	The noise assessment will be based on either the likely turbine model to be selected, or a suitable candidate turbine should this information not be available. The final choice of turbine will be subject to a competitive tendering process, and therefore may change at a later stage*. Noise modelling undertaken to date has considered a range of turbines. The noise modelling has been used to feed into the layout design process. <i>*The IoA GPG states: "4.1.6 Whilst some developments may already have a preferred turbine selection, most sites will not at this stage of the project, and it is therefore standard practice to consider a "candidate turbine" at the planning stage, which is representative of the range of turbines which may be installed at the site, to provide an appropriate estimate. The suitability of the final turbine model (post-consent) can be secured through the imposition of adequate planning conditions."</i>
		The turbine height should reflect that which is realistically to be deployed. This is preferable to varying the application for a taller unit should the application be approved.	Hub height changes do result in changes to the noise limits as the limits are set relative to wind speed at hub height which is then standardised to 10 m height. The assessment will be based on the largest hub height being considered as this will result in the lowest most conservative noise limits.
		It would be advisable to consider the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines: 2018 that includes a level for wind turbines. This should ensure that no receptor is likely to exceed an average noise exposure of 45dB Lden. This should be based on cumulative levels.	We would strongly recommend against the use of the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines (the Guidelines). The recommendations in the guidelines are conditional, and have not been endorsed by UK or Scottish government and are the subject to a number of technical limitations as set out below. We would seek to liaise with the SLC EHO to further discuss this matter and agree the scope of the noise assessment. Further information on the Guidelines: The Guidelines make recommendations in relation to a number of noise sources including road, rail and aircraft noise as well as leisure noise and wind turbine noise. For each of the noise sources considered; recommendations are rated as either 'strong' or 'conditional,' which are defined as follows: <i>"A strong recommendation can be adopted as policy in most situations. The guideline is based on the confidence that the desirable effects of adherence to the recommendation outweigh the undesirable consequences. The quality of evidence for a net benefit – combined with information about the values, preferences and resources – inform this recommendation, which should be implemented in most circumstances.</i> <i>A conditional recommendation requires a policy-making process with substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders. There is less certainty of its efficacy owing to lower quality of evidence of a net benefit, opposing values and preferences of individuals and populations affected or the high resource implications of the recommendation, meaning there may be circumstances or settings in which it will not apply."</i> Table 42 of the Guidelines also sets out additional context in relation to the balance of benefits versus harms and burdens, stating:

Consultee	Date	Key Comments	Updates to project and action to be undertaken in EIA Report
			<p><i>"Further work is required to assess fully the benefits and harms of exposure to environmental noise from wind turbines and to clarify whether the potential benefits associated with reducing exposure to environmental noise for individuals living in the vicinity of wind turbines outweigh the impact on the development of renewable energy policies in the WHO European Region."</i></p> <p>The L_{den} metric is not currently used in the UK for the prediction, measurement or assessment of wind turbine noise and this is also highlighted in Table 42 of the Guidelines, which states (in relation to additional considerations or uncertainties) that:</p> <p><i>"There are serious issues with noise exposure assessment related to wind turbines."</i></p> <p>This is consistent with earlier text in the Guidelines (on page 84), which notes that:</p> <p><i>"Based on all these factors, it may be concluded that the acoustical description of wind turbine noise by means of L_{den} or L_{night} may be a poor characterization of wind turbine noise and may limit the ability to observe associations between wind turbine noise and health outcomes."</i></p> <p>Whilst the Guidelines provide a useful overview of the information available relating to health effects at the time of the WHO review, the recommendations need to be considered in the context of the entire document.</p> <p>The Guidelines note that the evidence upon which the recommendations are based is low quality and this is reflected in the fact that the recommendation is conditional. The Guidelines note that the recommendation should be subject to a policy-making process with substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders.</p> <p>In relation to wind turbine noise assessment, no changes have been made to Scottish Government guidance, which continues to note that assessments should follow the guidance in ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG. The Institute of Acoustics has also not made any changes to the good practice guidance set out in the IOA GPG.</p> <p>Accordingly, we would recommend that an assessment against the Guidelines is not appropriate or necessary.</p>
		Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	
		<p>West of Scotland Archaeology Service (WoSAS) generally agreed with the Scoping Report subject to the caveats raised by Historic Scotland in their letter regarding setting.</p> <p>For completeness these are included below.</p> <p>HES noted that there was limited information provided in the archaeology and cultural heritage section of the report.</p>	<p>The reduction in turbine numbers from 18 to 10 reduces the area disturbed during the construction phase and hence the potential for heritage assets to be affected. Furthermore, the emerging layout is predominantly confined to land occupied by commercial forestry; initial desk-based research indicates that this area saw very limited activity in the Medieval and Post-Medieval periods and it is likely, given the wet ground conditions indicated by historic mapping, that this was also the case for earlier periods. In addition, forestry ploughing is likely to have severely damaged any assets that may have been present. The likelihood of significant adverse effects occurring as a result of construction or de-commissioning of the proposed wind farm is therefore greatly limited as a result of the emerging layout's being largely contained within the forestry plantation.</p> <p>Maps held by the National Library of Scotland have been reviewed, as has satellite imagery. Historic Environment Record (HER) data has been received from West of Scotland Archaeological Service (WoSAS). Information regarding designated heritage assets has been gathered from Historic Environment Scotland (HES).</p> <p>No designated heritage assets are present within the Site Boundary or Adjoining Land. Main Castle earthwork, which is considered by WoSAS to be of Schedulable Quality lies adjacent to the access track, outside the Site Boundary.</p> <p>Heritage assets are sparse within the Site Boundary. Previously recorded heritage assets are restricted to a group of undated enclosures and a reputed packman's grave. However, the current study has identified areas of cultivation remains on satellite imagery in the area to the south of the Tay Burn and an unroofed structure on maps to the north-east of Main Castle. The cultivation remains correspond with mapped features. Mitigation works in relation to BERI identified no archaeological remains. The archaeological potential of the Site therefore appears to be low.</p> <p>Direct impacts upon known assets will be readily avoided through design. Whilst those upon currently unrecorded assets may be addressed through a programme of archaeological fieldwork, most probably a targeted watching brief.</p> <p>A full desk-based assessment and field survey will be undertaken in July/August to inform the design and assessment (including setting). The results of this work will be presented in a technical appendix.</p>
		The potential cumulative impacts of the proposed development in combination with other developments in the vicinity should be assessed, due to differing turbine heights between the existing and consented schemes and the proposed development.	The cumulative effects of the proposed wind farm with operational wind farms and those that are consented, under construction or in planning within 10km will be assessed.
		<p>An assessment on the following scheduled monuments should contain a full appreciation of the setting of the following historic environment assets and the likely impact on their settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungavel Hill, cairn (SM 2848) • Glen Garr, cairn (SM 2469) • Blacksidend, cairn (SM 2924) • Chapelhouse, chapel and farmstead (SM 5405) 	The setting of these Scheduled Monuments will be assessed in detail and appropriate visualisations will be provided as necessary.
		WoSAS noted C and V category sites from the HER should be additional to the designated sites requiring setting assessment.	The setting of C and V category sites will be assessed appropriately. An appropriate visualisation will be provided for Mains Castle earthwork.
		WoSAS noted, Aerial photographic evidence should be included to support the DBA due to evidence of a multi-phase field system and cultivation remains visible on open ground.	Satellite imagery has been examined, this clearly shows cultivation remains and similar features on open ground. It is not proposed to examine aerial photographs held by HES Archives to identify such features that may have been present in forested areas, as historic mapping indicates that there is negligible potential to identify new features in the afforested areas and such features will, in any case, have been removed by forestry ploughing.
