LUC

SP Energy Networks

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project Summary of Feedback from the Pre-Application Consultation

Prepared by LUC May 2022





SP Energy Networks

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project

Summary of Feedback from the Pre-Application Consultation

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	1 st Draft	L. Meldrum	D. McArthur	K. Wigley	20.12.2021
2.	2 nd draft following SPEN comments on V1	D. McArthur	D. McArthur	K. Wigley	20.01.2022
3.	3 rd draft following further comments from SPEN	L. Meldrum	D. McArthur	K. Wigley	18.02.2022
4.	Final Report following legal comments	L. Meldrum	D. McArthur	D. McArthur	27.05.2022

Bristol Cardiff Edinburgh Glasgow London Manchester

landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants LtdLandscape DesignRegistered in EnglandStrategic Planning & AsRegistered number 2549296Development PlanningRegistered office:Urban Design & Master250 Waterloo RoadEnvironmental Impact ALondon SE1 8RDLandscape Planning & Landscape Management

100% recycled paper

Landscape Design Strategic Planning & Assessment Development Planning Urban Design & Masterplanning Environmental Impact Assessment Landscape Planning & Assessment Landscape Management Ecology Historic Environment GIS & Visualisation





Contents

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

Contents

Chapter 1	
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Document	1
The Need for the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project	1
SP Energy Networks	2
SPEN's Commitment to Engagement	2
Routeing and Consultation Process	3
Chapter 2	
Consultation Process	5
Overview	5
Who SPEN Consulted	5
Chapter 3	
Overview of Consultation Feedback	7
Representations Received	7
Chapter 4	
Conclusions and Next Steps	9
Confirmation of the Preferred Route	9
Next Steps	9
Appendix A	
Summary of Consultation Feedback	
from Routeing Stage	A-1

Chapter 1 Introduction

Purpose of the Document

1.1 This document has been prepared by LUC on behalf of SP Energy Networks (SPEN), to present the findings of pre-application consultation on the Scoop Hill 132 kilovolt (kV) Connection Project.

1.2 The pre-application consultation for the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project was undertaken during October and November 2021 following the publication of the Routeing and Consultation Report (2021)¹ which identified a preferred route for the new twin 132kV overhead line (OHL), as seen in Figure 1.1. The purpose of this document is to report on the feedback received to date from statutory and non-statutory consultees and members of the public on the content of the Routeing and Consultation Report and the preferred route identified, address feedback received and demonstrate how this feedback has influenced the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project. It is not the intention of this document to repeat information already contained within the Routeing and Consultation Report other than where it is necessary to provide sufficient context. Therefore, this document should be read with reference to the Routeing and Consultation Report.

The Need for the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project

1.3 A request to connect the proposed Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm to the electricity transmission grid has been received by SPEN. Following consideration of the network in this area by SPEN, the proposed connection from the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm substation to the Moffat substation (at Bearholm) will be via a new twin 132kV OHL.

1.4 The Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm is being proposed by Community Windpower Limited (CWL) and will comprise up to 75 wind turbines with an output capacity of up to 525 megawatts (MW), located approximately 5km south-east of Moffat and 11km north-east of Lockerbie in Dumfries and Galloway.

¹ SP Energy Networks (2021) Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project: Routeing and Consultation Report. Available [online] at: https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/pages/scoop_hill.aspx

Chapter 1 Introduction Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

1.5 The construction and operation of the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm will require Section 36 consent from Scottish Ministers under the Electricity Act 1989 ('the Act') as its generation capacity is greater than 50MW. The application for Section 36 consent was made by CWL in November 2020 (ECU reference: ECU00000533) and is awaiting determination.

1.6 As explained in more detail below, SPEN has a statutory duty under the Act to develop and maintain an efficient, coordinated and economical system of electricity transmission. SPEN is also subject to a licence condition which requires it to make its transmission system available for generators wishing to connect to it. SPEN therefore requires to connect the proposed Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm to the wider electricity transmission network.

1.7 Therefore, to meet its statutory and licence obligations, SPEN is proposing to seek Section 37 consent under the Act to construct a new twin 132kV OHL grid connection to connect the proposed Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm into two new 132kV switchbays at Moffat substation in Dumfries and Galloway. Deemed planning permission for the connection will also be sought at the same time².

1.8 The Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project will be approximately 2.5km in length and will require two 132kV OHLs supported on double 'Trident' wood poles. The existing electricity network and points of connection (substations) are shown on **Figure 1.1.** Further details of the project and routeing study undertaken to inform the selection of the 'preferred route' for consultation can be found in the Routeing and Consultation Report.

