15 Schedule of Environmental Mitigation

15.1 Introduction

15.1.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to provide a summary of mitigation measures and good practice environmental management commitments proposed throughout this Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) (**Chapters 6 -13**) to avoid, reduce, or offset the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the receiving environment.

15.1.2 Embedded mitigation has been incorporated into and assessed as part of the Proposed Development and therefore is not listed here. Further information on embedded mitigation is provided in **Table 2.2** of **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development (EIAR, Volume 2**).

15.1.3 The majority of the pre-construction and construction phase mitigation would be delivered through the site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The outline content of the proposed CEMP is provided in **Technical Appendix (TA) 2.2: Outline CEMP (EIAR Volume 4)**. The Outline CEMP would also reference the Applicants General Environmental Management Plans (GEMPs) (**TA 2.3, EIAR Volume 4**) and Species Protection Plans (SPPs) (**TA 2.4, EIAR Volume 4**). The implementation of the CEMP would be managed on-site by the Principal Contractor and their suitably qualified and experienced Environmental Clerk of Works (ECoW), with support from other environmental professionals as required (i.e the Planning Monitoring Officer). Further detail on specific mitigation measures to be included in the CEMP is contained in each of the technical chapters, where relevant.

15.1.4 **Table 15.1** provides a summary of those additional mitigation measures and good practice commitments identified throughout the EIAR.

