

Appendix 3.1

Scoping Responses Summary Table

Appendix 3.1: Glenmuckloch to Glenglass Reinforcement Project Scoping Consultation Response Summary

Consultee	Date of Response	Issue Raised at Scoping	Response/ Action to be taken in the EIA Report
Scottish Government Energy and Consents Unit (ECU) Scoping Opinion	20 th December 2020	Stated that Scottish Ministers are satisfied with the proposed scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).	Noted.
		Advised that a Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment (PHLRA) should be undertaken as part of the EIA process. This should be undertaken in accordance with The Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessments: Best Practice Guide for Proposed Electricity Generation Developments (Second Edition).	A PHLRA has been undertaken and is included as Appendix 7.5 .
		Requested that the ECU is kept up to date with further engagement between parties on the refinement of the Glenmuckloch to Glenglass 132kV Reinforcement Project (GGRP) design.	The Applicant has engaged with the ECU through the EIA process.
		Requested that the EIA Report includes a Schedule of Mitigation in tabular form setting out all measures proposed to mitigate significant environmental effects.	A Schedule of Mitigation is included at Appendix 3.3 of the EIA Report
		Recommended that an additional Scoping Opinion be sought should an application for consent not be submitted within 12 months of the Scoping Opinion being issued to ensure that the content of the Scoping Opinion remains relevant.	It has not been possible to submit the application for consent within 12 months of receipt of the Scoping Opinion due to ongoing design and landowner discussions. The Scottish Government has been updated as the project has progressed.
		Requested a summary table in the EIA Report setting out where each issue raised in the Scoping Opinion has been addressed.	This information is included within this table.
Dumfries and Galloway Council (D&GC)	7 th December 2020	Noted that the topics listed in the Report are acceptable.	Noted.
		Stated that St. Connel's Church (MDG75) has been formally submitted as a candidate for scheduling to Historic Environment Scotland. The proposed scheme has the potential to impact on the setting of the monument, cutting across the site's principal viewsheds up and down the Nith valley. Therefore, the EIA should consider the Scottish Government's new lidar data and that the impacts on the setting of St. Connel's Church should be included in the cultural heritage assessment in the EIA.	In the period between consultation and preparation of the assessment, St Connel's Churst has been designated as a Scheduled Monument and the potential for setting effects is detailed in Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage of the EIA Report.
		Confirmed that East Ayrshire Council have raised no objections or comments on the report.	Noted.
		In relation to flood management, noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface runoff from the site should be managed during and after construction. Runoff should mimic that of existing conditions and not be increased. Any significant increase in the rate of runoff into the watercourses which are located within the site may increase the flood risk downstream. 	Runoff and associated potential increase to flood risk has been considered as part of the EIA and assessment of effects on hydrology. The principles of SUDS has been incorporated into the final design, and standard good practice measures will be put in place to manage surface water runoff, including appropriate design of access tracks to avoid existing surface flow pathways, and drainage measures that do not restrict flow. This is detailed further with respect to tracks in Appendix 7.2 .
		The Nith District Salmon Fishery Board (NDSFB) advised aquatic surveys be conducted to include aquatic invertebrates and fish found in the watercourses along the intended route of the OHL. Request that these be conducted before any construction activity commences to establish a baseline and repeated during the construction phase and post completion, where a comparison can be made and assessment of any impacts is possible.	No fisheries surveys have been undertaken, as embedded mitigation in the form of good practice measures (e.g. buffers from riparian corridors) and standard construction phase mitigation techniques (e.g. pollution prevention measures) will avoid/minimise any anticipated significant effects on aquatic receptors. However, SPEN is committed to undertaking pre-construction and post-completion surveys to address this concern.