SP Energy Networks

SPEN owns and operates the electricity transmission 1.9 and distribution networks in Southern and Central Scotland through its wholly-owned subsidiaries, SP Transmission plc (SPT) and SP Distribution plc (SPD). SPT is the holder of a transmission licence³. SPEN's transmission network is the backbone of the electricity system within its area, carrying large amounts of electricity at high voltages from generating sources such as wind farms, power stations and various other utilities across long distances to connected homes and businesses. The transmission network consists of approximately 4,000km of overhead lines and over 600km of underground cables. The electricity is then delivered via the distribution network which has over 150 substations and in excess of 100 grid supply points which serves approximately two million customers in Southern and Central Scotland.

1.10 As transmission licence holder for Southern Scotland, SPEN is required under Section 9(2) of the Act to:

- Develop and maintain an efficient, co-ordinated and economical system of electricity transmission; and
- Facilitate competition in the supply and generation of electricity.

1.11 As mentioned previously, SPEN is required in terms of its statutory and licence obligations to provide for new electricity generators wishing to connect to the transmission system in its licence area. SPEN is also obliged to make its transmission system available for these purposes and to ensure that the system is fit for purpose through appropriate reinforcements to accommodate the contracted capacity.

1.12 Section 38 and Schedule 9 of the Act imposes a further statutory duty on SPEN to take account of the following factors in formulating proposals for the installation of overhead transmission lines:

- "(a) to have regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites, buildings and objects of architectural, historic or archaeological interest; and
- (b) to do what it reasonably can to mitigate any effect which the proposals would have on the natural beauty of the countryside or any such flora, fauna, features, sites, buildings or objects."

1.13 SPEN's 'Schedule 9 Statement' sets out how it will meet the duty placed upon it under Schedule 9. The Statement also refers to the application of best practice methods to assess the environmental impacts of proposals and to identify appropriate mitigation measures.

1.14 As a result of the above, SPEN is required to identify electrical connections that meet the technical requirements of the electricity system, which are economically viable, and cause on balance, the least disturbance to both the environment and the people who live, work and enjoy recreation within it.

SPEN's Commitment to Engagement

1.15 SPEN attaches great importance to the effect that its works may have on the environment and on people. In seeking to achieve 'least disturbance', SPEN is keen to engage with key stakeholders including local communities and

² In addition to Section 37 consent, as the OHL involves development, it also requires planning permission.

³ The references below to SPEN in the context of statutory and licence

duties and the application for Section 37 consent should be read as applying to SP Transmission plc.

Chapter 1 Introduction Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

others who may have an interest in the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project. This engagement process begins at the early stages of development of a project to ensure that the project design balances the views of stakeholders and communities with SPENs statutory and licence obligations and continues into construction, once Section 37 consent has been granted.

1.16 In Scotland, the requirements for public consultation in relation to applications for Section 37 are not prescriptive. However, Scottish Ministers encourage developers to adopt the requirements for public consultation as set out within the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Regulations (Scotland) 2013 and the relevant provisions of the Town and Country (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended).

1.17 SPEN's approach to stakeholder engagement for major electrical infrastructure projects is outlined in Chapter 2 of SPEN's Approach to Routeing and Environmental Impact Assessment document⁴. SPEN aims to ensure effective, inclusive and meaningful engagement with the public, local communities statutory and other consultees and interested parties through four key engagement steps:

- Pre-project notification and engagement with consenting bodies, planning authorities, and statutory consultees;
- Information gathering to inform the routeing stage;
- Obtaining feedback on the emerging route options and preferred route; and
- The Environmental Appraisal stage.

1.18 In addition, and as noted above, SPEN as a holder of a transmission licence, has a duty under Section 38 and Schedule 9 of the Act, when formulating proposals for new electricity lines and other transmission development, to have regard to the effect of work on communities. That is in addition to the desirability of the preservation of amenity, the natural environment, cultural heritage, landscape and visual quality.

1.19 Due to COVID-19 restrictions which were in place preventing face to face interactions, the public consultation and stakeholder engagement took place online using a virtual consultation room developed by LUC.

Routeing and Consultation Process

1.20 The routeing exercise was undertaken in 2021 and comprised a review of environmental, technical and economic considerations and the application of established step-by-step routeing principles to identify and appraise potential route

⁴ SP Energy Networks (May 2021) Approach to Routeing and Environmental Impact Assessment, Version 2, Available [online] at: options to establish a 'preferred' route for the connection. The objective was to identify a route which meets the technical requirements of the electricity system, which is economically viable and causes, on balance, the least disturbance to the environment and the people who live, work and enjoy recreation within it.