Table 15.1: Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
Biodiversity (Chapter 6)					
B1	Non-Statutory Designated Nature Conservation Sites - Ancient Woodland	The permanent loss of Ancient Woodland as part of the Proposed Development would be minimised, where possible, by considering alternatives to helicopter wiring at sensitive locations (e.g. by considering hand pulling methods), undertaking crown reduction of tree canopies instead of felling and through a phased approach to fell a minimum width for construction with selective felling during operation and maintenance. Micrositing of access tracks within the 50 m Limit of Deviation (LOD) and micrositing of towers within the 100 m LOD would also be undertaken, where possible, to avoid felling. The loss would also be minimised by retaining scrub/understorey layers in areas where existing tree cover doesn't breach safety clearances. In addition, the Applicant would seek to manage the operational corridor to encourage native scrub vegetation through natural regeneration and/or planting. Further details of the compensatory woodland planting required following tree felling and other mitigation proposals are provided in **Chapter 11: Forestry (EIAR Volume 2)** and in **TA 11.3: Woodland Planting Management Strategy (EIAR Volume 4)**. Recommendations for woodland enhancements and creation are also provided in **TA 6.3: Outline Habitat Management Plan (EIAR Volume 4)**.	Section 6.6	Principal Contractor/ ECoW	Pre-construction (Phase 1 enabling works) Post construction
B2	Peatlands	Active restoration of the peatland habitats in the field survey area, both the habitats impacted by the Proposed Development and habitats that have already been modified by activities unrelated to the Proposed Development, would be carried out in line with **TA 6.3: Outline Habitat Management Plan (EIAR Volume 4)** and would be secured by planning condition (Note: a planning condition would need to consider these activities are subject to formal landowner agreements and other permissions being granted). In order to account for the loss and degradation of wet heath and flush habitat, a minimum of 1.18 ha of peatland would be restored in areas of modified bog that no longer contain a significant proportion of peat-forming vegetation. As a good practice measure, a further 8.08 ha of peatland would be restored to account for the area of blanket bog being temporarily lost and degraded and the area of wet modified bog being permanently and temporarily lost and degraded as a result of the Proposed Development.	Section 6.6	The Applicant would intend to follow the approach and principles implemented in NatureScot's Peatland Action Project to deliver peatland restoration, albeit with site-specific measures to work with landowners in developing and delivering successful restoration actions. Completion of these works on site, would then be managed by the Principal Contractor and the ECoW.	Post-construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		There is also the opportunity for habitat enhancement, as detailed in **TA 6.3: Outline Habitat Management Plan (EIAR Volume 4)**. The creation of riparian woodland could benefit species by providing shelter and feeding opportunities.			
B3	Bat Roost Potential (BRP) Trees	Where mature trees or trees noted as containing high or moderate BRP (TN53, TN55 and TN57) may be felled or disturbed by the Proposed Development, a licensed tree-climbing bat surveyor would be employed to ensure no bats are roosting in the trees. If bats are found to be roosting in the trees, felling would only occur under an NatureScot licence, with a licensed bat surveyor present during the felling activity. The removal of suitable roosting habitat from the felling of BRP trees would be compensated by the provision of bat boxes. The exact type and location of bat boxes would be advised by the licensed bat surveyor and would depend on the type of roost and species of any bats found to be present. Where the tree noted as containing low BRP (TN54) may be felled, no further surveys are required but precautionary soft felling of the tree would be undertaken. **Figure 6.4 (EIAR Volume 3a)** shows the location of the BRP trees.	Section 6.6	Principal Contractor/ ECoW	Pre-construction (Phase 1 enabling works)
B4	Otter and Water Vole	Where possible, watercourse crossings would be suitably designed to allow continued otter and water vole movement along watercourses and would minimise riparian habitat loss. Full details of conceptual watercourse crossing design is provided in **TA 10.4: Watercourse Survey (EIAR Volume 4).** In implementing the Species Protection Plans (SPPs) (**TA 2.4, EIAR Volume 4**), a pre-construction protected species survey would be undertaken as close to the construction period as possible, and no more than three months before the start of works . The protected species surveys undertaken to inform the EIAR can be used to inform the pre-construction surveys. A suitably qualified ecologist would be appointed to undertake this survey. A suitably qualified and experienced ECoW would be employed to input into the CEMP and oversee the implementation of surface water management and ecological mitigation measures during construction. SPPs **(TA 2.4, EIAR Volume 4)** would also be followed during construction of the Proposed Development.	Section 6.6	Principal Contractor/ ECoW	Pre-construction During construction
B5	Standard Good Practice Working Measures	**Habitat Reinstatement** Areas of temporary infrastructure, such as access tracks and tower bases, would be reinstated as soon as possible after construction has been completed to allow the recolonisation of natural habitats, particularly in areas of blanket bog and wet heath, as detailed in the phased programme in **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2).** Permanent access tracks would not be narrowed or graded to encourage scrub or vegetation growth as access is required for maintenance purposes. Further details on the proposed approach to habitat reinstatement would be set out in the CEMP and the principal contractor would be required to provide a habitat reinstatement plan prior to the start of reinstatement works. The methodology for peatland reinstatement is also detailed in **TA 10.2: Outline Peat Management Plan (EIAR Volume 4).**		Principal Contractor/ ECoW/PMO	During Construction and post-construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		Micro-siting Micro-siting of towers, and/or the configuration of the construction working areas around towers, within the Proposed Development would seek to avoid localised ecological sensitivities wherever possible. This would include, but would not be limited to: • Maximising the distance of the Proposed Development from areas of Ancient Woodland and BRP trees to minimise the felling required for access track construction and for safety clearances. • Maximising the distance of the tower location from the main badger sett (Target Note 14.1) to a minimum of 30 m and considering alternatives to helicopter wiring in this area. If this is not possible, an NS licence would be required to disturb the sett during the construction phase. • Maximising the distance of the OHL from the badger setts (Target Note 1 and Target Note 2) to a minimum of 30 m and considering alternatives to helicopter wiring in this area. If this is not possible, an NS licence would be required to disturb the sett during the construction phase. • Maximising the distance of the access track from the badger sett (Target Note 17) to a minimum of 30 m. If this is not possible, an NS licence would be required to disturb or damage the sett during the construction phase. • Minimising the extent of construction work within wetland and peatland habitat, including GWDTEs. • Maximising the distance of the Proposed Development from the acidic pond with good quality habitat (TN3). • Maintaining Hydrological Connectivity. **Figure 6.6: GWDTE (EIAR Volume 3a)** shows the relevant 100 m and 250 m buffer zones around infrastructure whereby a 100 m buffer zone is required for excavations less than 1 m (such as for access tracks) and a 250 m buffer zone is required for excavations greater than 1 m (such as for tower foundations). Suitable drainage and surface water measures would be used to maintain hydrological connectivity in peatland habitats, particularly blanket bog, wet modified bog, flushes and wet heath, and in GWDTEs. This would include measures such as diverting drainage around working areas and maintaining hydrological connectivity in track design by using small diameter pipes in the sub-base. Where it is not possible to avoid routing access tracks through GWDTEs, or within a 100 m buffer zone of GWDTEs, a floating track construction would be used. The track design would have due regard to key principles set out in the joint NatureScot/Forestry Commission Scotland guide to floating roads on peat. Where there is no clearly defined channel flow through GWDTEs, track construction would use a floating construction that incorporates measures such as a porous granular rock fill blanket, non-alkaline porous layer and perforated pipes to maintain the flow connectivity across tracks. Where tower foundations are required within a 250 m buffer zone, up gradient of identified GWDTEs, the Applicant would give consideration, subject to detailed geotechnical investigation and foundation design, to alternative tower foundation techniques, such as mini-piles. This would involve less ground disturbance when compared to conventional foundations, potentially using a floated piling platform and no open excavation.			