		Many designated assets lie outwith the proposed 10km study area. These assets may receive impacts and it will be important to ascertain whether other designated assets might receive significant impacts.	Category A Listed Buildings within Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes within 20km will be initially considered to identify those where significant effects are likely to occur. Other assets will be considered where raised specifically by consultees.
		Water Resources	

Consultee	Date	Key Comments	Updates to project and action to be undertaken in EIA Report
		<p>Including site specific issues raised by SEPA.</p> <p>Detailed assessment requires to be undertaken on the direct and indirect effects on private water supplies that may be affected by the proposed development.</p>	<p>To date, desk-based baseline research work has been undertaken in December 2018 / January 2019 to identify nearby private water supplies (PWSs) and recorded groundwater and surface water resources and quality of these. As part of the EIA, this information will be refreshed to capture any changes in the intervening period.</p> <p>For surface water, in 2017, the Avon Water/Glengavel Water (SEPA ID 10408) was classified as having an overall status of Moderate. SEPA's water classification hub shows there are two groundwater bodies covering the proposed site area. The northern area of the site area overlies the Slouch Moss groundwater body (SEPA ID 150497) and the southern part overlies the North Glengavel groundwater body (SEPA ID 150575). Both groundwater bodies were classed in 2017 by SEPA as having an overall status of Good and no adverse pressures were listed for either of these waterbodies.</p> <p>South Lanarkshire Council previously confirmed that there are no PWSs recorded within the site, but several private water supplies are noted to the north and east. A review will be undertaken to identify properties near to watercourses with headwaters in the proposed development area or where groundwater supplies may be present and the landowners will be contacted to confirm the source location and from this it will be determined if further assessment of potential impact is required. If such an assessment identifies a potential adverse impact, then appropriate mitigation will be proposed.</p> <p>In the EIA Report, the hydrological and hydrogeological assessment will consider the potential effects on Surface Waters and Groundwaters, Private Water Supplies (PWS) and Water Abstractions.</p>
		Ground Conditions and Geology	
		Comprehensive surveys of peat extent and depth are required.	<p>To date, an initial peat depth probing survey has been undertaken on a 100m grid over accessible areas of the site, in accordance with current Scottish Government guidance. It has not been possible to undertake probing within some of the denser forestry at the site or where it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>The initial peat depth data shows variable peat depths over the site with localised areas of deeper peat (e.g. Slouch Moss, Cawdron's Flow) but that there are significant areas of the site with no or only shallow peat.</p> <p>The initial peat depth data will be used to guide the location and turbines and design of site infrastructure in order to avoid areas of deeper peat, as far as practical and taking into account other constraints.</p> <p>As per the guidance, following the design freeze for turbine locations and update of the design of site infrastructure to suit the layout, a second stage of detailed peat probing and coring will be undertaken on the infrastructure layout and further adjustments will be made to the design to further avoid impacts on peat.</p> <p>The peat surveys will be used to inform the Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA), carbon balance calculations and outline Peat Management Plan. If appropriate, peat excavated as part of the wind farm development could potentially be used for restoration of areas of degraded peat.</p>
		The EIA Report must consider the hydrological impact of the proposed development on ground conditions and peatland, including wider peatland resource outwith the boundary of the application site.	<p>In the EIA Report, the ground conditions and geology assessment will consider the potential effects on peat and peatland and geology (superficial geology and bedrock).</p> <p>The sensitivity of the peatland will be assessed using criteria based on its condition (e.g. whether it has been drained or not), supported vegetation (e.g. peat-forming versus non-peat-forming), and depth. The magnitude of effect will be assessed and tailored to the nature of the receptor where necessary. The scale of effect will be assessed by combining the sensitivity and the magnitude of change.</p> <p>It is recognised that the hydrological condition of the peat is important in terms of controlling the rate of carbon sequestration or indeed, loss of carbon. The Sphagnum mosses and other peat forming species are subject to slow, anaerobic decomposition when permanently waterlogged, but plant litter inputs are lost rapidly in aerobic conditions. Therefore, the depth of the water table is an important component to determine whether the peat will likely be sequestering or whether the peat may be subject to accelerated decomposition.</p>
East Ayrshire Council	02.11.2018	Landscape and Visual	
	NOTE: LVIA scope was clarified responding to the comments on 2 nd November 2019. The refined scope is reflected in this table.	<p>Whilst it is recognised that viewpoint 5 will show a representative point from Darvel, given that the ZTV shows that the full length of the A71 Irvine Valley within East Ayrshire a further viewpoint would be useful to fully demonstrate the impact on the Irvine valley communities.</p> <p>EAC would have liked to have seen a viewpoint within Newmilns or Galston.</p>	Viewpoint 9 at Newmilns was added in the scoping clarification to address this point as shown on Figure 3 .