1.21 Following established best practice for routeing OHLs, initial stages of the routeing process comprised the identification of a study area, within which environmental characteristics were mapped to inform the identification of a total of five route options. These route options were appraised against environmental criteria including landscape and visual amenity, cultural heritage, forestry, hydrology and biodiversity, to identify a preferred route for the OHL connection. Following a technical review by SPEN, to ensure that the preferred route met SPEN's technical requirements for connecting OHLs, the preferred route was then taken forward through the consultation process, with feedback being used to further review the routeing findings and inform the next steps.

1.22 More information about the process followed to identify and appraise route options to select the preferred route can be found in the Routeing and Consultation Report.

1.23 An overview of the broad sequential steps in SPEN's routeing methodology are provided in **Figure 1.2** below.

https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/userfiles/file/SPEN_Approach_to __Routeing_Document_2nd_version.pdf

Chapter 1 Introduction Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022





© Crown copyright and database rights 2021 Ordnance Survey 0100031673



Figure 1.1: Preferred Route Option 3

- Study area
- Substation
- Existing 400kV overhead line (OHL)
- Route Option 3



CB:JN EB:nunn_j LUC FIG01_01_11086_r0_Preferred_Route_A3L_15/12/2021 Source: LUC, Forestry Commission Scotland (FCS),NatureScot, HES, D&G HER, WoSAS HER.

Chapter 2 Consultation Process

Overview

2.1 Full details of the consultation that was undertaken (i.e. consultation dates, distribution of leaflets and posters, advertising the public consultation, project website, hosting of the online public exhibition (including attending live chat sessions) and methods made available to provide feedback) are contained within the Routeing and Consultation Report.

Who SPEN Consulted

2.2 This section describes the various groups of stakeholders relevant to the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project that SPEN consulted during its pre-application consultation.

2.3 All consultees (both statutory and non-statutory) were sent information about the project via e-shot on the day the public consultation went live i.e. 25th October 2021. These included details of where to find information on the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project, where to access the Routeing and Consultation Document, when and how to attend the online virtual exhibition, and how to make comments to SPEN (including deadline). Consultees were asked for their views on:

- The preferred route (Route Option 3).
- Any of the alternative route options considered during the routeing process.
- Any other issues, suggestions or feedback the consultees would like SPEN to consider.

2.4 Consultees were also informed that comments at this stage are informal comments to SPEN and are made to allow SPEN to determine whether changes to the preferred route are necessary. An opportunity to comment formally to the Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (ECU) will follow at a later stage in the process following submission of the application for Section 37consent and deemed planning permission.

Landowners

2.5 Landowners within the preferred route corridor were contacted directly by SPEN's land project officer separately for their feedback on the proposals.

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

Local Authority and Statutory Consultees

2.6 Statutory consultees contacted as part of the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project are listed below:

- Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC);
- Annandale North Ward Councillors;
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA);
- NatureScot;
- Historic Environment Scotland (HES).
- Moffat and District Community Council;
- Kirkpatrick Juxta Community Council; and
- Wamphray Community Council.

2.7 The consultees listed above were contacted via email prior to the public consultation going live and were provided with an overview of the project as well as the opportunity to arrange a virtual meeting with SPEN to discuss the project. Only Moffat Community Council requested a call with SPEN (see **paragraph 3.4** below).

Non-Statutory Consultees

- 2.8 The non-statutory consultees contacted were:
- Transport Scotland;
- Scottish Forestry;
- British Horse Society;
- BT;
- Civil Aviation Authority(CAA);
- Crown Estate Scotland;
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation;
- Fisheries Management Scotland;
- Joint Radio Company (JRC);
- John Muir Trust;
- Mountaineering Scotland;
- NATS Safeguarding;
- Royal Scottish Protection of Birds (RSPB);
- Scottish Rights of Way and Access Society (ScotWays);
- Scottish Water;
- Scottish Wildlife Trust;
- Scottish Wild Land Group;
- Visit Scotland;

- Edinburgh Airport;
- Scottish Badgers;
- South Scotland Red Squirrel Group;
- Lothian and Borders Raptor Study Group;
- British Trust for Ornithology (Dumfries and Galloway);
- National Farmers Union of Scotland;
- The Ramblers Association;
- Scottish Outdoor Access Network;
- Sustrans Scotland;
- The Health and Safety Executive (HSE);
- The National Trust for Scotland; and
- The Coal Authority.