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		Where conventional foundation excavations are required within a 250 m buffer zone, up gradient of identified GWDTEs, the quality and quantity of the groundwater that feeds the GWDTEs downstream from the excavations would be maintained by over-pumping and dewatering of excavations discharged to ground (via suitable pollution prevention measures) in a suitable location close to the excavation. Greenfield run-off (i.e. non-silty surface water flow that has not yet passed over any disturbed construction areas) would be kept separate from potentially contaminated water from construction areas, where possible. Where appropriate, interceptor ditches and other drainage diversion measures would be installed immediately in advance of any excavation works in order to collect and divert greenfield run-off around areas disturbed by construction activities. All surface water within disturbed areas would be managed in accordance with sustainable drainage system techniques, using a multi-tiered approach to provide both flow attenuation and treatment through infiltration, where possible, and physical filtration prior to discharge. Ditches would follow the natural flow of the ground with a generally constant depth to ditch invert. They would have shallow longitudinal gradients, where possible. Regular check-dams would be used where necessary to control the rate of run-off. The ditches would be designed to intercept any stormwater run-off and to allow clean water flows to be transferred independently through the works without mixing with construction drainage. The regular interception and diversion of clean run-off around infrastructure would prevent significant disruption to shallow groundwater flow and peatland. This would also reduce the flow of water onto any exposed areas of rock and soil, thereby reducing the potential volume of silt-laden run-off requiring treatment. Greenfield run-off would be discharged into an area of vegetation for dispersion or infiltration, mimicking natural flows, so as not to alter downstream hydrology or soil moisture characteristics. Further details can be found in **Chapter 10: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology and Soils (EIAR Volume 2**).			
Ornithology (Chapter 7)					
O2	Destruction or Disturbance of Species' Nests or Black Grouse Leks	Where possible, all felling and vegetation clearance work would be undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (March to September inclusive). Where this is not possible, pre-construction surveys for nesting birds will be implemented to locate active nests within, or immediately adjacent to the construction and felling areas along the OHL Route. All pre-construction bird surveys should extend a sufficient distance out from the OHL Route to identify any nest sites which may be within the disturbance range of the species in question. For example, pre-construction checks for general nesting birds do not need to extend more 50 m beyond the development footprint, while surveys for rare and vulnerable raptors should extend out to at least 750 m. For rare and vulnerable breeding raptors, including hen harrier, honey buzzard, white-tailed eagle, and goshawk, it is recommended that surveys are conducted in the year prior to works being undertaken in order to identify territories. The surveys should focus on the areas of confirmed or probable territories but also include other areas of potentially suitable habitat. The applicant / contractor would be responsible for undertaking these surveys. During the year of works, surveys for rare and vulnerable breeding raptors should also be undertaken well ahead of works advancing into each section of the Proposed Development so that any new nest sites are identified early and appropriate mitigation measures can be applied. In the event that any confirmed, or suspected active nests are identified within range of potential disturbance, then an exclusion zone will be established around the nest site in	Section 7.6	ECoW/ Principal Contractor	Pre-construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		line with the SPP and as advised by the ECoW. Works will not be permitted within the exclusion zone until nesting has been completed and young have fledged, or the ECoW deems, through monitoring each stage of the breeding attempt, that the extent of the exclusion zone may be reduced. This measure is of particular importance as the closest known nest of raptors to the Proposed Development is white tailed eagles. Construction activity on the section closest to the white-tailed eagle nest must be timed to avoid the key territorial and breeding season, months of February to August **(EIAR Confidential TA).** To prevent any disturbance impacts on black grouse, construction works shall be timed to avoid periods of lekking activity. Where any works are to be undertaken with 500 m of an identified lek site works shall be restricted to avoid any early morning or late evening works during the main lekking season (March to May). The ECoW shall undertake regular surveys (every two weeks between March and May) of the lek sites to ensure they remain functional and are being attended by males and females. **Monitoring** Construction phase monitoring would be carried out by the ECoW, to ensure compliance with environmental legislation and effective delivery of mitigation measures (and licence conditions) set out in the generic and works-specific SPP. This would include monitoring of the white-tailed eagle nest for the entire duration of the construction phase. Additional mitigation measures would be enacted if deemed necessary as a result of monitoring.			Post-construction
O2	Collisions Risk	To mitigate the potential for significant impacts on white tailed eagle line markers will be installed on a section of the earth wire to decrease collision risk. More detail on the location of line marking is set out in **Technical Appendix 7.2: Confidential Results and Mitigation (Confidential TA).** This would involve approximately 840 m of line marking. Line marking comprises placing bird diverters on the thinner, less visible, earth wire of the OHL making the lines more obvious to birds. Flight diverters would be checked as part of routine maintenance visits to ensure they are still present. This would be undertaken every spring, after the period of worse weather in the winter. **Monitoring** To confirm the effectiveness of this mitigation measure, it is proposed that a programme of post-construction monitoring is undertaken with carcass searches undertaken for the stretch of the Proposed Development that is line marked. This monitoring would be undertaken following on from the pre-construction raptor monitoring undertaken for mitigation measure. Approximately 840 m of the line-marked Section would be surveyed, including a buffer of approximately 25 m on either side of the line. The post-construction monitoring plan would be based on a programme of systematic carcass searches and included the following1: • Any dead birds would be recorded. Where possible, a cause of death, whether collision or other, would be recorded, as would be the species, sex, age and any other relevant information. Identified birds would be marked to ensure they were not double counted on a subsequent visit. • A calibration exercise would be undertaken to calculate the efficiency of the surveyors undertaking the carcass searches. This involved artificially placing carcasses in the survey area and having surveyors search for them. The success rate would then be used to develop a correction factor that would be applied to the survey results. • The carcass searches would be undertaken at regular intervals throughout the course of one year, with ten monthly visits spread across the year, commencing when the Proposed Development becomes operational.	Section 7.6	The Applicant	Post-construction/Operational

[1] This plan has been defined similar to the program of post-construction monitoring undertaken for the Knocknagael to Tomatin 275kV OHL: Ramboll UK Ltd (2021) LT19 Knocknagael to Tomatin: Post Construction monitoring Report.

