Appendix 2.1 Summary of Scoping Responses

The Kennoxhead Wind Farm to Coalburn Substation 132 kV Overhead Line Scoping Report was submitted to the Scottish Ministers Energy Consents Unit (ECU) on the 24th June 2020. The ECU distributed the Scoping Report and requested scoping opinions from the stakeholders and consultees listed in **Table A.1** below.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU) – Scoping Opinion	March 2021	Stated that, where there is a demonstrable requirement for peat landslide hazard risk assessment, the assessment should be undertaken as part of the EIA process.	The routeing stage of the proposed development sought to avoid areas of deep peat as far as practicable to minimise potential for peat slide. Consideration of peat landslide hazard risk assessment will be covered in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**.
		Consider that the mitigation measures suggested for any significant environmental impacts identified should be presented as a conclusion to each chapter. Requested that a consolidated schedule of mitigation measures is included in the EIA Report.	All embedded mitigation measures are set out in **Chapter 4: Development Description**. In addition, the relevant embedded and additional mitigation measures are also described in detail in the specialist topic chapters. **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA** will be supported by a Schedule of Mitigation which forms **Appendix 2.2 Gatecheck Report** and sets out all embedded and additional mitigation measures on a topic-by-topic basis.
		This scoping opinion will not prevent the Scottish Ministers from seeking additional information at application stage, for example to include cumulative impacts of additional developments which enter the planning process after the date of this opinion.	Noted.
		It is acknowledged that the EIA process is iterative and should inform the final layout and design of proposed developments. Scottish Ministers note further engagement between relevant parties in relation to the refinement of the design of the proposed development may be required, and would request that they are kept informed of ongoing discussions in relation to this.	Noted.
		When finalising the EIA report, applicants are asked to provide a summary in tabular form of where within the EIA report each of the specific matters raised in the scoping opinion has been addressed.	Noted.
		Applicants are encouraged to engage with officials at the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit at the pre-application stage and before proposals reach the design freeze.	Noted.
South Lanarkshire Council (SLC)	December 2020	<u>General</u> SLC agree with the topics listed in the Scoping Report. Request that a standalone chapter outlining all proposed mitigation and enhancement measures should be included.	Noted. LVIA methodology has also been agreed with SLC during pre-application consultation.
		<u>Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology</u> A sustainable drainage system serving the application site is to be provided. A flood risk assessment and the sustainable drainage system should comply with the requirements set out in SLC's Developer Design Guidance (dated May 2020). Consideration should also be given to surface water management during construction.	Flood risk, drainage and water management are addressed in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology,** including relevant construction mitigation measures. An appraisal of the potential construction noise impact at the nearest residential receptors was conducted by a competent acoustics expert. The results of this are detailed in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**. Given the minimal operational noise from installations of the proposed development's type and the short-term transient nature of construction works the scope of this appraisal is considered proportionate.
		<u>Archaeology and Cultural Heritage</u> Although it is explained in the text that Figure 5.1 only shows non-designated assets within a 200m buffer of the proposed overhead line (OHL) route, this is not clear on the figure, which gives a false impression of the range and density of recorded material present. Any EAIR figures should make it clear that only non-designated assets within a 200m buffer have been shown on the figure. Important that the proposed field survey is undertaken to identify features not included in desk-based review and assess how features might be affected by ground disturbance caused by construction activities. Assessment of direct impacts during construction should include locations of wooden poles, compound areas, lay down areas and temporary access tracks. Disagree with scoping out indirect effects on setting until possible effects on the setting of non-designated assets have been considered as well as designated assets.	An archaeological walkover survey identified all known and unknown non-designated assets within 200m of the proposed route, including associated infrastructure outside of this route corridor. Indirect impacts on setting of non-designated assets were considered in assessment of potential significant effects. Results of survey and assessment detailed in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology**. WOSAS were consulted further. This consultation is detailed further in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology**.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
		Amenity and Health Should be reference in EIAR, such as appendix or separate noise statement, to show that construction and operational noise will not impact amenity.	Noted.