Local Communities and Members of the Public

2.9 Leaflets were distributed to local properties located within the study area i.e. the area within which the five route options were located. The project leaflet invited members of the public to attend the online virtual exhibition and provided details about how to access more information via the project website and make comments. The wider general population in Dumfries and Galloway were informed about the consultation using advertisements and posters. Adverts were placed within the Dumfries and Galloway Standard and The Moffat News, (both weekly local newspapers), for two weeks in the lead up to the consultation going live. Posters were displayed at the following locations in Beattock and Moffat:

- Annandale Transport Museum;
- Beattock Village Hall*;
- Post Office in Esso Petrol Station;
- Grieves Newsagent;
- Moffat Town Hall and Community Shop;
- Moffat Co-Operative;
- Moffat Youth Theatre*;
- Old Well Theatre*;
- Premier Convenience Shop;
- The Moffat Book Shop; and
- Barnados Charity Shop Staff Room;

* At the time of distribution these locations were closed, so instead the poster was posted through the letterbox.

Chapter 3 Overview of Consultation Feedback

Representations Received

3.1 This chapter explains how the responses from the stakeholders outlined in **Chapter 2** have been summarised and presented. In total there was 676 visits to the online virtual exhibition, with a total of 5 representations received from the public through the online anonymous feedback questionnaire. Feedback has also been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees.

Stakeholder Responses

3.2 A total of 10 statutory/non-statutory consultees made representations during the pre-application consultation. These were:

- HES;
- SEPA;
- Transport Scotland;
- Moffat and District Community Council;
- Kirkpatrick Juxta Community Council;
- Scottish Wildlife Trust;
- The Coal Authority;
- The Health and Safety Executive (HSE);
- BT; and
- Scottish Badgers.

3.3 NatureScot acknowledged the initial email sent on 8th October 2021 to inform them about the consultation event, however, no formal consultation response was received.

3.4 A joint call with members of Moffat and District Community Council and Kilpatrick Juxta Community Council took place on Tuesday 30th November 2021 to provide some background information on the project, the purpose of the consultation and the findings of the routeing process. Moffat and District and Kilpatrick Juxta Community Councils subsequently submitted formal responses to the consultation⁵.

⁵ Whilst the deadline for submitting formal responses was 28th November 2021, it was acknowledged that this was not a fixed

deadline, and the community councils were invited to submit formal responses following the call.

Chapter 3 Overview of Consultation Feedback

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

3.5 SPEN will continue to liaise with landowners to ensure that their views are taken into account in the design process as the project progresses.

3.6 Consultation responses received and the responses made by SPEN (including any actions required through the design process) are outlined in **Appendix A**: Summary of Pre-Application Consultation Feedback from the Routeing Stage.

3.7 In summary, most consultees (including HES and SEPA) supported the selection of Route Option 3 as the preferred route and agreed with the findings and methodology of the appraisal process. Kilpatrick Juxta Community Council and Moffat and District Community Council raised concerns regarding an OHL solution, and requested that the connection should be undergrounded to minimise landscape and visual amenity effects. A response to each of the comments raised by the statutory and non-statutory consultees is provided in **Tables 1.1** and **1.2** of **Appendix A**.

Key Public Feedback Themes

3.8 To maintain anonymity of members of the public who provided feedback, comments have been split into themes in **Table 1.3** of **Appendix A**. Key themes identified included:

- Comments on the visibility of the OHL and the effects on landscape and visual amenity including residential properties.
- Comments on the rationale for an OHL as opposed to an underground cable.
- Comments of the effects of climate change on the OHL in relation to energy security and reliability.
- Concerns raised regarding archaeology in the area.
- Comments on the information provided in the virtual consultation room and the Routeing and Consultation Report.
- Comments in relation to the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm.

How Feedback Has informed Route Selection

3.9 SPEN has carefully considered the feedback received to understand how this could influence the selection of the preferred route. Most consultee/public feedback agreed with the preferred route (Route Option 3). No issues or information has been raised in the stakeholder feedback which has not already been considered during the routeing process, and which would otherwise result in SPEN reconsidering the preferred route. The key issues raised during consultation, including in relation to landscape and visual amenity and cultural heritage, will continue to be considered by SPEN as

part of the detailed design of the OHL alignment as the project progresses.

Ongoing Public Engagement

3.10 SPEN will continue to keep communities, including landowners, up to date (via the project website) as its proposals move forward. There will also be further opportunities for people to provide feedback during future consultation following the submission of the application for Section 37 consent to the ECU.

Chapter 4 Conclusions and Next Steps

4.1 SPEN has reviewed and considered in detail all feedback received to date from the public, consultees and landowners in relation to the pre-application consultation for the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project.

4.2 The feedback received has informed SPEN's review of the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project regarding the following:

- views on the project as a whole, including the routeing methodology and consultation process;
- views on SPEN's route options; and
- information about the local area, for example, local environmental characteristics.