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
LVIA and RVAA (Chapter 8)					
L1	General Construction Activities	The following general precautionary measures would be adopted to minimise landscape and visual effects during the construction stage: • All working areas would be restricted to the specified areas and demarcated to prevent incursion of site plant into non-construction locations; • Material storage/temporary stockpiles would be retained for the shortest duration practicable and would be sited to avoid visual intrusion to neighbouring receptor locations, with particular regard to avoidance of sky-lining such features in views from neighbouring low-lying receptor locations such as the Rocky Coastland/Rocky Mosaic landscapes along the shoreline of Loch Awe; • Peat materials would be placed directly, wherever practicable, to avoid double handling, reduce vehicle movements, and to reduce potential drying and oxidisation of the peat. Where this is not possible the peat would be stored in accordance with the **EIAR Volume 4: TA 2.5: Draft Peat Management Plan**; • Temporary site compounds would be reinstated prior to the commencement of the operational phase of the site to avoid the necessity of retaining restoration materials on site over the operational period and to avoid sustained effects on landscape fabric character and visual amenity; • The surface of lay-down areas would be reinstated to replicate the appearance of adjoining land Habitat enhancement and/or Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) may be incorporated as part of the reinstatement works. If agreed with relevant authorities, this could result in a differing appearance to the adjoining land (e.g. wildflower meadows as opposed to agricultural fields); • Excavations for tower foundations, laydown areas and temporary tracks (if any) would be reinstated prior to commencement of the operational phase of the proposed development; and • All track sides would be reinstated with suitable material to ensure they would blend in with the adjoining ground at the site.	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	During Construction
L2	Concrete for Tower Bases	It is the intention that concrete required for the construction of tower foundations would be brought to site ready mixed. It is anticipated that these construction works would be screened from the majority of receptor locations (e.g., along key transport routes and nearby settlements), due to intervening topography, roadside vegetation and coniferous forestry. In any event, this would be a temporary element and would be removed and ground cover restored to tie-in with the surrounding land cover during reinstatement works at the site.	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	
L3	Crane Pads and Laydown Areas	These elements of the Proposed Development would be kept to a minimum size and would be surfaced to match the track construction.	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	
L4	Mitigation During Operation	Mitigation of operational effects is primarily a matter of the siting/ alignment and design of different aspects of the Proposed Development, and as such constitutes embedded mitigation. This involved a staged process including a Red Amber Green (RAG) Assessment to determine a suitable alignment and design that takes into consideration cost considerations, technical, and environmental constraints and opportunities. Details of	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		the key design drivers and decisions made during the design of the Proposed Development are discussed in Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development and Chapter 3: Consideration of Alternatives (EIAR Volume 2). Landscape and visual considerations, such as the existing landscape and visual baseline context as well as published guidance, were key to the design development. Those pertaining to the siting and design of the Proposed Development are summarised below.			
L5	Siting	The alignment evolved to ensure that the Proposed Development would be located: • Low in the landscape to avoid structures being skylined in key or important views; • Outwith areas subject to nationally recognised landscape designations or classifications such as WLA, and away from settlements and other concentrations of sensitive receptors; • In larger scale upland moorland and forested locations that are more capable of accommodating transmission lines than smaller scale landscapes; • In a landscape that is already subject to ongoing modification or change and which contains existing or consented developments and/or other forms of large-scale development; • Away from distinctive landscape features, the scale and form of which could be compromised; • To avoid, wherever possible, interrupting views of key landmark landscape features such as Ben Lui and Ben Cruachan; and • To reduce the visibility and prominence of the Proposed Development from key sensitive receptor locations to the west and north, including main settlements, glens and key transportation and tourist/scenic routes and recreational routes in the Study Area.	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	
L6	Layout and Design	Priority considerations in respect of the design from a landscape and visual perspective included: • The preference for towers of a size that would be suitable within the scale of the Craggy Upland landscape character type, in order to ensure that the Proposed Development would have limited impacts upon the perceived size and scale of any landscape features; and • Preferential use of existing tracks on site to minimise effects associated with this aspect of the Proposed Development.	Section 8.5.2	Principal Contractor	
Cultural Heritage (Chapter 9)					
C1	Possibility of intersecting with identified heritage assets.	**Preservation in Situ** Should micro-siting be undertaken, forestry felling works, towers and associated infrastructure would be located, where possible, away from heritage assets. Heritage assets would be excluded from construction working areas, ground-breaking works at proposed tower positions and proposed access track locations, as far as reasonably practicable and as advised by an ACoW. Known heritage assets and archaeologically sensitive areas, would not be used for storage of materials or as parking areas for vehicles or machinery.	Section 9.8 Mitigation proposals are set out on a site by site basis in **Appendix 9.1: Cultural Heritage Assets (EIAR Volume 4)** within the Inner Study Area.	ACoW and Principal Contractor	Pre-construction and during construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		Where linear assets survive as upstanding features (principally field banks and walls) access tracks would be routed through any existing gates or through broken or less well-preserved sections of banks or walls wherever possible. Disturbance to field banks, walls, relict rig and furrow remains and lynchets would be keep to the minimum necessary to ensure that most of the remains would be retained intact. The remains of a section of former mid-18th century military road (21742), a former farmstead (CFA030) and a sheepfold (CFA006) would be marked out for avoidance during the construction phase. The assets will be identified by placing high visibility markers 5 m from the outer limit of the visible remains, facing the working area. Any required micrositing of access tracks or Tower T9 would be managed to avoid the visible remains and the demarcated area. The markers will be left in place for the duration of the construction phase and removed on completion of the Proposed Development. Any road widening activity along existing access tracks would be managed to avoid identified cultural heritage assets within close proximity to the access track routes, including shielings huts (44203) and sheepfold (CFA032), with road widening works being kept to the opposite side of the track to the heritage assets. **Watching Briefs** The Applicant would seek to agree the scope of the archaeological watching brief(s) with WoSAS in advance of development works. The scope of the agreed works will be confirmed in a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to be signed-off prior to commencement of the construction works, including enabling works. Taking account of the avoidance through design, and the character of identified cultural heritage baseline, watching briefs will be carried out at the following locations: • Assets (13857 / 21742 / 21747): where existing access tracks that require upgrading follow the route of a former drove road (13857) and military road (21742 / 21747). An archaeological watching brief would be carried out during any ground-breaking works along the proposed access tracks where they follow the route of a former drove road / military road, to identify and record any surviving remains that may be encountered. If significant discoveries are made during the watching brief, and preservation in situ is not possible, provision would be made for an appropriate amount of investigation and recording to be agreed in writing with WoSAS. Based on the results of the desk-based study and the field survey, there are no other specific areas where construction works could be expected to encounter buried archaeological remains. It has been assessed that there is a medium to low potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological remains to be present particularly in moorland/rough pasture areas at Achlian and Brackley. Therefore, if required under the terms of a condition of consent, the scope of any required archaeological watching brief(s) will be agreed through consultation with WoSAS in advance of development works commencing and will be set out in the WSI. **Post-excavation Assessment and Reporting** If new, archaeologically significant discoveries are made during archaeological monitoring, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered remains in situ, provision will be made for the excavation where necessary, of any archaeological deposits encountered. The provision will include the consequent production of written reports, on the findings, with post-excavation analysis and publication of the results of the works, where appropriate. **Construction Guidelines** Written guidelines will be set out in the WSI, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines will set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional support if buried archaeological			