		The Council's road officer was unable to provide a response to this request, however D&GC advised should the route pass over any adopted roads, contact should be made with the Roads Officer to ascertain what permits/consents may be required. Transport Scotland would be responsible for any management or consents required to the A76.	Plans showing the locations of the accesses from the public road and a typical bellmouth design are provided in Chapter 4: Development Description of the EIA Report. No response has been received from Transport Scotland to the Scoping consultation however they did advise during consultation at the routeing stage when they acknowledged the crossing of the A76.
		Stated that proposed site crosses Core Path 84 and it would be appropriate that the EIA includes measures to minimise the impact on this route through both construction operations and during the operational period of the development.	Implementation of a diversion (i.e. avoiding formal closure) and managed crossing will be put in place where the temporary construction works intersect with Core Path 84. It is envisaged that any required diversion would be formed within the immediate vicinity of the existing affected route by stripping vegetation to create a passable surface on similar topography, with the length of any required diversion or crossing points kept to a minimum. If required, signage and way markers would be deployed to assist walkers using the route during construction.
		Landscape architect response (received 7th January 2021 under separate cover). Confirmed that the study area was appropriate and agreed with the approach to the assessment of effects on landscape character, noting that there is potential for impacts on where the line crosses the incised tributary valley of the Euchar Water, the open undulating mid slopes of Drumbuie Head and Brunt Rig, and the River Nith valley floor. Noted that the setting and scenic quality of Rowantree Crag and the River Nith are both landscape features of specific concern and that the LVIA should set out in detail how any effects would be mitigated. Noted that the visual receptors were under-represented in terms of potential geographical extent, close range properties, setting of Rowantree Crag in the Euchar Water valley and the River Nith and the visitor destination and arts venue at Crawick Multiverse. Noted that commentary should be provided on the effects with existing developments and that this should be clearly linked to the cumulative assessment with consented and in-planning developments that are proposed to be done in the CLVIA.	The proposed list of viewpoints for assessment has been further refined following ongoing consultation as the project has progressed. Full details of the consultation and final viewpoint list are provided in Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the EIA Report.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	10/02/2020	Confirmed that there were no heritage assets along the proposed route of the overhead line (OHL).	Noted.
		Agreed that cultural heritage can be scoped out from detailed assessment	Noted.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issue Raised at Scoping	Response/ Action to be taken in the EIA Report
		Advised that archaeological and cultural heritage advisors for Dumfries and Galloway will also be able to offer advice and information on assets which are not covered by HES such as unscheduled archaeology and category B and C listed buildings.	Consultation has been undertaken with the archaeological advisors for D&GC as noted above.
NatureScot	16/03/2020	The GGRP lies approximately 1.7km to the south west of the Muirkirk and North Lowther Uplands Special Protection Areas (SPA) and the North Lowther Uplands SSSI. It is advised that the EIA report should provide rationale explaining why the applicant considers that the proposed works would not be likely to have a significant effect on the qualifying features of the SPA or site integrity.	No significant effects are predicted on the qualifying features of the SPA and this is detailed further in Chapter 9: Ornithology of the EIA Report. Further consultation was undertaken with NatureScot which is also detailed in Chapter 9 .
		Advises that the applicant asks both RSPB and the local RSG whether there are any hen harrier roost records close to the proposed transmission line route, and that the applicant takes this information into account in relation to any SPA-related assessment.	The RSPB and local RSB have been approached for data and the full detail of the consultation is provided in the Chapter 9 of the EIA Report.
		Note that work carried out for the breeding season is reasonable, given the area involved and access constraints, but note that there is no information provided on wintering waterfowl (particularly for the Nith Valley crossing) or roosting hen harrier (a feature of the SPA).	The approach to the surveys has been agreed with NatureScot. Full details of the surveys and consultation is provided in Chapter 9 of the EIA Report.