Confirmation of the Preferred Route

4.3 Following the findings of the routeing study and consideration of the feedback received during the pre-application consultation, SPEN is of the view that Route Option 3 continues to best align with the Routeing Objective set out in the Routeing and Consultation Report (October 2021). It is therefore the most technically feasible and economically viable route, and will cause, on balance, the least disturbance to the environment and the people who live, work and enjoy recreation within it. Therefore, Route Option 3 has been confirmed as the 'proposed' route option for the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project going forward (see **Figure 1.1**).

Next Steps

4.4 The proposed Route Option 3 will be progressed to identify a more detailed alignment for the twin OHLs, including pole positioning, which will be informed by environmental baseline surveys, detailed engineering ground surveys and discussions with landowners. The alignment, including all ancillary development, will be included in the application for Section 37 consent and deemed planning permission to the Scottish Government ECU. Information collated from feedback received as part of the pre-application consultation relating to locally important areas and features will be reflected in the design of the alignment alongside the field surveys where relevant.

Chapter 4 Conclusions and Next Steps

Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project May 2022

4.5 SPEN will consult fully with affected landowners and occupiers on all aspects of the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project and will give them an opportunity to comment on proposals as they progress.

4.6 The Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project will require consent under Section 37 of the Act as well as deemed planning permission. A Screening Request will be submitted to the Scottish Government ECU to request a formal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion from the Scottish Ministers in accordance with Regulation 8(1) of The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. If it is determined that an EIA is not required to accompany the application for Section 37 consent, the application will be accompanied by an Environmental Appraisal Report.

4.7 Following the submission of the application for Section 37 and deemed planning permission, further public consultation will be carried out by the Scottish Government ECU.

Appendix A

Summary of Consultation Feedback from Routeing Stage

Table 1.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback from Statutory Consultees

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	SPEN Response / Comments
HES	Response received on 13/12/21 Advised that advice should also be sought from Dumfries and Galloway Council (DGC)'s archaeology and conservation advice service on matters not covered by HES' interests. These include conservation areas, unscheduled archaeology and category B and C- listed buildings. HES noted there may be some potential for impacts on the Poldean, Standing Stone 110m SSW of (SM12697) located inside the study area boundary, the Milton Roman Fort (SM676) and Catherine's Hill, settlement 620m N of Nether Murthat (SM12736), located just outside the study area boundary. Confirmed they are satisfied that appropriate consideration has been given to the scheduled monuments and their settings in the identification of route options for the proposals. HES agreed that Route Option 3 is the preferred route option for the proposals and also agreed with the conclusion presented in the RCD Appraisal Table that this route is likely to affect the lowest number of heritage assets and give rise to the least amount of setting change. As a result, HES consider any impacts associated with this route option are unlikely to be significant.	 DGC, which includes their archaeology and conservation advice service, was consulted via email on 8th October 2021 and 25th October 2021 by LUC. No comments have been received from DGC in response to this consultation. As part of its consultation on the EIA screening request, the Scottish Government ECU will consult with DGC for input to the EIA Screening Opinion, and this will give the DGC archaeology service more opportunity to provide feedback on the project. Any feedback received will be taken into consideration as the design of the project progresses. As part of the Environmental Appraisal/EIA, the cultural heritage specialists will consult with DGC's archaeology service to inform the cultural heritage assessment. This will include consultation to inform the selection of assessment viewpoints. With regards to the Poldean Standing Stone (SM12697), Milton Roman Fort (SM12697) and Catherine's Hill settlement (SM12736), Preferred Route Option 3 is at distance from these assets so no direct effects will occur. Comments on Route 3 being selected as the preferred route from a cultural heritage perspective are noted. SPEN will continue to take into account potential direct and indirect setting effects through the iterative design process. HES and DGC will be consulted as the project progresses, including to agree viewpoint locations for the Environmental Appraisal/EIA.
SEPA	Response received on 13/12/21 Agreed with the selection of Route Option 3 as the preferred route on the basis that it crosses the least number of watercourses.	Noted. The detailed alignment of the OHLs and positioning of wood poles and other infrastructure will continue to avoid watercourses and maintain at least a 50m buffer from watercourses where possible.
Transport Scotland	Response received 24/11/21 Raised no objection to the proposed route for the OHL as Route Option 3 lies entirely east of the M74(T), with no potential to physically impact the trunk road network. Noted, that it is unclear in the RCD whether abnormal loads will be required during construction of the OHL but it is assumed these will not be required.	Comments on Route Option 3 are noted. No abnormal loads will be required for construction of the OHL.