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc.) should be discovered during any construction activities. The guidelines will make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.			
Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (Chapter 10)					
H1	Construction Phase	**Chemical Pollution** Measures to prevent Chemical pollution will be implemented through application of the CEMP, SSEN GEMP TG-NET-ENV-510 (Oil Storage and Refuelling); TG-NET-ENV-512 (Working Near Water); and TG-NET-ENV-513 (Working in Sensitive Habitats). Specific measures to be adopted would include, but not be limited to, the following: • All refuelling would be carried out in designated locations, 30 m away from water courses. Irrespective of the buffer distance and location of refuelling, drip trays and spill kits will be available in accordance with standard best practice; • Fuel, oils and chemicals will be stored on an impervious base within a suitably drained bund able to contain at least 110 % of the volume stored (and in compliance with compliance with General Binding Rule 28 of the Controlled Activity Regulations); • Plant parking areas would be situated at least 30 m from watercourses and plant nappies placed under plant onsite when parked up for extended durations; • A personnel Site Induction will make specific reference to required pollution prevention measures; and • In the event of a pollutant spillage on site, the material will be contained (using an absorbent material such as sand or soil or commercially available booms) and were an event to occur affecting a watercourse, SEPA would be notified immediately. **Sedimentation and Erosion** Measures to prevent sedimentation and erosion will be set out in the CEMP (as outlined in **TA2.2: OCEMP, EIAR Volume 4**). The CEMP would include measures to minimise potential adverse effects related to surface water and groundwater discharge, including impacts associated with dewatering which may arise from the excavation of tower foundations. Therefore, the contractor shall be required to meet regulatory requirements and implement best practice measures as set out in SEPA planning guidance and CAR regulations. Specific measures to be adopted would include, but not be limited to, the following: • The area of soils disturbed or excavated shall be minimised and where disturbance is necessary management of materials shall be carried out in accordance with SSEN GEMP TG-NET-ENV-511: Soil Management; • Clean runoff (i.e. non-silty surface water flow, including that which has not passed over any disturbed construction areas) would be kept separate from construction areas as afar as possible, and subsequently distributed to suitable downslope vegetated area; • Sediment laden runoff shall be directed to settlement ponds suitable for the containment of volumes of water and sediment as appropriate to the area of disturbed or excavated ground (taking in to account the potential for rainfall events). Water discharged from settlement ponds shall be directed to vegetated	Section 10.6	Principal Contractor	During construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		areas and measures such as silt fences shall ensure sediment loads are fully entrained; • Where drains are installed, either temporarily during the construction phase or in association with the installation of site infrastructure, check dams would be installed at suitable intervals (as defined by the gradient of the drain) to reduce flow velocity and allow the settlement of sediment loads prior to discharge to watercourses; and • Following construction activity any disturbed land and vegetation shall be restored to pre-construction conditions (including temporary access tracks) in line with SSEN GEMP TG-NET-ENV-522: Restoration. **Alteration to Surface Water Flows and Runoff** Details of any necessary drainage measures would be included in the final CEMP and the design and installation of such measures would mitigate potential adverse impacts on the hydrology of the Site and surrounding areas during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Measures would ensure that pre-development runoff rates are maintained and that rates of runoff to watercourses are not increased. At the limited number of locations where a track is required to cross a watercourse, or where other infrastructure is necessary within 50 m of a surface watercourse, either as described in this Chapter or as identified by the ECoW, the installation of drainage measures shall be supervised by the ECoW during the construction phase of works. The requirement for monitoring of water quality (prior to and during construction) within watercourses downstream of the Proposed Development would be agreed with SEPA and Marine Scotland. Procedures for this would be detailed in the CEMP. **Water Resources** Where works are to take place within the identified Cladich DWPA, Scottish Water shall be contacted prior to the commencement of works and works shall be carried out in line with their requirements. Works within the DWPA shall be supervised by the ECoW and visual inspection of the watercourse and intake point shall be carried out on a daily basis to ensure sediment loads are not increased. Water quality sampling shall be carried out prior to construction work to determine physico-chemical baseline conditions and subsequent monitoring will be conducted during the construction phase of the Proposed Development to identify deviation from baseline conditions, under the supervision of the ECoW. Construction works situated within the Cladich DWPA would be subject to additional measures to ensure that the release of sediment laden water or pollutants to the watercourse resulting from the Proposed Development would be mitigated: • A detailed pre-construction risk assessment will be completed by the contractor in consultation with Scottish Water; • A silt barrier (silt fencing or a fibre roll) would be installed downslope of the proposed construction tower locations, following best practice guidance2, prior to the commencement of construction and would remain in situ until the			

