* + - 1. Summary of Consultation Feedback from Statutory Consultees

| Consultee | Summary of Feedback | SPEN Response / Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| HES | Response received on 13/12/21Advised 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 13/12/21Agreed 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 24/11/21Raised 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.  |

* + - 1. Summary of Consultation Feedback from Community Councils

| Consultee | Summary of Feedback | SPEN Response / Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kilpatrick Juxta Community Council (KJCC) | Response received 01/12/21Noted that whilst there are some local people in the community who are happy for renewable energy expansion no matter the means, 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 acknowledged the cost of an underground connection would be much higher financially. However, the cost to the village community, the impact on the skyline 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. 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. 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. | Comments noted. These points were raised and discussed on the call with SPEN on 30th November 2021.SP Energy Networks (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 also 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 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 (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** 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 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 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.  |
| Moffat and District Community Council (MDCC) | Response received 05/11/21Confirmed the CC would like to schedule a virtual meeting to obtain more information on the proposal.  | A zoom call took place at 7pm on 30th November 2021 with MDCC and KJCC. Members of SPEN and LUC were also in attendance.  |
| Response received 03/12/21The 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. |

* + - 1. Summary of Consultation Feedback from Non-Statutory Consultees

| Consultee | Summary of Feedback  | Response / Comments  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT) | Response received 27/10/21Raised 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 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  | SPEN email response sent on 27/10/21SPEN 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 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 29/10/21Confirmed 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.  | Noted. No response required. |
| The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | Response received 03/11/21Confirmed 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 10/11/21Noted 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. Requested to be notified once the coordinates have been confirmed to allow a further check to be completed. All queries should be directed to radionetworkprotection@bt.com | 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 12/11/21Noted 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 12/11/21SPEN 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.Confirmed that robust mitigation proposals will be implemented, including pre-construction surveys and the implementation of a Species Protection Plan.  |

* + - 1. Summary of Consultation Feedback from Public Representation

| Key Themes / Topics  | Issue Raised | Response / Comments  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Where will the electricity from the wind farm be consumed?  | Asked if the electricity will be distributed entirely in Scotland once it reaches the substation.  | SPEN responded by email on 03/11/21 as follows: "*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 12/11/21Asked 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?  | SPEN responded by email on 12/11/21.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 01/12/21Strongly 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 19th February 2020 and Beattock Village Hall on 11th 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. |
| Climate Change  | Response received 01/12/21Raise 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 relationto 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 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 25th 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. |