		Transportation Council would prefer standalone chapter or transport statement rather than the TMP being a technical appendix. Details of scaffold arrangements and stand-offs to the public roads will be required along with proposals for traffic management. A submission of proposals showing specific material delivery points, lay down spaces, turning areas, site compound(s)/storage, site car parking, crane platforms is required. There should also be some information on the anticipated traffic volumes and routes associated with woodland clearance, material deliveries and site staffing. A larger scale plan showing the specific route of the OHL showing standoffs to the Council's road infrastructure such as culverts, bridges, underpasses should be submitted. Proposals for maintaining access to the Council's Core Paths during the construction phase should be submitted.	A section covering transportation is set out in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**, which includes key data. Based on the short term nature of the construction and decommissioning processes, the geographic spread of the construction works on the public road network and SPEN's commitment to appropriate traffic management it is considered that this approach is proportionate. SLC Roads department were consulted further and details of this consultation are set out as relevant in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**.
NatureScot	September 2020	General NatureScot guidance 'General pre-application and scoping advice for onshore wind farms' provides information on recommended survey methods, sources of further information and guidance, and data presentation. Following cases decided in the EU Court of Justice, mitigation cannot be taken into account in the assessment of effects on Natura sites unless the mitigation is essential/intrinsic.	Noted.
		Key Issues Protected areas: • Muirkirk & North Lowther Uplands Special Protection Area (SPA) – preferred route lies close to SPA, which is classified for its breeding hen harrier, peregrine, merlin, short-eared owl and golden plover and for its non-breeding (wintering) hen harrier. A Habitats Regulations Appraisal (HRA) will likely be required so application must include sufficient information to facilitate this. There is likely to be a significant effect on the SPA because it overlaps with the foraging ranges of the SPA species. EIA should consider collision risk for SPA bird species during operation, potential disturbance for SPA species during breeding season and for hen harrier during nonbreeding season. • Coalburn Moss Special Area of Conservation (SAC) / Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – designated for active raised bog and degraded raised bog still capable of natural regeneration. Will also be subject to a HRA if significant effects likely so application must include sufficient information to facilitate this. EIAR should include information of the proposed route and construction methods, including access requirements, so potential significant effects on SAC can be determined. EIA should consider stand alone and cumulative effects on SAC. If no significant effects predicted then there should be sufficient justification in EIAR. Coalburn Moss SSSI also notified for raised bog habitat so advice above should be followed in assessment of impacts on the SSSI. • Kennox Water SSSI - notified for its geological interest. The potential for impacts on the geological interest of the site, including indirect impacts on the site's accessibility or visibility, will require consideration as part of the EIA process. Recommend that a buffer between the site and any development is maintained. Adjacent development would only be likely to affect the interest of the site if construction debris was to be deposited within the site.	Consideration of protected areas and peat is provided in **Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity** and **Chapter 9: Ornithology**.
		Carbon-Rich Soils, Deep Peat and Priority Peatland Habitat Welcome proposal for targeted peat depth surveys. Part of preferred route, north of Coalburn, classes as Class 1 peat so will be a key area for surveying. Surveys should comply with Scottish Government guidance. SEPA should be consulted regarding excavated peat reuse and disposal. A draft peat management plan should be included in EIAR.	Construction within peatland has been kept to a practical minimum. Methods for managing peat on site are outlined in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**. A peat management plan would be created prior to construction in any areas of peatland.