		While night-time visualisations viewpoints will be agreed with SLC within a 15km radius of the wind farm, EAC expects this process will both involve viewpoints within East Ayrshire and further dialogue with EAC.	The proposed viewpoint locations for nighttime photomontages – viewpoints 5,6 and 8, representing the nearby settlements of Drumclog, Gilmourton and Darvel are shown on Figure 3 .
		EAC expect this application to appropriately consider the night-time visual implications for the Irvine Valley communities and the A71 within East Ayrshire.	This will be included in the scope of the night-time assessment. The 15km radius extends along the A71 to the edge of Harford.
		EAC expect the landscape policies of the East Ayrshire LDP (ENV7 and ENV8) to be taken into account as well as the East Ayrshire Landscape Capacity for wind energy study.	These policies and the capacity study will be taken into account in-so-far as they are relevant to a proposal which is not within the EAC policy area.
		EAC recommend that the proposed development considers all relevant elements of RE1, the key East Ayrshire policy for wind energy applications.	These policies will be taken into account in-so-far as it is relevant to landscape and visual matters and to a proposal which is not within the EAC policy area.
Consultees Responses not covered by the SO above.			
Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)	13.12.2018	The locations of historic nests sites should be agreed with SNH before the proposal for the reduction of the 250m buffer distance is adopted.	SNH will be contacted in July 2020 to agree the locations of historic nests. This information will inform the CRM.
SLC Biodiversity officer	10.10.2018	I think that a cumulative ecological impact assessment of priority bog habitat should be considered given the local (and international) importance of these habitats, and that this is a geographical area with many windfarms that may impact similarly.	NVC of area within revised site boundary is being undertaken. Cumulative loss will be included in EclA assessment.

Consultee	Date	Key Comments	Updates to project and action to be undertaken in EIA Report
SNH NOTE: The majority of SNH comments were covered by the SLC response and are not repeated here.	No Date Ref: P/18/1345	It is best practice to site turbines within areas of similar landcover	This point will be considered in developing the site design.