Table 1.2: Summary of Consultation Feedback from Community Councils

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	SPEN Response / Comments
Kilpatrick Juxta Community Council (KJCC)	Response received 01/12/21 Noted that whilst there are some local people in the community who are happy for renewable energy expansion no matter the means,	Comments noted. These points were raised and discussed on the call with SPEN on 30 th November 2021. SP Energy Networks (SPEN) has a legal duty to develop and maintain
	there are far more members of the community who are not of this view. Appreciated that SPEN's position to offer overground connection options are mainly based on economic considerations and	an efficient, co-ordinated and economical system of electricity transmission. As the transmission license holder for central and southern Scotland, SPEN is also obliged to provide a connection for new customers wishing to connect in its area. In keeping with this
	acknowledged the cost of an underground connection would be much higher financially. However, the cost to the village community, the impact on the skyline	obligation, SPEN requires to offer a connection which is technically feasible and efficient, economically viable and which balances effects on the environment and people. That option is generally OHL at transmission voltages. As SPEN moves forward with a project, it
	and the potential loss of income generated from tourism are also equally valid factors and must be fully assessed before adding to the visual impairment which is becoming more prevalent in the area due to the proliferation of wind farms.	continues to balance technical and economic considerations alongside landscape, environmental and community considerations in order to develop proposals which achieve the best balance.
	Noted Beattock is almost completely surrounded on all sides by unnatural additions to the hillsides and the option of the Scoop Hill 132kV OHL will contribute to this in an unacceptable manner which can be avoided.	volt (132kV) OHLs on wooden poles between the wind farm substation at Scoop Hill and Moffat substation (at Bearholm). SPEN remains confident that the solution being presented achieves the best balance of these considerations. Further information on the use of underground cable can be found under the 'undergrounding' section in Table 1 3
	The community were originally promised a connection from the wind farm that would be undergrounded when the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm was first proposed by the developer and this was communicated to them both in writing and verbally. However, the developer may have omitted to mention that it would be SPEN rather than the developer who would be taking the connection forward. As a result, when the route options were announced, from the perspective on many locals, it has demonstrated a complete disregard of community opinion. The community have concerns with another OHL in the area, given the aftermath of the recent Storm Arwen causing many homes and businesses to have no power for several days. In light of climate change, it is likely in the future these occurrences will become more frequent and extreme and if the connection was to be below ground the disruption could be minimal.	below. The response details SPEN's general approach to underground cables. Landscape and visual issues (including residential visual amenity) have
		been taken into account in the appraisal and selection of Route Option 3, and will continue to be a key consideration as the detailed design of the project progresses. This route will avoid the highest ground in the eastern and northern part of the study area thus reducing visibility from settlements along the M74 corridor, including Beattock. The route also avoids the Moffat Hills Begional Scenic Area (RSA) and does not route
		west of properties within the study area which have principal open views towards the River Annan. The detailed design of the OHLs, including positioning of individual wood poles, will continue to reflect the need to minimise landscape and visual issues (including views from residential properties), and this will continue to remain as a key design consideration as the project develops.
		Regarding storms and their effects on power supply, it should be noted that OHLs offer the most efficient means of transmitting electricity. OHLs are designed to high technical standards, including making sure that appropriate set back distances from other OHLs, tall structures such as turbines and trees are achieved to minimise disruption to supplies.

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	SPEN Response / Comments
Moffat and District Community Council (MDCC)	Response received 05/11/21 Confirmed the CC would like to schedule a virtual meeting to obtain more information on the proposal.	A zoom call took place at 7pm on 30 th November 2021 with MDCC and KJCC. Members of SPEN and LUC were also in attendance.
	Response received 03/12/21 The MDCC would prefer underground cabling and this should be considered as Option 6 and discussed amongst the stakeholders. Noted a community consultation of the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm planning application in the summer of 2021 and the visual impacts of the Wind Farm were a key concern. No concerns were raised in relation to the Scoop Hill Grid Connection as it was of the understanding to all members that this would be undergrounded.	See response to KJCC above in relation to undergrounding. SPEN is obliged (under the terms of its licence)) to provide a connection for new customers wishing to connect in its area. In keeping with this obligation, SPEN requires to offer a connection which is technically feasible and efficient, economically viable and which balances effects on the environment and people. That option is generally an OHL at transmission voltages. As SPEN moves forward with a project, it continues to balance technical and economic considerations alongside landscape, environmental and community considerations in order to develop proposals which achieve the best balance.
		In regards to Scoop Hill, the proposed connection is for two 132kV OHLs on wooden poles between the wind farm substation at Scoop Hill and Moffat substation. SPEN remains confident that the solution being presented achieves the best balance of these considerations. Further information on the use of underground cable can be found under the 'undergrounding' section in Table 1.3 below. The response details SPEN's general approach to underground cables.