		Note that the EIAR should consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impacts upon the SPA with consideration given to the connectivity distance for qualifying species. Potential impacts on wintering birds, especially roosting hen and waterfowl along the Nith Valley. Detail potential impacts and any mitigation suggested for the species noted (particularly peregrine, barn owl, black grouse, curlew) in relation to the GGRP as the information received so far has not been at the stage/ form which provides enough detail on the proximity of the selected route to these birds. 	As noted above, the scope and extent of surveys and assessment has been subsequently agreed with NatureScot. Full details of the surveys and consultation is provided in Chapter 9 of the EIA Report.
		The proposals for protected species surveys are considered appropriate.	Noted. No further action required.
		SNH recommends that all potentially affected peatland habitats within the survey corridor should be mapped to NVC standards.	All maps have been produced to the required specifications and include the information set out within the response.
		Cumulative landscape and visual impact assessment should include developments which are subject to valid applications as well as those which are constructed and approved.	Both constructed and approved developments have been included within the cumulative landscape and visual impact assessment.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	11/02/2020	Advise that the following is submitted in support of the application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map and assessment of all engineering activities in or impacting on the water environment including proposed buffers, details of any flood risk assessment and details of any related CAR applications. Map and assessment of impacts upon Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems and buffers. Map and assessment of impacts upon groundwater abstractions (including Private Water Supplies) and buffers. Peat depth survey and table detailing re-use proposals, if encountered. Map and table detailing forest removal. Map and site layout of borrow pits, or stockpile areas of imported stone to be used for access tracks. Schedule of mitigation including pollution prevention measures. 	There are no GWDTEs affected and no private water supplies located within 1km of the GGRP. Further details are provided in Chapter 7: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Peat . All other requests and maps have been produced to the required specifications and include the information set out within the response, including provision of details on peat.
		A Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) construction site licence will be required for management of surface water run-off from a construction site, including access tracks, which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is more than 4 hectares; is in excess of 5km, or; includes an area of more than 1 hectare or length of more than 500m on ground with a slope in excess of 25°. 	All required licences will be obtained prior to construction commencing.
		While it is unlikely that development will take place within 250m of a groundwater supply source; it would be helpful if the EIA Report provides evidence to confirm this.	Details of nearby public water supplies are included in Chapter 7 , however, as noted above, there are no PWS within 1km.
		Confirmed that provided watercourse crossings are designed to accommodate the 1 in 200 year event and other infrastructure is located well away from watercourses then there is no requirement for detailed information on flood risk.	Noted.
		Note that the site must be designed to avoid impacts upon the water environment, including minimum buffer of 50m around each loch or watercourse.	Further consultation with SEPA confirmed that 50m should be adhered to if possible, however they would be open to justification on how 50m could not be achieved but that this would be entirely dependent on what the watercourse is, steepness etc., and should be considered the 'exception' rather than the rule. Where it has been necessary to locate infrastructure within 50m of a watercourse, this is detailed further in Chapter 7 .
		Note that the EIA Report must demonstrate how the layout has been designed to minimise disturbance of peat and consequential release of CO2 and outline the preventative/mitigation measures to avoid significant drying or oxidation of peat. The submission must include a table which details the quantities of acrotelmic, catotelmic and amorphous peat which will be excavated for each element and where it will be re-used during reinstatement. Details of the proposed widths and depths of peat to be re-used and how it will be kept wet permanently must be included.	Detailed surveys have been undertaken of the peat depth across the length of the route in line with best practice and, where possible, areas of deeper peat have been avoided in the final design. Appendix 7.4 sets out measures for managing peat across the site during construction.