		Landscape and Visual Impacts Would like to agree final viewpoint list with applicant. Cumulative effects should be considered. Cumulative assessment should consider current baseline (existing and under construction developments) and alternative baselines, such as consented but not constructed schemes. Cumulative assessment should accord with NatureScot guidance. Expect a final Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) to be included in the EIAR.	The final viewpoint list was agreed in consultation with NatureScot. All existing cumulative sites have been considered in the existing baseline. An alternative baseline that includes under construction or consented schemes has been assessed. Details of the cumulative assessment are provided in **Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual Amenity**. A ZTV is included in **Volume 3: Figures and Visualisations**.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
		Ecology and Ornithology Advise the applicant seeks information on breeding raptors from the South Strathclyde Raptor Study Group to help with EIAR and issues that may need addressed during construction. Recommend Phase 1 habitat survey focuses on habitats listed in Annex 1 of the EC Habitats directive and UKBAP Priority Habitats, and be accompanied by supporting quadrat information. Protected species surveys should be undertaken in accordance with NatureScot guidance. Regarding ornithological surveys: • all relevant wind farm data, even data older than 5 years if the recent data supports its conclusions, is appropriate; • surveys missed due to Covid-19 are required but only one year necessary. Principle surveys required are the winter walkover surveys, which should be completed fully in 20/21 season and the Moorland Breeding Bird/Scarce Breeding Bird surveys in 2021. Guidance from NatureScot available; and Would like black grouse surveys to be taken and factored into design. Evidence from recent wind farm surveys indicate that black grouse population might be of national importance. Black grouse susceptible to collision with OHL so mitigation by good route planning advised.	Consideration of ecology and ornithology is provided in **Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity** and **Chapter 9: Ornithology.** Any further consultation is detailed further in these chapters. Full details of ecology and ornithology survey efforts are included in **Appendices 8.1-8.3.**
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	September 2020	General Following key issues must be addressed in the EIA to avoid delay and potential objection: • Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications; • Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTEs) and buffers; • Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions and buffers; • Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals; • Map and table detailing forest removal; • Map and site layout of borrow pits; • Pollution Prevention Plan and Construction Method Statement; • Borrow Pit Site Management Plan; • Map of proposed surface water drainage layout; and • Map of any proposed water abstractions, with details of the proposed operating regime.	**Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology** assesses the effects of the proposed development on the water environment and is accompanied by supporting figures. CAR licences will be applied for by the appointed contractor during the construction stage. A schedule of mitigation is included in **Appendix 2.2 Gatecheck Report**.
		Site-Specific Comments A peat management plan should be submitted with EIAR and include assessment of opportunities for enhancement. Would welcome an assessment of habitat enhancement along proposed route. Habitat maps must be overlain with all proposed infrastructure. Invasive non-native species survey not required but final plans should include a commitment that any INNS encountered will be appropriately managed.	Further design details relating to peat are included in **Chapter 3: The Routeing Process and design Strategy** and **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**. Methods for managing peat on site are outlined in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**. A peat management plan would be created prior to construction in any areas of peatland. Noted.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
		Regulatory Advice Authorisation is required under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) to carry out engineering works in or in the vicinity of inland surface waters (other than groundwater) or wetlands. Inland water means all standing or flowing water on the surface of the land (e.g. rivers, lochs, canals, reservoirs). Management of surplus peat or soils may require an exemption under The Waste Management Licensing (Scotland) Regulations 2011. Proposed crushing or screening will require a permit under The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012. Consider if other environmental licences may be required for any installations or processes. A Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) construction site licence will be required for management of surface water run-off from a construction site, including access tracks, which: • is more than 4 hectares, • is in excess of 5km, or • includes an area of more than 1 hectare or length of more than 500m on ground with a slope in excess of 25˚ Below these thresholds the applicant will need to comply with CAR General Binding Rule 10 which requires, amongst other things, that all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that the discharge does not result in pollution of the water environment. The detail of how this is achieved may be required through a planning condition. SEPA have guidance for construction sites. Applicant can engage SEPA in pre-CAR application discussions.	Noted.
		Site Layout All maps must be based on an adequate scale with which to assess the information. Each of the maps below must detail all proposed upgraded, temporary and permanent site infrastructure. Existing built infrastructure must be re-used or upgraded wherever possible. The layout should be designed to minimise the extent of new works on previously undisturbed ground. Cabling must be laid in ground already disturbed such as verges. A comparison of the environmental effects of alternative locations of infrastructure elements, such as tracks, may be required.	Noted.