Table 1.3: Summary of Consultation Feedback from Non-Statutory Consultees

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	Response / Comments
Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT)	Response received 27/10/21 Raised that the possible works may impact on the red squirrel population in the area. Advised they would expect that all relevant surveys are carried out in	SPEN email response sent on 27/10/21 SPEN confirmed that any necessary red squirrel surveys will be completed once the application is progressed to the formal environmental assessment/appraisal stage. Appropriate mitigation to avoid or offset any effect on red squirrels, including a Species
	advance and the work is planned to factor in the breeding season. When planning any felling, SWT would appreciate if the movement of squirrels and habitat connectivity can be taken into consideration, and suggest that alongside felling permission, landowners and contractors are made aware of the risk and responsibility they have to resident red squirrels, and are made aware of surveys to be conducted in advance of felling activities	Protection Plan (SPP), will be developed if required. Should consent be granted for the project, further pre-construction surveys would be undertaken and overseen by an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW), including obtaining any species licenses required.
Coal Authority	Response received 29/10/21	Noted. No response required.

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	Response / Comments
	Confirmed the study area for the proposed development is located outside of the defined coalfield and therefore have no specific comments or observations to make on the proposal.	
The Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	Response received 03/11/21 Confirmed the proposed development would not lead to a material increase in the number of people within a consultation distance. Therefore, HSE do not require to be consulted further and have no comments to make on the proposal.	Noted. No response required.
BT Radio Network	Response received 10/11/21 Noted the project should not cause any interference to BT's current and presently planned radio network. The figure below shows there are no active/planned radio links (purple lines) within 100m of the central points labelled WID11678 with red dots.	Noted. No response required. Fixed microwave links will continue to be considered as a design constraint as the project progresses to detailed design. BT will be consulted on the application for Section 37consent.
Scottish Badgers	Response received 12/11/21 Noted there are records of badger setts around the substation and along all route options. Some sett records also appear to be present along field margins and open ground. Therefore, robust protected species surveys should be undertaken to include these habitats in addition to the typical woodland and margins.	SPEN email response sent on 12/11/21 SPEN confirmed that protected species surveys will be undertaken once the route is more defined following consultation. These surveys will be used to inform the detailed OHL alignment during which any identified badger setts will be avoided, whilst balancing other factors which can influence the placement of individual poles.

Consultee	Summary of Feedback	Response / Comments
		Confirmed that robust mitigation proposals will be implemented, including pre-construction surveys and the implementation of a Species Protection Plan.

Table 1.4: Summary of Consultation Feedback from Public Representation

Key Themes / Topics	Issue Raised	Response / Comments
Where will the	Asked if the electricity will be distributed entirely in Scotland once it	SPEN responded by email on 03/11/21 as follows:
electricity from the wind farm be consumed?	reaches the substation.	"The electricity that would be generated at the proposed windfarm at Scoop Hill could be distributed and used anywhere in the UK due to the nature of the fully interconnected transmission system between Scotland, England and Wales. The proposed connection will allow the electricity produced by the Scoop Hill Windfarm to access the wider UK transmission system, via Moffat substation. From there it can supply homes and businesses throughout Scotland as well as the wider UK system via the existing Anglo-Scottish overhead line interconnector, which carries electricity between Scotland and England."
Removal of Turbines	Response received 12/11/21	SPEN responded by email on 12/11/21.
	Asked if the three turbines viewed from Moffat High Street that have been removed could be reinstated and the profits from the energy produced be paid info the Moffat Community?	Confirmed the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm is not part of this consultation or development for which SPEN is responsible. Therefore the final decision on turbine locations and where the revenue will go is not for SPEN to decide.
Undergrounding	Response received 01/12/21 Strongly opposed to an OHL connection and instead an underground cable should be used to connect Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm, as the community has been under the impression following the meetings the wind farm developer held in Boreland Village Hall on 19 th February 2020 and Beattock Village Hall on 11 th March 2020 that the cabling would be underground.	SPEN has a legal duty to develop and maintain an efficient, co- ordinated and economical system of electricity transmission. As the transmission license holder for central and southern Scotland, SPEN is obliged to provide a connection for new customers wishing to connect in its area. In keeping with this obligation, SPEN requires to offer a connection which is technically feasible and efficient, economically viable and which balances effects on the environment and people. That option is generally an OHL at transmission voltages. As SPEN moves forward with a project, it continues to balance technical and economic considerations alongside landscape, environmental and community considerations in order to develop proposals which achieve the best balance.
		In regards to Scoop Hill, the proposed connection is for two 132, 000 volt (132kV) OHLs on wooden poles between the wind farm substation at Scoop Hill and Moffat substation. SPEN remains confident that the solution being presented achieves the best balance of these considerations.