		<p>Cumberhead wind farm has just converted to in-application so should be assessed as part of your cumulative assessment. We also consider that Hagshaw Hill repowering and Douglas West Extension should be included should there be enough information to do so, as they are likely to convert to in-application in the near future. We think it important that these ones are included as they are likely to cause significant cumulative interactions with this proposal. They are also be similar in terms of turbines being very large, that will also require aviation lighting.</p> <p>Given the number of surrounding consented and built wind farm applications we think the assessment of cumulative effects is likely to be of particular importance. Minimising visual congestion and trying to create a balanced appearance should be a key design aim.</p>	<p>Suggestions regarding cumulative sites to be included at this stage will be considered in accordance with the agreed methodology for identifying cumulative developments.</p> <p>The design of the wind farm will be considered taking account of the cumulative context.</p>
SEPA	30.10.2018	The application site (or parts thereof) lie within the medium likelihood (0.5% annual probability or 1 in 200 year) flood extent of the SEPA Flood Map. However, the proposed development is considered to be appropriate to be located within a flood risk area provided the infrastructure is designed and constructed to remain operational during floods.	<p>The flood extent data will be taken account of in the design of the wind farm infrastructure.</p> <p>In the EIA Report, the hydrological and hydrogeological assessment will consider the potential effects on Surface Waters and Groundwaters, Private Water Supplies (PWS) and Water Abstractions.</p>
		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>The initial peat depth data shows variable peat depths over the site with localised areas of deeper peat (e.g. Slouch Moss, Cawdron's Flow) but that there are significant areas of the site with no or only shallow peat.</p> <p>The initial peat depth data will be used to guide the location and turbines and design of site infrastructure in order to avoid areas of deeper peat, as far as practical and taking into account other constraints.</p> <p>The peat surveys will be used to inform the Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PLHRA), carbon balance calculations and outline Peat Management Plan.</p>
Consultee	Date	New Scoping Information for Consultation	
Scottish Forestry were not consulted as part of the request for a Scoping Opinion and will be consulted separately by the Applicants Forestry consultants.	To be consulted in July 2020	<p>The Forestry Chapter will focus on the full extent of the commercial forestry within the site, which is situated north-west of Muirkirk and south-east of Darvel, in South Lanarkshire, on its border with East Ayrshire. The forest will be assessed as one commercial unit from a forestry management perspective.</p> <p>The majority of the commercial woodland comprises Sitka spruce with planting ages ranging from 1976-1990, there are small areas of mixed conifer and mixed broadleaves which make up the remainder of the forest, these were planted in 2005. There are areas of open ground found throughout the forest, but the majority of the site has been planted as a commercial crop. There is also extensive fire damage across the site.</p> <p>Growing conditions for trees are variable across the site, largely as a result of varying soil conditions on fertility. There are large areas of peaty gleys and peat which produce low yield class crops due to poor drainage and fertility. The elevated sections of the site contain mineral soils with better fertility and drainage and are better suited to commercial forestry.</p> <p>The structure of the forest will inevitably alter, even in the absence of development, as crops mature and are harvested. The EIA chapter will provide information on the anticipated differences between "normal" changes as the result of standard forest management and those which will occur as the result of the proposed Development.</p> <p>The basis for assessing forestry impacts will be the production of a conventional Forest Plan structure detailing felling and restocking plans in five year phases over the lifetime of the development to show the anticipated management of the forest in the absence of the windfarm. This 'Baseline Forest Plan' is then compared to a Forest Plan prepared on the same principles, reflecting the design requirements to accommodate the windfarm (the Windfarm Forest Plan). In this way, a comparison of forestry related changes and impacts can be quantified and assessed.</p> <p>The chapter will follow the assessment methodology set out in the Forestry (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulation 2017 in assessing the overall significance of environmental effects.</p> <p>In conducting the forestry analysis, we will be mindful of the scoping responses with particular attention being paid to comments from Scottish Forestry, Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency. SEPA have highlighted in their scoping feedback that they will require a map and table detailing the forest removal caused by the development, these documents will be completed as part of the forest plan. Consultation will be undertaken with Scottish Forestry in preparing the Wind Farm Forest Plan.</p> <p>The analysis will take into account the requirements of the United Kingdom Forestry Standard (UKFS) and its supporting Guideline documents such as the Forest and Water Guidelines. In addition, the most up to date (February 2019) Guidance to SF staff on implementing the Scottish Governments' Policy on Control of Woodland Removal, will be utilised to calculate the compensatory planting requirements arising from the proposed Development.</p> <p>Consideration will also be given to the disposal of non-forestry residues in line with the Management of Forestry Waste WST-G-027 version 3 (Dec 2017) advice from SEPA and the accompanying Use of Trees Cleared to Facilitate Development on Afforested Land – Joint Position Statement and Guidance (April 2014) from SEPA, SNH and FCS.</p>	