		Engineering Activities The site layout must be designed to avoid impacts upon the water environment. Where activities such as watercourse crossings, watercourse diversions or other engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment cannot be avoided then the submission must include justification of this and a map showing: • All proposed temporary or permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses; • A minimum buffer of 50m around each loch or watercourse. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse and drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works; • Detailed layout of all proposed mitigation including all cut off drains, location, number and size of settlement ponds If water abstractions or dewatering are proposed, a table of volumes and timings of groundwater abstractions and related mitigation measures must be provided. Refer to Appendix 2 of SEPA's Standing Advice for advice on flood risk. Watercourse crossings must be designed to accommodate the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flows, or information provided to justify smaller structures. If it is thought that the development could result in an increased risk of flooding to a nearby receptor then a Flood Risk Assessment must be submitted. SEPA's 'technical flood risk guidance for stakeholders' outlines the information required as part of a Flood Risk Assessment.	The routeing stage of the project sought to avoid or cross all flood zones at their narrowest point where avoidance was not possible. The detailed design stage has sought to avoid watercourse crossings by maintaining a 20m buffer around all ground infrastructure. Where this has not been possible due to other environmental constraints, details have been provided in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**. Further design details relating to the water environment are included in **Chapter 3: The Routeing Process and Design Strategy**.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
		Disturbance and Re-Use of Excavated Peat and Other Carbon Rich Soils The planning submission must a) demonstrate how the layout has been designed to minimise disturbance of peat and consequential release of CO2 and b) outline the preventative/mitigation measures to avoid significant drying or oxidation of peat. There is often less environmental impact from localised temporary storage and reuse rather than movement to large central peat storage areas. The submission must include: • A detailed map of peat depths (this must be to full depth and follow the survey requirement of Scottish Government's guidance) with all the built elements (including peat storage areas) overlain to demonstrate how the development avoids areas of deep peat and other sensitive receptors; and • A table which details the quantities of acrotelmic, catotelmic and amorphous peat which will be excavated for each element and where it will be re-used during reinstatement. Details of the proposed widths and depths of peat to be re-used and how it will be kept wet permanently must be included. Proposals must be in accordance with Scottish Renewables 'Guidance on the Assessment of Peat Volumes, Reuse of Excavated Peat and Minimisation of Waste' and SEPA's 'Developments on Peat and Off-Site uses of Waste Peat'.	Noted.
		Disruption to Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE) The layout and design of the development must avoid impact on GWDTE. The following information must be included in the submission: • A map demonstrating that all GWDTE are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it; • If the minimum buffers above cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. SEPA are likely to seek conditions securing appropriate mitigation for all GWDTE affected	Targeted NVC surveys have been undertaken across the route to inform an assessment of effects on GWDTEs in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**, and findings are presented in **Appendix 8.1 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report**.
		Existing Groundwater Abstractions The submission must include: • a map demonstrating that all existing groundwater abstractions are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions. If micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey needs to be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting. The survey needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it; and If the minimum buffers above cannot be achieved, a detailed site specific qualitative and/or quantitative risk assessment will be required. SEPA are likely to seek conditions securing appropriate mitigation for all existing groundwater abstractions affected.	Consideration of groundwater abstractions will be provided in **Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology**.