[2] SEPA, WAT_SG_29: Engineering in the Water Environment Good practice Guide, 2008. Available online: https://www.sepa.org.uk/media/150997/wat_sg_29.pdf [last accessed January 2022].

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		construction phase is completed and permanent drainage measures that shall serve the track are operational; • If dewatering is carried out at the foundation of proposed tower locations, sediment laden water would be pumped to suitably sized settlement ponds (or purpose built sediment tanks), discharge from which would be to a vegetated area at least 10 m from a watercourse or subject to mechanical filtration through the use of de-watering bags, pipe-end filters or passing water through a suitable filter medium; • The use of semi-permeable silt curtains situated at a downstream location within the watercourse (at which flow velocities would allow suitable installation) could be considered; • No storage of fuels or potentially contaminative materials (including cements), refuelling of plant or extended laydown of plant shall take place within the DWPA; • One watercourse crossing is proposed within the DWPA. At this location a silt barrier shall be installed to a 30 m buffer from the watercourse and splash guards installed at the approach to and on the crossing; and • Measures to mitigate the potential for the release of sediment laden water from this area during construction would be overseen by the ECoW, who would carry out and record daily inspection of the watercourse and sediment control measures during construction work to ensure no visible increase in sediment load occurs. Detailed risk assessment shall be carried out by the appointed contractor, prior to the commencement of construction work, at four locations identified in TA10.5: Private Water Supplies Assessment (EIAR Volume 4); Bovuy PWS, BB_PWS_1 and BB_PWS_2 and at the Brackley Farm PWS (subject to confirmation of the PWS location identified by the landowner). These locations are downstream of the Proposed Development and as such potentially sensitive to alterations in the quality and quantity of surface water supply. Standard procedures will be applied by the Principal Contractor and set out in the CEMP to protect PWS water quality and supply during construction works. To ensure that all drainage measures employed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development are maintained appropriately and remain effective, the performance of the drainage measures would be monitored, and drainage management works would be supervised by the ECoW. Works in proximity to PWS identified above shall be carried out in accordance with SSEN General Environmental Management Plan (GEMP) TG-NET-ENV-518 – Private Water Supplies, as detailed further in **TA10.5: Private Water Supplies Assessment (EIAR Volume 4).** **Peat and Carbon Rich Soils** Key measures to minimise and prevent impacts to peat and carbon rich soils are included within the outline PMP **(TA10.2: Outline Peat Management Plan)** and PLHRA **(TA10.3: Peat Landslide Hazard Risk Assessment, EIAR Volume 4)**. These set out good practice measures and specific mitigation measures to minimise the potential			