Key Themes / Topics	Issue Raised	Response / Comments
Climate Change	Response received 01/12/21 Raise concerns about climate change and the effects this could have on providing a reliable source of power to communities via an OHL. Particularly, as storms are predicted to become more frequent, causing power cuts.	See response to KJCC in Table 1.1 on this matter.
Route Options	Two respondents highlighted that this was the best route and it looked to be reasonable and low impact.	Comments on Preferred Route Option 3 noted.
	Two respondents stated they did not agree with any of the proposed route options, with one stating the connection should be undergrounded as originally planned.	See response above in relation to undergrounding. The five route options identified during the routeing process has provided an adequate set of alternatives to appraise and demonstrate that a reasonable number of route options have been considered. Given the environmental and technical constraints shown within the study area in Figure 4.2: Routeing Considerations of the Routeing and Consultation Report, including slope, residential properties, forestry and the Moffat Hills RSA, five route options are realistically the most options that are possible within such a small study area, and these have all been appraised in the Routeing and Consultation Report in a clear and documented way.
Landscape and Visual	One respondent is strongly opposed to any above ground route due to visual impacts the area is already experiencing and noted the connection should revert to the original plan for an underground connection to be made.	See response above in relation to undergrounding. Landscape and visual issues have been taken into consideration in the selection of Route Option 3. This route will avoid the highest ground in the eastern and northern part of the study area thus reducing visibility from settlements along the M74 corridor, including Beattock. The route also avoids the Moffat Hills Regional Scenic Area (RSA) and does not route west of properties within the study area which have principal open views towards the River Annan. The detailed design of the OHLs, including positioning of poles, will continue to reflect the need to minimise landscape and visual issues, and this will continue to remain as a key design consideration as the project develops.
	One respondent raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed development to their property. The respondent comments that the proposed development could have detrimental visual effects on the view they would experience from their property.	All residential properties within the study area have been avoided by at least 150m in all route options – see Figure 5.1a: Landscape Designations, NatureScot National Landscape Character Types and Visual Receptors and Appendix B: Appraisal of Route Options of the Routeing and Consultation Report. It should be noted that the route options are considered to be more representative of 'corridors' within which the OHLs would be located i.e. the OHL routes will not be the full extent of the orange corridors shown. Proximity to residential properties and minimising visual effects from principal property views

Key Themes / Topics	Issue Raised	Response / Comments
		through the careful positioning of infrastructure will continue to be a key design consideration as the project develops.
Cultural Heritage	Consideration for the archaeology in the area should be taken into account.	Known cultural heritage features have already been considered in the appraisal of route options and mapped as routeing considerations – see Figure 5.4: Cultural Heritage of the Routeing and Consultation Report and Appendix B . The route options appraisal has found that Route Option 3 will affect the least cultural heritage assets, and potentially result in the least setting change. A detailed site walkover survey of the proposed OHL routes will be undertaken, and an assessment of effects on cultural heritage will be included in the Environmental Appraisal to accompany the Section 37 application. Avoidance of cultural heritage assets, and minimising both direct and indirect effects, will continue to be a key design consideration going forward.
Information	Two respondents stated that information on the alternative route options was not easy to locate, with one respondent noting that a better explanation of this was required.	All information on alternative route options is provided in Chapter 4: Identification of Route Options , Figure 4.3: Overviews of Route Options 1-5 and Figures 4.3a-e of the Routeing and Consultation Report. The comparative appraisal of all route options is provided in Appendix B of the Routeing and Consultation Report.
	One respondent stated that no direct information had been provided to them despite how close their property is to the connection.	All properties within the study area i.e. the area within which all five route options were proposed were issued with an information leaflet prior to the public consultation going live on 25 th October 2021 (see Figure A1.1). Further details on the other means by which the consultation was advertised can be found in Chapter 2 of the Scoop Hill 132kV Connection Project Summary of Feedback from the Pre- Application Consultation Report, and all information on the project can be found at: https://www.spenergynetworks.co.uk/pages/scoop_hill.aspx.
General	One respondent opposed the Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm.	Scoop Hill Community Wind Farm is not part of this project and the application by Community Wind Power is currently being considered by the Scottish Ministers via the Section 36 consent application process.



© Crown copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey 0100031673

CB:SR EB:robertson_s LUC FIGA01_01_11086_r0_Consultation Leaflet Recipients_A3L 22/02/2022



Figure A1.1: Consultation Leaflet Recipients

- Study area
- Substation
- Existing 400kV overhead line (OHL)
- X Consultation leaflet recipients