		Forest Removal and Forest Waste Key holing must be used wherever possible. The supporting information should refer to the current Forest Plan if one exists and measures should comply with the Plan where possible. Clear felling may be acceptable only in cases where planting took place on deep peat and it is proposed through a Habitat Management Plan to reinstate peat-forming habitats. The submission must include: • a map demarcating the areas to be subject to different felling techniques; • photography of general timber condition in each of these areas; • a table of approximate volumes of timber which will be removed from site and volumes, sizes of chips or brash and depths that will be re-used on site and a plan showing how and where any timber residues will be re-used for ecological benefit within that area, supported by a Habitat Management Plan.	**Chapter 11: Forestry** provides an assessment of effects of the Kennoxhead OHL project on forestry resources along the proposed route.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
		Borrow Pits Scottish Planning Policy states (Paragraph 243) that "Borrow pits should only be permitted if there are significant environmental or economic benefits compared to obtaining material from local quarries, they are time-limited; tied to a particular project and appropriate reclamation measures are in place." The submission must provide sufficient information to address this policy statement. A Site Management Plan should be submitted in support of any application. The following information should also be submitted for each borrow pit: • a map showing the location, size, depths and dimensions. • a map showing any stocks of rock, overburden, soils and temporary and permanent infrastructure overlain with all lochs and watercourses to a distance of 250 metres. It should be demonstrated that a site specific proportionate buffer can be achieved. On this map, a site-specific buffer must be drawn around each loch or watercourse proportionate to the depth of excavations and at least 10m from access tracks. If this minimum buffer cannot be achieved each breach must be numbered on a plan with an associated photograph of the location, dimensions of the loch or watercourse, drawings of what is proposed in terms of engineering works. • justification for the proposed location of borrow pits and evidence of the suitability of the material to be excavated for the proposed use, including any risk of pollution caused by degradation of the rock. • a ground investigation report giving existing seasonally highest water table including sections showing the maximum area, depth and profile of working in relation to the water table. • a site map showing cut-off drains, silt management devices and settlement lagoons to manage surface water and dewatering discharge. Cut-off drains must be installed to maximise diversion of water from entering quarry works. • a site map showing proposed water abstractions with details of the volumes and timings of abstractions. • a site map showing the location of pollution prevention measures. The drawing notes should include a commitment to check these daily. • a site map showing where soils and overburden will be stored including details of the heights and dimensions of each store, how long the material will be stored for and how soils will be kept fit for restoration purposes. Where the development will result in the disturbance of peat or other carbon rich soils then the submission must also include a detailed map of peat depths (following guidance outlined above). • sections and plans detailing how restoration will be progressed including the phasing, profiles, depths and types of material to be used. details of how the rock will be processed in order to produce a grade of rock that will not cause siltation problems during its end use on tracks, trenches and other hardstanding.	Noted.
		Pollution Prevention and Environmental Management A schedule of mitigation supported by the above site specific maps and plans must be submitted. These must include reference to best practice pollution prevention and construction techniques and regulatory requirements. They should set out the daily responsibilities of ECOWs, how site inspections will be recorded and acted upon and proposals for a planning monitoring enforcement officer. The submission needs to demonstrate that there will be no discarding of materials that are likely to be classified as waste as any such proposals would be unacceptable under waste management licensing.	A schedule of mitigation is included in **Appendix 2.2 Gatecheck Report**.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	August 2020	HES advised that WOSAS would be able to offer advice on the scope of the cultural heritage assessment. This may include heritage assets not covered by HES interests, such as unscheduled archaeology, and category B- and C-listed buildings. Confirm that there are no heritage assets within their statutory remit within the development site boundary or within its vicinity. Content for heritage assets within HES statutory remit to be scoped out of the assessment.	Noted. WOSAS were consulted further. This consultation is detailed further in **Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology**.
British Horse Society (BHS)	September 2020	BHS would like to see the multi-use nature of core paths and rights of way (as in utilised by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and all abilities access takers, in keeping with the Land Reform (Scotland) 2003 Act) taken into consideration.	All new access track formations will be temporary and for facilitating construction of the New 132kV OHL only -see **Chapter 4: Development Description**. Whilst temporary diversions of recreational routes may be required during construction, works at any one location will be short in duration therefore the effect of a diversion would be limited. All existing recreational paths will remain open during operation of the OHL.
BT	August 2020	The proposed OHL should not cause interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network.	Noted.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
The Coal Authority	August 2020	The identified proposed route falls within the Development High Risk Area (DHRA). Accordingly, there are coal mining features and hazards that need to be considered in relation to this project. A Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent to inform the EIAR Chapter on Ground Conditions should be submitted in support of the proposed route. This will enable the applicant's technical consultants to identify and mitigate any risk to the scheme as a result of former coal mining activity and for the applicant to demonstrate to the decision maker that the site is safe, stable and suitable for the development proposed.	**Chapter 7: Geology, Hydrogeology and Hydrology** has assessed potential coal mining risk during construction and operation.
Crown Estate Scotland	August 2020	The assets of Crown Estate Scotland are not affected by this proposal.	Noted.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MoD)	August 2020	The Ministry of Defence has raised no safeguarding objections on the basis that the proposed Kennoxhead OHL Project is outside of the MoD safeguarding areas.	Noted.