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		effects on peat and carbon rich soils. Specific mitigation to be included to minimise and reduce potential impacts on peat and carbon rich soils include: • Proposed access tracks located over deep peat (>1 m in depth) would be 'floated' to minimise the volume of excavated peat. If required, bog mats would be used to cross waterlogged areas or minor watercourses without causing damage to bank integrity or compaction of soils; • Towers located over deep peat would be constructed using a piled foundation solution where practicable to minimise the peat excavation and disturbance required. Working areas will be constructed using a layer of geotextile and stone over the peat, which can be reinstated on completion; • Avoid cutting trenches or aligning excavations across slopes (which may act as incipient back scars for peat failures) unless appropriate mitigation has been put in place; • Awareness of peat instability and pre-failure indicators would be incorporated in site induction, tool box talks, and training to enable all site personnel to recognise ground disturbances and features indicative of incipient instability; • Peat and carbon rich soils would be stored temporarily on site during the works in accordance with the outline PMP to avoid desiccation and creation of run-off; and • Peat and carbon rich soils excavated during the works would be used for the reinstatement of infrastructure such as track verges/shoulders and tower locations. Surplus excavated peat would be used to backfill drainage ditches and depressions in three habitat restoration areas located along the Proposed Development (**TA 10.2: PMP - Figure 10.2.1: Proposed Peatland Restoration Areas, EIAR Volume 4**).			
	Private Water Supplies	Specific mitigation measures will be carried out at the three locations identifies downstream from the Proposed Development, shown in tables 10.7 and 10.8 **Chapter 10 Hydrology (EIA Volume 2: Technical Chapters)**. The following measures shall be implemented at these locations: • A detailed pre-construction PWS risk assessment will be completed by the contractor. This would re-confirm the locations of the PWS sources on-site, pre-construction monitoring of water quality and ensuring appropriate pollution prevention measures. • During construction water quality would be monitored. If the quality and/or quantity of water to the PWS is impacted by the Proposed Development, a temporary alternative source will be supplied until remedial works are completed. • Water quality will be monitored immediately following construction to confirm the PWS is unaffected. • Standard PWS procedures will be applied by the principal contractor and set out in the CEMP to protect PWS water quality and supply during construction works		Principal Contractor	

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
	Access Tracks	The design of access tracks will be carried out in line with best practice measures[3,4] such that track construction shall not significantly alter habitat drainage regimes. Watercourse Crossing Assessment is available in **TA 10.4, EIAR Volume 4**.			
Forestry (Chapter 11)					
	During Construction	No significant effects are predicted based on the area of woodland removal proposed in conifer plantation or considering the potential for increased windthrow. On this basis no mitigation is proposed; however, the applicant proposes to implement a suite of standard good practice working methods to ensure that all construction activity (including woodland removal) avoids significant effects on ecological and hydrological receptors. The permanent loss of ancient semi-natural woodland areas as part of the Proposed Development is considered to be significant in ecological terms and would be mitigated by a reduction in the operational corridor width and seeking to further retain scrub/understorey layers in areas where existing tree cover does not breach safety clearances and allows for safe construction activity. In order to address the potential significant effect on forest land-use management, the applicant has committed to the development of OHL Woodland Reports for each forest ownership **TA 11.1 (EIAR Volume 4)**. The OHL Woodland Reports identify all areas of felling required to form the operational corridor and access corridors. In addition, the OHL Woodland Reports will aim to reduce the risk of future wind throw by identifying felling to stable forest edges (outside of the operational corridor). The OHL Woodland Reports would also include, but are not limited to seeking to agree a forest landscape design following good practice as defined by Forestry Commission (Scottish Forestry) Guidance (2014)[5]. The delivery of the felling identified in the OHL Woodland Reports will require working jointly with the forest owner to deliver felling and restocking outwith the operational corridor. As explained in **Table 11.1**, the Applicant has agreed the use of the 'OHL Woodland Report' to confirm the extent of woodland removal required. This proposed felling will be further reviewed with the landowners to link this with their existing long-term forest plan, which will, once amended, be required to adhere to the UKFS as part of the approval process with Scottish Forestry. <u>This approval is required prior to any felling being undertaken outwith the Proposed Development operational corridor or proposed access tracks.</u>	Section 11.7	Principal Contractor/ECoW Forestry Contractor /Landowners/Applicant	Pre/during construction Post – construction
	Additional Good Practice	Good practice measures have been implemented into the environmental management controls set out in **Chapter 2: Description of the Proposed Development** including: • adherence to Forestry Commission (Scottish Forestry) Guidelines e.g. to ensure protection and enhancement of the water environment; and • implementation of tree harvesting and extraction methods to ensure minimisation of soil disturbance and compaction. All woodland removal operations contracted by the Applicant would adhere to UKFS.	Section 11.7	Principal Contractor	

[3] Scottish Natural Heritage, 2015. Constructed tracks in the Scottish Uplands. 2nd Edition Updated September 2015.

[4] Forestry Commission England, 2011. Grants & Regulations Operations Note 25 – Forest roads and Tracks. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/721066/ON025-ForestRoadsandTracksv1.0issued110809__1_.pdf

[5] Forestry Commission Practice Guide, 'Design Techniques for Forest Management Planning' (2014);.URL: Design_techniques_for_forest_management_planning.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk).