Consultee	Date of Response	Issue Raised at Scoping	Response/ Action to be taken in the EIA Report
		The GGRP and all associated infrastructure (including peat storage areas) should demonstrate how the development avoids Ground Water Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystems (GWDTE). A map demonstrating that all GWDTE are outwith a 100m radius of all excavations shallower than 1m and outwith 250m of all excavations deeper than 1m and proposed groundwater abstractions is required.	Where possible, the layout has been designed to avoid sensitive habitats and deeper areas of peat. These areas were visited during field work and details are provided in Chapter 8: Ecology . No GWDTEs will be affected by the route.
		Note that excavations and construction works can disrupt groundwater flow, and affect existing extractions. Note that if micro-siting is to be considered as a mitigation measure the distance of survey must be extended by the proposed maximum extent of micro-siting and needs to extend beyond the site boundary where the distances require it.	Surveys have extended beyond the final alignment of the GGRP, such that any micro-siting within the agreed tolerance (i.e. 50m) would not arise in different effects to those reported in the EIA Report, unless specifically stated.
		Note that as felling is required, the information provided in the EIA Report should refer to the current Forest Plan if one exists and measures should comply with the Plan where possible. Note that information on felling should be provided including a map identifying where felling will occur, photography of timber condition in each area, a table showing amounts of timber to be removed and what will be reused on site, and a plan showing how and where any timber residues will be used for ecological benefit, if relevant.	Details on forestry are provided in Chapter 4 of the EIA Report.
		Guidance on borrow pits provided.	No borrow pits are proposed. All stone will be imported to the site, most likely from Sorn quarry.
Marine Scotland (MS)	05/02/2020	Noted that the GGRP was located within the catchment of the River Nith which supports important salmon and trout populations which should be considered within the EIA, including the potential impacts associated with mining, forestry, and proposed felling operations on the water chemistry and aquatic biota. Advised that appropriate, site specific mitigation measures to avoid and/or minimise potential impacts on the water quality and fish populations should be discussed in the EIA report.	The guidance from Marine Scotland has been taken into consideration. No fisheries surveys have been undertaken, as embedded mitigation in the form of good practice measures (e.g. buffers from riparian corridors) and standard construction phase mitigation techniques (e.g. pollution prevention measures) will avoid/minimise any anticipated significant effects on aquatic receptors.
British Telecommunications (BT)	30/01/2020	Confirmed that the GGRP is not anticipated to interfere with BTs current and presently planned radio network.	Noted. No further action required.
Coal Authority	30/01/2020	Confirmed that the GGRP falls within the defined Development High Risk Area and that there are a number of recorded and historic unrecorded underground and open cast coal mining sites and entries within the vicinity of the GGRP.	Noted.
		A Coal Mining Risk Assessment will be required to ensure that due consideration to the potential risks posed to the GGRP by coal mining legacy present within the site.	A Coal Mining Risk Assessment is provided as Appendix 3.2 of the EIA Report.
		The Coal Authority considers that any layout proposed will need to be informed by the presence of the mine entries / opencast highwall(s).	The design of the GGRP has been adjusted to reduce or avoid adverse effects where possible with details set out in Chapter 2: The Routeing Process and Design Strategy of the EIA Report.
Crown Estate Scotland	05/03/2020	Confirmed Crown Estate Scotland have no comments to make on the GGRP.	Noted. No further action required.
Defence Infrastructure Organisation	14/02/2020	Confirmed that there are no safeguarding objections linked to the GGRP.	Noted. No further action required.
Glasgow Prestwick Airport	26/02/2020	Noted that the GGRP lies within the vicinity of Glasgow Prestwick Airports published Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP's) and recommend further engagement with Glasgow Prestwick and that an IFP check be carried out to establish whether the GGRP with have any potential impact.	An IFP check was undertaken by Pager Power on behalf of SPEN in December 2021 which confirmed there would be no impact. This was issued to Glasgow Prestwick Airport on 14 th December 2021 and Glasgow Prestwick Airport subsequently undertook an internal review which also confirmed there would be no impact.
NATS	12/02/2020	Confirmed that they have no objection to the GGRP.	Noted. No further action required.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	12/02/2020	Requested that potential effects on ornithology are scoped into the EIA and assessed in the EIA Report and noted the following points for further detailed consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> noted that effects on black grouse should be assessed and provided details on the location of a black grouse lek in close proximity to the GGRP. The southern section of the GGRP passes directly through a habitat management area (HMA) which was agreed as part of the planning consent for the Sanquhar Six windfarm. Noted that there are seven pairs of curlews that will be affected by the GGRP which are considerable in terms of its conservation status and may be at potential risk from collision. Agreed with mitigation measures to phase construction and mark lines, but noted that this should be explored in much greater detail. 	Potential effects on ornithology have been scoped into the EIA and have been assessed in detail in Chapter 9 of the EIA Report. This will include consideration of black grouse and curlew, and will also set out in detail proposed mitigation, including in the form of line marking.
Scottish Water	27/01/2020	Scottish Water have no objections to the GGRP but noted that it has the potential to impact upon existing Scottish Water assets.	Locations of utilities, including Scottish Water assets, will be confirmed before construction commences.

Note no responses to Scoping were received from the following organisations:

- Civil Aviation Authority;
- John Muir Trust;

- Mountaineering Scotland;
- Scottish Wildlife Trust;
- Visit Scotland;
- Transport Scotland;
- Scottish Forestry;
- Glasgow Airport;
- British Horse Society;
- Fisheries Management Scotland;
- Joint Radio Company;
- ScotWays;
- Scottish Wild Land Group;
- Health and Safety Executive;
- National Trust for Scotland;
- Sustrans Scotland;
- Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland;
- West of Scotland Archaeology Service;
- Kirkconnel and Kelloholm Community Council;
- Royal Burgh of Sanquhar Community Council;
- Penpont Community Council.