Glasgow Airport	August 2020	The site is located outwith the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces for Glasgow Airport. It is within the Instrument Flight Procedure safeguarding area and may impact upon procedures. Glasgow Airport's position will only be confirmed once the OHL details are finalised and they have been consulted on a full planning application.	Noted
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	September 2020	This application will have no aviation safeguarding impact on Glasgow Prestwick Airport. Consequently it is unlikely that Glasgow Prestwick Airport Ltd will object.	Noted.
NATS Safeguarding	August 2020	NATS examined the proposed OHL from a technical safeguarding aspect and confirmed that it does not conflict with their safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS raised no safeguarding objection to the proposal.	Noted.
RSPB	September 2020	RSPB confirmed that they had no comments to make.	Noted.
Scottish Forestry	August 2020	Having reviewed the proposed route and the scoping report, Scottish Forestry confirmed that they are pleased to note that the route remains as previously discussed in June 2019. However we also note that the route has not been finalised and could still be subject to change. It is also noted within paragraph 9.4.1 Compensatory Planting, that the compensatory planting requirements of the proposed route is currently 8.12ha and if subject to change due to routeing alongside Carmacoup Forest, that this figure might reduce to 6ha. Whilst we appreciate that this figure has been calculated, Scottish Forestry would wish to see a firm commitment within the EIA to provide a Compensatory Planting Plan, subject to approval by SF, that details the location, final area, ground preparation, species choice, protection measures and long term management of the planting, should planning approval be granted and before any development work begins.	Compensatory planting requirements are discussed in **Chapter 11: Forestry**
ScotWays	September 2020	The National Catalogue of Rights of Way shows that rights of way SL103, SL117, SL118 and SL122 would be affected by 'proposed route'. As there is no definitive record of rights of way in Scotland, there may be other routes that meet the criteria to be rights of way but have not been recorded. There may be general access rights over any area of land under the terms of the Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003. Recommend that the applicant consult the Core Paths Plans, prepared by South Lanarkshire Council.	Consideration of rights of way will be given in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**
Scottish Water	September 2020	Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced the following is advised: • the development proposals impact on existing Scottish Water assets. The applicant must identify any potential conflicts with Scottish Water assets and contact the Asset Impact Team to apply for a diversion. any conflict with assets identified may be subject to restrictions on proximity of construction. Scottish Water asset plans can be obtained Site Investigation Services (UK) Ltd; • there are no Scottish Water drinking water catchments or water abstraction sources, which are designated as Drinking Water Protected Areas that may be affected by the proposed activity; • Scottish Water will not accept any surface water connections into their combined sewer system. There may be limited exceptional circumstances where this would be allowed for brownfield sites only; • If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude; and • The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or SUDS proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed. All proposed developments are required to submit a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form to be submitted directly to Scottish Water.	Noted.

Scoping Consultee	Date of Response	Comments received / issues raised	Response
Transport Scotland	September 2020	It is acknowledged that any effects on the trunk road network as a result of the proposed OHL are likely to be minimal and limited to the construction period. However, anticipated trip generation has not been detailed in the supporting documentation to provide justification for the exclusion of the assessment of traffic effects from the EIA Report. The proposed preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), and the inclusion of an outline CTMP as an appendix to the main EIA Report is advisable. The scoping out of the traffic assessment from the main EIA Report is considered acceptable on the basis that a CTMP will be prepared in support of development proposals. This should quantify the anticipated trip generation over the course of the construction period, providing traffic volumes by vehicle type and month, and detail anticipated construction traffic routes, access requirements and any proposed mitigation measures. The outline and full CTMP should be submitted for approval by South Lanarkshire Council, in consultation with Transport Scotland.	A section covering transportation is set out in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**, which includes key data. Based on the short term nature of the construction and decommissioning processes, the geographic spread of the construction works on the public road network and SPEN's commitment to appropriate traffic management it is considered that this approach is proportionate. An outline CTMP is set out in **Appendix 2.6 Transport Statement**.

Table A.1: Kennoxhead wind farm to Coalburn substation 132 kV overhead line scoping responses