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
	Compensatory Planning	The Applicant will replant the area quantity (hectares) of woodland removed for the Proposed Development. This will be achieved in the form of Compensatory Planting Scheme agreements with landowners within the regional land boundary of the Local Authority, of where the Proposed Development is geographically located. The **EIAR Volume 4: Technical Appendix 11.3 Compensatory Planting Management Strategy** provides further details on this mitigation method	Section 11.9	Principal ContractorApplicant	Post-construction
Noise and Vibration (Chapter 12)					
N1	Construction activities	No specific mitigation was identified at the design stage. A CEMP will be expected to offer reasonable recommendations to manage any potential impacts. Construction noise limits are met according to BS5228. However, noise may be above the background noise level for the area and a perceived change in noise levels could occur. It is best practice that construction is controlled with a CNMP, in accordance with the guidance and procedures outlined in BS5228-1. Procedures should include: • Minimising the noise as much as is reasonably practicable at source. • Attenuation of noise propagation. • Carrying out identified high noise level activities at a time when they are least likely to cause a nuisance to residents. • Providing advance notice of unavoidable periods of high noise levels to residents. • In order to maintain a low impact on the noise environment, consideration will be given to attenuation of construction noise at source by means of the following: ○ Giving due consideration to the effect of noise, in selection of construction methods. ○ Avoidance of vehicles waiting or queuing, particularly on public highways or in residential areas with their engines running. ○ Scheduling of deliveries to arrive during daytime hours only. Care should be taken to minimise noise while unloading delivery vehicles. Delivery vehicles will comply with the Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which should follow routes that minimise residential roads. ○ Ensure plant and equipment are regularly and properly maintained. All plant should be situated to sufficiently minimise noise impact at nearby properties. ○ Fit and maintain silencers to plant, machinery, and vehicles where appropriate and necessary. ○ Operate plant and equipment in modes of operation that minimise noise, and power down plant when not in use. ○ Use electrically powered plant rather than diesel or petrol driven, where this is practicable. • Working typically will not take place outside of daytime defined hours. Daytime is defined to be 07:00 – 19:00 on weekdays and s 07:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays. • Consideration will be given to the attenuation of construction noise in the transmission path by means of the following:	Section 12.5	Principal Contractor	During construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		○ Locate plant and equipment liable to create noise as far from noise sensitive receptors as is reasonably practicable or use natural land topography to reduce line of sight noise transmission. ○ Noise screens, hoardings and barriers should be erected where appropriate and necessary to shield high-noise level activities. ○ Provide lined acoustic enclosures for equipment such as static generators and when applicable portable generators, compressors, and pumps. The nature and effect of the construction operations, including increased traffic noise, results in the need to minimise noise produced during these activities. Best practicable means will be employed to minimise noise produced by the works. In establishing criteria, controls and working methods, account will be taken of guidance provided in BS5228-1. In setting working hours, consideration is given to the fact that the level of noise through the normal working day is more easily tolerated than during the evening and night-time. After conducting a BS5228 assessment and confirming the noise levels, working can continue into the evenings, as long as the threshold noise levels in Category A are adhered to. Essential work outside of defined daytime hours should be subject to prior notification to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and consultation with the local community. An updated CNIA will be undertaken by the Principal Contractor as part of their CEMP, which will include an assessment of mobile plant items based on expected vehicle movements. The CEMP will identify mitigation measures where appropriate to ensure appropriate construction noise levels are achieved at all NSRs.			
Traffic and Transport (Chapter 13)					
T1	Construction Activities	It is the intention of the Applicant to implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as a 'good practice' measure to ensure that the impact of the Proposed Development, and of other developments acting cumulatively, on the public road network are minimised as far as practicable. The CTMP would identify measures to reduce the number of construction vehicles as well as considering reducing or avoiding the impact of vehicles through construction programming / routing and identification of an individual with responsibilities for managing traffic and transport impacts and effects. The CTMP will identify the programme of works, the agreed routes to sites and details of a site Liaison Officer who would have responsibilities for managing traffic and transport impacts and effects. The CTMP will also identify measures to reduce and manage construction staff travel by private car, particularly single occupancy trips. The CTMP would include the following measures as a minimum: • The Principal Contractor would develop a logistics plan highlighting the access points for the project, loading bays(s), welfare, storage, security and material handling that would be enforced following full site establishment. • Approved haul routes would be identified to the sites and protocols put in place to ensure that HGVs adhere to these routes.	Section 13.7	Principal Contractor	During Construction

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation/Monitoring Response	EIA Report Reference	Responsibility	Timing
		• All contractors would be provided with a site induction pack containing information on delivery routes, any restrictions on routes and maximum load capacity for the internal access tracks. • Temporary construction site signage would be erected along the identified construction traffic routes to warn other road users of construction activities and associated construction vehicles. • A construction traffic speed limit (for example, 20 mph in 30 mph zones) would be imposed through the sensitive areas along the route (i.e. Dalmally and Inveraray) and on approach to the main site access point on the A819. • The construction material 'lay down' areas would allow for a staggered delivery schedule throughout the day, avoiding peak and unsociable hours (i.e. before 06:00 and after 22:00). • An integral part of the progress meetings held with all trade contractors is the delivery schedule pro-forma. All contractors would be required to give details of proposed timing of material deliveries to the sites. At this stage, they would be given a specific area for delivery. • The CTMP and the control measures therein would be included within all trade contractor tender enquiries to ensure early understanding and acceptance / compliance with the rules that would be enforced on this project. • Under no circumstances would HGVs be allowed to lay-up in surrounding roads. All personnel in the team would be in contact with each other and with Site management, who in turn would have mobile and telephone contact with the subcontractors. • Roads would be maintained in a clean and safe condition. A wheel washing / wheel cleaning facility would be installed on-site during the construction period in order to reduce mud and debris being deposited onto the local road network. • A condition survey of the A819 will be undertaken pre and post construction phase to monitor the condition of the road. The Applicant will ensure that any deterioration to the A819 will be repaired.			